

KITTITAS COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

PUBLIC HEARING STAFF REPORT

HEARING DATE: October 5, 2010

ACTION REQUESTED: Continue a Public Hearing for the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan for the years 2011-2016 and the Annual Construction Program for 2011.

BACKGROUND: Public Works revised the 2011-2016 Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan and documentation for this plan as requested at the September 21, 2010 Board of County Commissioners public hearing.

Public Works is requesting that the Board consider the proposed change to add the Yakima River Canyon Scenic Byway – SR 823 project submitted by KEEN, to clarify road levy funding assumptions will be based on a conservative estimate but any shifting of these funds to general fund will not exceed \$500,000, and to add the strategy that encourages off-street parking for recreational users.

INTERACTION: Public Works

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan and the Annual Construction Program.

- ATTACHEMENTS:**
1. 2011 Annual Construction Program and 2011-2016 Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan including:
 - a. Six-Year TIP & Annual Construction Program report
 - b. Strategy for Six-Year Plan
 - c. Transportation Improvement Plan Yearly comparison
 - d. Open House summary
 - e. Anticipated Revenue for Transportation Improvements
 - f. 2011 Annual Construction Program
 - g. 2011-2016 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan
 2. Resolutions to Adopt the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan and the Annual Road Construction Program

HANDLING: Return one signed copy of each resolution to Public Works

LEAD STAFF: Jan Ollivier, Transportation Manager



KITITITAS COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

2011 Annual Construction Program

and

2011-2016 Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan

Adopted _____ by the Board of County Commissioners

•

2011 Annual Road Construction Resolution No. 2010-_____
2011-2016 Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan Resolution No. 2010-_____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	1
Six-Year TIP & Annual Construction Program Report	2
Strategy for Six-Year Plan	3
Transportation Improvement Plan Yearly Comparison	4
Open House Summary	5
Anticipated Revenue for Transportation Improvement	6
2011 Annual Construction Program	7
2011-2016 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan	9

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

BRAC	Bridge Replacement Advisory Committee (funding program)
CAPP	County Arterial Preservation Program
CNSTR	construction cost estimate
DES	design cost estimate
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FFC	Federal Functional Classification
KCCD	Kittitas County Conservation District
MP	mile post
RAP	Rural Arterial Program
ROW	right-of-way cost estimate
STP	Surface Transportation Program – Safety
TIB	Transportation Improvement Board

PROGRAM REPORT

BACKGROUND:

Public Works has prepared a Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan for 2011-2016 and an Annual Construction Program for 2011. Open houses took place on 8/17/10 in Cle Elum and on 8/19/10 in Ellensburg to receive input and comments from the public, see attached Open House comments. A comparison of the 2010 program with the current 2011 program is also attached.

FUNDING:

The County must update and approve a Six-year Transportation Plan each year prior to approving the next year's budget. The Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan funding is based upon the assumption that there will not be any major increases or decreases in federal, state and local funding from 2010 levels. The major funding sources and expected revenue amounts are as follows:

1. County Arterial Preservation funding of approximately \$373,000 per year is used for placing structural asphalt surfaces and chip sealing county roads.
2. The Rural Arterial Transportation Account (RATA) is the primary funding source for reconstructing main roads. The county is eligible to receive approximately \$1.3 million each biennium for projects that compete successfully with other Eastern Washington Counties. The Nelson Siding Road reconstruction project received \$1.3 million in the 2005-2007 biennium, \$1.2 million in the 2007-2009 biennium, and \$553,500 in the 2009-2011 biennium. The Westside Road reconstruction project (MP 1.98-5.81) received \$700,000 in the 2007-2009 biennium, \$1,746,500 in the 2009-2011 biennium, and is expected to receive the remaining required funding \$1,353,500 in the 2013-2015 biennium.
3. Not to exceed a \$500,000 shift in the local road levy to the general fund and no major changes in the gas tax allocation. Public Works receives approximately \$4.6 million in property taxes and \$1.8 million in gas taxes which pay for administration and maintenance expenses and is considered local funding in the Six-year Transportation Plan.
4. Federal BRAC funding is used for Structurally Deficient bridges. There are no county bridges eligible for this funding at this time.

