



## REGIONAL NORTH-SOUTH TRAVEL CAPACITY STUDY

### Technical Advisory Committee | Meeting #3 Summary

October 2, 2019 | Richland Community Center

#### **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Membership (listed alphabetically by organization)**

- Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (BFCG) (Patrick Pittenger, Erin Braich, Tanner Martin)
- Ben Franklin Transit (Bill Barlow)
- Bike Tri-Cities (Dave Beach)
- Fire, City of Richland Emergency Services (Randy Aust)
- Lamb Weston (Scott Williams)
- Mission Support Alliance (Andy Foster)
- Tri-Cities Chamber of Commerce (Stephanie Swanberg)
- US Dept of Energy - Richland Office (D.J. Ortiz for Jeff Bird)
- Energy Northwest (Michael Paoli)
- Washington State University (Ray White)

#### Project Team & Study Sponsors

- City of Richland, Public Works (Pete, Rogalsky, Julie West, John Deskins)
- J-U-B ENGINEERS (Spencer Montgomery, Ben Hoppe)
- The Langdon Group (Bryant Kuechle, Caroline Mellor, Tia Schleiger)
- Washington State Department of Transportation (Paul Gonseth and Troy Suing)
- City of Richland, Community & Economic Development (Kerwin Jensen)
- Benton County (Matt Rasmussen)
- City of West Richland Public Works, Study Sponsor (Roscoe Slade)

#### Additional Organizations with Members Unable to Attend

- Richland School District
- Preferred Freezer
- Pacific Northwest National Lab (PNNL)
- Port of Benton
- Bechtel
- Framatome
- Kadlec Regional Medical Center

#### **Project Goals Statement**

The Cities of Richland and West Richland, Benton County, and the Washington State Department of Transportation (Study Sponsors) are working with a consultant team to study north-south transportation capacity with the ultimate goal to increase mobility and reduce travel times both locally and regionally. The study includes evaluating and comparing the potential benefits of capacity improvements, such as

interchange or intersection improvements and a new corridor, in at least three distinct corridors (SR-240, George Washington Way and a new Kingsgate Way corridor) from both a technical and public input perspective.

**Meeting Goal**

To review the results of the alternative evaluation process; to reach a recommended prioritization for the alternatives; for CAC members to determine committee consensus in support of the recommended prioritization for the alternatives.

**Agenda Items Summary**

**Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Goal**

- Bryant Kuechle, The Langdon Group, welcomed the group and introduced the goal of the meeting.

**Review of Alternative Scoring**

- Spencer Montgomery, JUB Engineers, explained the results of the weighting of the nine criteria established by the TAC members.
- Prior to the meeting, TAC members completed an exercise to weight the importance of each criteria. A higher weight indicates a higher importance resulted from the committee’s aggregated weighting exercise.
- The full scoring and details for each criterion can be found on the project webpage.

**Final Criteria Weighting**

Criteria	Definition	Weight
Safety	Considered conflict points between vehicles and vehicles/ bicyclists, plus the degree that an alternative route is provided.	10
Human Impacts	Considered qualitative measures of impacts on environmental justice, noise, right-of-way and construction.	6
Cost	Estimated cost.	5
Travel Time Savings for Origin-Destination Pairs	Pairs of origin-destination locations were used to model travel time savings.	5
Ease of Implementation	Considered qualitative measures of ability to phase, fundability, property acquisition and environmental/ approval processes.	4
Environmental Impacts	Considered qualitative measures of impacts on wetlands, cultural/ archaeological impacts, parks, endangered species and unstable soils.	4
North-South Delay Reduced	Five study intersections were used to model effects.	4
Negatively Impacts Future HOV	Uses up available Right-of-Way, or would require conversion of existing lanes	3
Side Street Delay Reduced	Five study intersections were used to model effects.	2

Note: Criterion with the same weight were ordered alphabetically in the above table.

### Recommended Alternative Prioritization

- The TAC voted to present these results to the public open house for feedback on the rankings.
- TAC Members agreed on the recommendation that the highest priority is to pursue SR 240 Grade Separation as a long-term solution, with phased implementation. The first phase was recommended to be the Aaron Drive/SR 240/I-182 Interchange Improvements.
- Pete Rogalsky inquired to the project team if grade separating the By-Pass would eliminate the need to implement George Washington Way/Columbia Point Drive Intersection Improvements (#3 below). Spencer shared that the modeling analysis indicates that George Washington Way congestion would persist even after the highest ranked alternative was completed.
- After discussion, TAC Members agreed that the below prioritization does not preclude implementation of other projects in these corridors. The different types of travel capacity improvement projects have different funding opportunities; therefore, projects may be implemented in a different order than the listed ranking.

<b>Recommended Alternative Ranking</b>	<b>Total Weighted Score</b>
1. SR 240 By-Pass Grade Separation	307
2. Aaron Drive/I-182/SR 240 Interchange Improvements	248
3. George Washington Way/Columbia Point Drive Intersection Improvements	222
4. Kingsgate Way Extension	194
5. No Build	187
6. Widen SR 240 Southbound	180
7. North Richland Bridge	174

### Public Involvement Update

- Bryant reviewed the TAC Meeting #2 Summary. This summary and all Study documents are posted on the project website in an effort to foster a transparent process.
- CAC members provided feedback on the draft public survey, specifically on the need to integrate other active transportation modes, such as scooters. After discussion, the TAC and project team concluded that these other active transportation modes are included under the “improved non-motorized travel” choice under the question of “what is most important to you regarding your travel?” Additional active transportation choices would be more appropriately refined through other studies.
- The survey is to be released October 14<sup>th</sup>. Results of the survey and the final report will be available on the project website in December.
- The open house is to be held on October 16<sup>th</sup> at the Red Lion in Richland. The open house will provide the public with opportunities to visually understand the Study process, ask questions of project team members and provide input on the recommended alternative prioritization.

### Action Items & Next Steps

- TAC Members were encouraged to use their workplace communication channels to help advertise the upcoming open house and survey.
- The project team will follow-up with the TAC on the results of the survey and open house feedback from the public.
- The TAC will reconvene again if necessary; a subsequent meeting will be proposed if the feedback received at the open house largely differs from the consensus of the TAC.
- The project team will present the final report to the City Council on the December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.