



US 2 Upper Wenatchee Valley
TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Project Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Wednesday, June 19, 2019

11:30 AM – 1:30 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
- Sergeant Scott Lawrence, Chelan County Sheriff
- Nick Manzano, WSDOT
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
- Kendra Breiland, Fehr & Peers
- Kara Hall, Fehr & Peers
- Bianca Popescu, Fehr & Peers

In-person observing

- Richard Warren, WSDOT
- Lilith Vespier, City of Leavenworth

Purpose of the meeting

- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, reviewed the meeting agenda
 - What we've heard so far
 - Project evaluation exercise & report back
 - Project selection criteria
 - Next steps

AGENDA ITEM #2 – WHAT WE'VE HEARD SO FAR

Online Engagement

- Penny reviewed the online site usage and feedback.
 - Trends for Pages per Session & Average Time are consistent with industry average.
 - Visits to the site spiked with promotion following the previous Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting. We hope to see similar trends following today's meeting.

- Who Participated
 - Most responses came from Leavenworth residents and surrounding area, but also received fair participation from other residents in the area, including Peshastin, Coles Corner, etc.
- Vision & Guiding Principles
 - Generally, feedback indicates that we've captured the important principles.
 - A PAC member asked what the "consideration for cost" response referred to. Kara Hall, Fehr & Peers, noted that feedback mentioned considering value for residents in expensive improvements.
- Guiding Principles
 - Safe & Complete and Reliable were identified as the most important of the principles.

Leavenworth Farmers Market

- Penny noted that Kaiwen Lee, EnviroIssues, and Bianca Popescu, Fehr & Peers, staffed a booth at the June 13 Farmers Market. They spoke with 59 people about the study.
- Bianca noted that the community was positive about the purpose and hoped for outcomes of the project.
- Many residents also indicated interest in new or improved bicycle facilities on US 2 and on parallel routes.

How Did We Incorporate Feedback?

- Kara noted they reviewed the guiding principles and criteria with community input in mind. She reviewed changes that were made in response to the input.
 - Removed vibrant from guiding principles, focused instead on region's economy
 - Supported guiding principle will be factored into consideration based on the feedback we receive
 - Revised rankings on guiding principles 1, 3, and 4.1 (Right of Way)
 - Paula noted we should consider reordering Principles to align with feedback. "Safe and complete" – since it was the most important thing for the public
 - Paula noted that Parking & Way – Finding should likely have more explicit ranking.

What's Next

- Penny reviewed the new, interactive map site that is now live online. With the new feature, online visitors can comment on project team ideas and can place pins on the map with their own ideas for projects.
 - People are adding ideas and commenting on our project ideas
 - Penny requested that PAC members share the website broadly among their networks. The site will only be as effective as how many people can access it – so please share!
 - The interactive map will be live through the end of July to capture feedback and input during seasonal travel periods.
 - WSDOT will use Variable Voice Messaging to promote project feedback during the busy months.

- Richard Warren, WSDOT Multimodal Planning, noted the interactive map feature is fantastic. He mentioned that Nick Manzano, WSDOT, had reported to an internal review team on the online engagement for the study and the team was very impressed.
- Penny's team is working to schedule a Peshastin community briefing in order to reach the Spanish and agricultural community

AGENDA ITEM #3 – PROJECT EVALUATION EXERCISE

Kara introduced the agenda item, noting the goal is to get feedback from the PAC on the project list.