STRATEGY FOR SIX-YEAR PLAN

1. Widen shoulders on roads that lack sufficient shoulders for safe travel in accordance with the current road standards.
2. Fund or seek funding for major improvements to improve transportation corridors including:
 - Nelson Siding Road
 - Kittitas Highway Reconstruction
 - Industrial Park Street Improvements
 - Bowers Road Extension East
 - Teanaway Road and NF Teanaway Road
 - Westside Road
 - Fairview Road
 - No. 6 Road
 - Lambert Road Extension
3. Rehabilitate or replace structurally deficient bridges. Bridges over 20 feet long receive federal funding and bridges less than 20 feet must be funded from local dollars.
4. Dust Control and Soil Stabilization.
5. Overlay or seal coat roads to provide additional strength and life to the roads.
6. Enhancing county safety by placing guardrails and improving intersections at hazardous locations.
7. Improve safety in areas that allow for recreational users by encouraging off-street parking.
8. Encourage alternative modes of travel by providing pathways and bicycle lanes.

**Comparison of 2010-2015 and 2011-2016
6-Year Transportation Improvement Plans**

Item #	Project Name	2010 Status	Work Proposed 2011-2016 TIP
1	Nelson Siding Road MP 0.00 – MP 4.36	Environmental permits under negotiation.	Complete design and start construction on Big Creek and Little Creek bridges and road clearing in 2011. The remaining construction will take place in 2012.
2	Kititas Hwy Reconstruction E-Burg CL to Kititas CL	Funds to complete project awarded in 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010.	Design in 2011 and 2012. Determine right of way acquisition needs. Construct in 2013.
3	Industrial Park Street Improvements	Partial funds awarded in 2007, 2008, and 2010. Design completed in 2010.	Utility work started in 2010, street improvements to be constructed in phases starting in 2011.
4	Bowers Road Extension East	No change.	Seek funds to start design in 2011 for construction in 2013.
5	Teanaway Road and NF Teanaway Road	Project funded with Forest Highway allocation in 2010.	Work with Forest Highway Team to design in 2011 and construct in 2014.
6	Westside Road	Partial funding awarded in 2007-2009 and 2009-2011 bienniums, additional funds expected in 2011-2013 biennium	Start design in 2011, construct in 2014.
7	Fairview Road	No change, continued seeking funds.	Continue to seek funding.
8	No. 6 Road	No change, continued seeking funds.	Seek RAP funding when available.
9	Winston Bridge and Public road alignment	Project is on hold per Suncadia's request.	Suncadia will continue engineering design and environmental permitting, tentatively in 2013.
10	Lambert Road Extension	Identified as a potential new corridor in the County's 20-Year Transportation Plan	Seek grant funds to build this new corridor.
11-15	Safety Enhancements	Received guardrail and intersection safety improvement funding from WSDOT.	Continue upgrading and installing guardrail at various locations (08 and 07) and intersection safety improvements at various locations.
16-17	Sno-Park Improvements	None.	Coordinate with private parties to upgrade Woods N Steele Road for eligibility of sno-park funding. Salmon La Sac Sno-Park design will begin in 2013.
18-20	Shoulder Widening	No shoulder widening improvements completed.	Improve Cle Elum Airport Road shoulders in 2012, and Tjossem Road shoulders in 2013.
21-23	Arterial Asphalt Overlay/Widening	No asphalt overlay/widening improvements completed.	Design Anderson Road in 2011, construct in 2012. Design Old Hwy Ten in 2012, construct in 2013.
24	Dust Control and Soil Stabilization	Preventative treatment of existing roads.	Preventative treatment of existing roads.
25	Pathways & Bicycle Routes	No pathways or bicycle routes funded.	Use path funds as local match when seeking grant funding for path projects or to design and construct needed pathways.
26-30	Bridges	Completed WF Teanaway Road bridge. Began work on Cleman Road bridge, Carroll Road bridge, and Badger Pocket bridge.	BRAC funded bridge projects completed. Repair of multiple structurally deficient bridges including Old Highway 10 Road bridge, No. 6 Road bridge, Brick Mill bridge, and Cooke Canyon Road bridge.
31	Chip Seal	Chip sealed 18 miles of roadway	Chip seal 70 miles of roadway.
32	Turn-Arounds	None.	Program the construction of one turn around based on Priority Array.

OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY

August 17th, 2010 · Cle Elum, WA · Kittitas County Upper District Court · 4:30pm – 6:00pm

7 citizens attended the open house. Two comments were received by email and one comment was received at the Open House. The comments are as follows:

August 17, 2010

I'm writing in regards to the plan to rebuild the Teanaway Roads. I suspect that official planning won't kick off for quite some time but thought I'd get the following in now as I probably won't be able to make today's open house. First of all congratulations on securing funding! Pulling a trailer down the road has always made me nervous... I've a couple of concerns, comments and potential suggestions I'd like to share as you get the project planning underway.

1. Replacing the Lick Creek culverts on the North Fork Road is obviously needed but I've a concern that the stream bed between the North Fork Rd and where it dumps into the Teanaway River is not sufficient for the amount of water that will flow unimpeded with what I assume will be a larger higher capacity culvert. It will mean that at least one and possibly more smaller sized culverts will be downstream from the one the county replaces upstream. The existing county culverts have in a sense acted as a flow control valve for this portion of the creek. There are 3 residential access culverts below this point. The closest to the undersized pair that go under the road is approximately 6 foot in diameter, the next is 11' 6" wide oblong and then there is an 8 footer diameter one about a hundred yards up from the North Fork. Replacing the too small culverts upstream could have the potential of putting the 6 parcels and their respective buildings at a higher risk of flooding below this point. It would be great if the Army Corp of Engineers or others could have a good look at the situation and take into account the high sediment levels that Lick Creek produces and how a newer higher capacity culvert might affect the down stream neighbors. (Extensive logging and fire in this drainage are also factors.) One thought would be an overflow relief channel eastwards into the North Fork for high water events. Please note that two of us (Low and Rooney parcels) combined driveways, eliminated the need for one set of culverts and replaced our culverts with a high capacity one with both monetary and engineering expertise from the KC Conservation District last summer.
2. Snowmobile access on the North Fork. I see this project as an excellent opportunity to enhance the snowmobiling experience for many as well as helping reduce the costs associated with grooming the trails in this area. Currently the groomers have to backtrack when grooming some of the trails in this area versus being able to make a circular route. Doubling back takes time and burns up the ever precious funding that is available for this important upper county economic driver. My suggestion would be to confer with Tim Foss at the ranger district on

potential solutions. (Shoulder use? Or just off of the road right away access for a trail from AFLC?) And the Teanaway Snowmobile Club would make itself available for any work days that enhancing groomer access would entail.