- PAC members were divided into two groups and asked to review the entire project list and identify a) Projects you like and why, b) Projects you don't like and why, c) short term projects, d) long term projects
- "Short Term" was defined to mean 5 years or less for implementation, 5-10 years – long term, 10 years > potential Vision Project
- Workshop outcomes
 - Group A (City of Leavenworth (COL), Friends of Leavenworth (FOL), Chamber):
 - Segment 1 - Liked #3, #4
 - Segment 2 - Liked #14, 16, 19, 18, [17 – FOL], 20, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32 [can only fund them if there is a collision history – WSDOT says], 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 43, and 44
 - 39 and 41 are already implemented in Segment 1
 - Segment 3 – Liked 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, (52 already happening), 57
 - Segment 4 - Liked 59
 - Group B (WSDOT, County, Sheriff)
 - Segment 1 – Liked 1 - 4, 6 – 12
 - Segment 2 – Liked #13, 16-18, 21, 23-31, 33, 35-41, 43-44,
 - Segment 3 – Liked #47-57
 - Segment 4 – Liked all, #58 – 63
- Segment 1 discussion
 - Shuttle to Stevens Pass would be great, but has nothing to do with our project
 - #2 is a really long term project "vision project" – can't see it happening
 - Inappropriate for residential community to have freight
 - #4 should separate out the two concepts – 'upgrading existing' is very different than 'creating new' pull-outs
- Segment 2 discussion
 - #13 – What does it look like? Front Street is already being closed. Both groups were ok with the option as long as it does not include blocking US 2.
 - #14 – Clarification was made that the center lane goes one way, alternating the direction based on the congestion. It was also discussed as being available as an evacuation route. Members observed there were many community comments about not having a plan for massive evacuation or emergencies. This project needs to be restated.
 - #17 – Some were against pedestrian bridges, stating people will still j-walk, cost is high, location is not known, fencing would be needed

- Some who liked the option said it would be nice to separate pedestrians
- Underpass: Safety concerns were noted; it would have to be well designed, well-lit, and safe to be used
- #19 – County disagrees with this project unless only looking at multimodal facilities
- #20 – County had same concern as for #19
- #21 - Is this the best priority of funds?
 - It was noted it could be a visual enhancement and an opportunity to prevent j-walking.
- #22 - This was clarified as to be a coordinated plan for flagger training to improve effectiveness of flagging.
- #26/27 - Bike share was considered low priority because of low density; some liked the idea.
- #30 - Dynamic counting for parking concerns included the cost/benefit because of such a small area. Some counting systems are weather dependent, malfunctioning in snow conditions. Group B liked the better parking management part. Group A liked this idea if a parking structure was built.
- #32 - Roundabout depends on WSDOT; whether it fits criteria. WSDOT noted the intersections aren't prioritized from a collision perspective, but if the City wants to go after a grant to fund them, they would.
- #35 – Concern that population density isn't high enough to make this work.
- #39 – Daily service of Trailways-type bus – already have it (Northwestern bus)
- #42 – It was noted that officers are unlikely to prioritize this.
- Segment #3
 - #46 – Okay with North Rd if active modes
 - #53 – The aerial tramway is very “visionary”
- Segment #4
 - Creating a bicycle route via the irrigation ditch would be a better effort spent than creating a safe lane on US 2
- Each group provided documentation for Short Term/Long Term projects
- Kendra noted that this discussion will be used to identify fatal flaws in projects and understand priorities as the team moves into developing project packages for evaluation of final report.
- Feedback from the groups indicated that there were some project descriptions needing more explanation and details.
 - Kara noted that final project descriptions, locations, and improvements will be refined as the process moves forward.

AGENDA ITEM #4 – PROJECT SELECTION OVERVIEW

Kendra Breiland, Fehr & Peers, provided an overview of how the Evaluation Matrix will be used. She noted the conversation today was helpful in informing how the projects are evaluated.

- Top projects will be evaluated using the matrix scoring and prioritizing the Safe & Complete and Reliable principles based on community feedback (perhaps doubling points associated with those principles).

- She noted the matrix is a tool, not a decision-making device. She noted the team heard what is considered a “no-go” today and that feedback will be considered.
- The team will be creating a package of projects. There are likely to be some top tier projects and some middle tier projects to ensure there are short term and long-term solutions that align with project goals and principles.
- Joel asked whether the public will have an opportunity to respond to the packages. Kara responded that feedback loop will occur in September when there is a more complete plan.
 - Nick asked if the approach will be to put the project packages on the interactive map?
 - Penny responded it will be considered but it will depend on how easily the packages can be described and presented. They will need to be straight-forward and easy to understand.
- CDTC will give an update in August to their board.

AGENDA ITEM #5 – NEXT STEPS

- The interactive online map will be live through July 31.
- Consultant team will be completing the evaluation matrix, incorporating community feedback and narrowing the project list and beginning evaluation.
- Project Packages will be presented at the next PAC meeting.
- Next PAC meeting is August 21st.