3. Bicycle use. I'm seeing more and more bikers in the area. Just as snowmobiling is an economic driver, factoring in bicycle use could also be a great recreational hook for the area.
4. Excess speed. A new buff road makes this even more likely! Residing at about milepost 8.4 and the first opportunity for a vehicle to legally pass for several miles, I know firsthand the dangers of this stretch of road for both humans and animals alike. This small stretch of road, approximately ¼ mile in length has about ten driveways fronting it. Walking down the road, even the 280 feet to my neighbors with my dog can be a stressful event on a busy weekend. I'd recommend you consider a lower speed limit for some of these similar stretches with multiple driveways, not just a suggested one, a double yellow line for this straightaway as well as driveways ahead or some such appropriate signage.
5. Excess speed and road kill. I was again reminded of the deer/elk and turkey issues a few weeks ago when a VW Jetta was upside down in the long straight away by the mercantile in broad daylight. Supposedly avoiding a deer. More proof that some folks just don't get that they need to share the road with our resident neighbors. It's hard to factor in specific road knowledge but more signage will be needed... And the turkeys are way slower than the 50 mph speed limit and do cause issues when they hit windshields!
6. Open range. As you probably know, the valley is open range and the North Fork in particular has cattle frequently on the road. I was reminded of this two nights ago when I came within feet of a very black cow standing in the middle of the very dark road. The cattle often work their way from up north down the Storey Creek basin and then need to be driven back up the North Fork Road to where they belong. It's become harder for the cow handlers over the years as more fences go up resulting in their need to use the road. In late August and September this often becomes a several day a week activity. It's hard on the roads and counter productive to your goal of less maintenance. And thankfully has not caused many vehicle accidents but they have occurred. The Porsche and cow both lost big time a few years back... Might fencing become part of the project?

I've cced several of the adjoining neighbors so that they can share any additional thoughts and will also contact the Corps of Engineers to share my concerns about Lick Creek. (I spoke to the Corps folks briefly when they inspected our new culvert.)

Please feel free to contact me for any additional information. Thanks!

Tracy Rooney, 13610 Teanaway Rd, North Fork, Cle Elum, WA 98922, tracyr@msn.com, 509.674.7373

August 25th, 2010

I wanted to get my thoughts/concerns on record concerning the plan to rebuild the Teanaway Road.

Tracy Rooney and I are next door neighbors and have been discussing issues that we believe are important and relevant to this project. Tracy sent in his comments last week; my comments generally follow his with a few exceptions.

1. Replacing the Lick Creek culverts on the North Fork Road is obviously needed but I've a concern that the stream bed between the North Fork Rd and where it dumps into the Teanaway River is not sufficient for the amount of water that will flow unimpeded with what I assume will be a larger higher capacity culvert. It will mean that at least one and possibly more smaller sized culverts will be downstream from the one the county replaces upstream. The existing county culverts have in a sense acted as a flow control valve for this portion of the creek. There are 3 residential access culverts below this point. The closest to the undersized pair that go under the road is approximately 6 foot in diameter, the next is 11' 6" wide oblong and then there is an 8 footer diameter one about a hundred yards up from the North Fork. Replacing the too small culverts upstream could have the potential of putting the 6 parcels and their respective buildings at a higher risk of flooding below this point. It would be great if the Army Corp of Engineers or others could have a good look at the situation and take into account the high sediment levels that Lick Creek produces and how a newer higher capacity culvert might affect the down stream neighbors. (Extensive logging and fire in this drainage are also factors.) One thought would be an overflow relief channel eastwards into the North Fork for high water events. Please note that Tracy and I combined driveways, eliminating the need for one set of culverts and replaced our culverts with a high capacity one with both monetary and engineering expertise from the KC Conservation District last summer. Also note that both Tracy and I suffered substantial damage and loss due to flooding of Lick Creek a couple years ago. (Total losses exceeded \$100,000) Based on this flood, we both decided to spend a great deal of time and money to change our culverts and driveways to minimize the chances of another flood event. Various local, state and federal agencies worked with us on this project to make absolutely certain that we "did it right". However, depending on what changes occur to the culverts to the north of us, we could be faced with a flood event that would destroy not only our out buildings but our homes and property as well. As such, it will be critical for this project to recognize and properly deal with this flooding issue.
2. Snowmobile access on the North Fork. I see this project as an excellent opportunity to enhance the snowmobiling experience for many as well as helping reduce the costs associated with grooming the trails in this area. Currently the groomers have to backtrack when grooming some of the trails in this area versus being able to make a circular route. Doubling back takes time and burns up the ever precious funding that is available for this important upper county economic driver. My suggestion would be to confer with Tim Foss at the ranger district on potential solutions. (Shoulder use? Or just off of the road right away access for a trail from AFLC?) As President of the Teanaway Snowmobile Club, we would make our club available for any work days that enhancing groomer access would entail.
4. Excess speed. A new buff road makes this even more likely! Residing at about milepost 8.4 and the first opportunity for a vehicle to legally pass for several miles, I know firsthand the dangers of this stretch of road for both humans and animals alike. This small stretch of road, approximately ¼ mile in length has about ten driveways fronting it. I'd recommend you consider a lower speed limit for some of these similar stretches with multiple driveways, not just a suggested one, a double yellow line for this straightaway as well as driveways ahead or some such appropriate signage.
6. Open range. As you probably know, the valley is open range and the North Fork in particular has cattle frequently on the road. Every year I have at least 3 instances where people come to my house to report that they have run into cow(s) and have suffered vehicle damage and/or personal injury. Vehicles have hit cows that have literally mashed completely from one end of the car to the other. In an attempt to miss cows

standing in the road, drivers have swerved and crashed into cars in the oncoming lane, have hit trees and crashed into the ditches. The cattle often work their way from up north down the Storey Creek basin and then need to be driven back up the North Fork Road to where they belong. Over the years it has become harder for the cow handlers to control the cows as more fences go up. This results in their need to use the Teanaway Road (that is full or corners and hills) to drive the cows. In late August and September this often becomes a several day a week activity. It's hard on the roads, very dangerous and counter productive to your goal of less maintenance. Can you image the potential disaster if you were driving at 50 MPH around a corner and all of a sudden have cows, horses and riders all over the road in front of you? Should fencing become part of the project?

Please feel free to contact me for any additional information. Thanks!

Richard Low, 13620 Teanaway Rd, North Fork, Cle Elum, WA 98922, richardlow@shoemakermfg.com, 509.674.2977

August 17, 2010

Regarding the Teanaway and North Fork Teanaway Road. The reconstructed road to not follow the same pattern as the new road along Lake Cle Elum, i.e. a road designed for a 60 mph speed when 35 or 40 is appropriate. Do not straighten the road. Do not widen the road. Provide a bike lane. After all ... this is technically a Dead End Road! Used and enjoyed primarily for its scenic value and access to outdoor recreation.

Pico Cantieni, 5920 Red Bridge Road, Cle Elum WA 98922

August 19th, 2010 · Ellensburg, WA · Kittitas County Public Works Conference Room · 4:30pm – 6:00 pm

3 citizens attended the open house. No comments received.

ANTICIPATED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT REVENUE

Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Local: Property Tax	\$4,130	\$4,130	\$4,130	\$4,130	\$4,130	\$4,130
Local: Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax	\$1,853	\$1,853	\$1,853	\$1,853	\$1,853	\$1,853
Local: MVET (Bikes & Trails)	\$10	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9	\$9
Local: Sales and Use Tax	\$480	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State: RAP	\$935	\$1,571	\$0	\$4,600	\$264	\$1,086
State: CAPP (Gas Tax)	\$373	\$373	\$373	\$373	\$373	\$373
State: TIB	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal: Forest Highway	\$1,500	\$0	\$0	\$14,000	\$0	\$0
Federal: STP	\$1,347	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200
Federal: Approps	\$2,280	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal: BRAC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUMMARY:						
Local Funds	\$6,473	\$5,992	\$5,992	\$5,992	\$5,992	\$5,992
State Funds	\$1,308	\$1,944	\$373	\$4,973	\$637	\$1,459
Federal Funds	\$5,127	\$200	\$200	\$14,200	\$200	\$200
Total Revenues	\$12,908	\$8,136	\$6,565	\$25,165	\$6,829	\$7,651

ANNUAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR 2011

AGENCY ACTION: COUNTY >> Kittitas
 DATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 9/21/2010
 DATE OF FINAL ADOPTION
 ORDINANCE/RESOLUTION NO.
 DATE OF AMENDMENT

TOTAL \$'S
 \$1,185,230
 \$1,094
 \$94

(A) TOTAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - columns (14)-(15)
 (B) PUBLISHED COUNTY FORCES LIMIT (see Instructions)
 (C) TOTAL COUNTY FORCES CONST PROGRAM-column (15)

** Line (B) must be smaller than Line (A) **

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)-(11) SOURCES OF FUNDS			(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	
ITEM NUMBER	ROAD PROGRAM ITEM NO	ROAD LOG NO	ROAD/PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION (Include brief term description or MP's; Bridge #)	PROJECT LENGTH (Miles)	FUNCTIONAL CLASS	WORK CODE(S)	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	COUNTY FUNDS \$1,234,567		OTHER FUNDS		PRELIM & CONST. ENGRNG 595.10 \$1,234,567	RIGHT OF WAY 595.20 \$1,234,567	CONTRACT \$1,234,567	COUNTY FORCES \$1,234,567	GRAND TOTAL ALL 695
								AMOUNT \$1,234,567	PROGRAM SOURCE							
01	1	23030	Nelson Siding Rd Improvements (MP 0.0 - 4.38)	4.38	08	ABOG		110	880	RAP	50	0	1,050	0	1100	
02	2	98951	Kittitas Highway Reconstruction	4.84	07	ABOG		40	280	STP/Appro	300	0	0	0	300	
03	3	varies	Industrial Park Street Improvements	1.05	19	ABCEFG		50	0		0	0	0	0	50	
04	4	22710	Bowers Rd. Extension East (MP 1.93 - 2.63)	0.70	17	ABOG		134	0		134	0	0	0	134	
05	5	28500 25880	Teahaway Road & North Fork Teahaway (Teahaway: MP 0.0 - 7.28 and NF Teahaway 0.0 - 5.8)	13.08	08	ABOG		50	350	Forest Hwy	400	0	0	0	400	
06	6	22710	Westside Road (MP 1.98 - MP 5.81)	3.83	08	ABC		40	180	RAP	200	0	0	0	200	
07	11	23010	Lambert Rd/Taylor Rd Intersection Safety Enhancements	N/A	08	ABOG		100	0		20	0	80	0	100	
08	12	varies	Run-off-road Improvements (guardrail, culverts, etc)	N/A	N/A	G		10	500	Rural Rd. Safety Prog	10	0	500	0	510	
09	20	60640	Anderson Rd Overlay	0.41	16	ABC		0	20	CAPP	20	0	0	0	20	
10	25	N/A	Pathways & Bicycle Routes	varies	N/A	H		24	0		0	0	0	24	24	
11	27	83047	Old Highway Ten Bridge	0.10	07	I		0	100	Rural Rd Safety Prog.	20	0	80	0	100	
12	34	90301	Cooke Canyon Road Bridge	0.10	09	I		100	0		0	0	100	0	100	
13	37	N/A	Turnarounds (countywide)	varies	N/A	ABOG		10	0		0	0	0	10	10	
PAGE / PROGRAM TOTALS, CONSTRUCTION							668	2,380	0	1,154	0	1,810	84	3,048		

RESERVE PAGE
FOR RESOLUTION

Kittitas County Department of Public Works 2011-2016 Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan

[illegible]

Anticipated Funding Sources (thousands)

*Airport Roads include Falcon Rd (MP 0 00 - MP 0 23) Elmview Rd (MP 0 00 - MP 0 30), Beech Rd (MP 0 00 - MP 0 15), Cessna Rd (MP 0 00 - MP 0 07) and Piper Rd (MP 0 00 - MP 0 07)

RESERVE PAGE
FOR RESOLUTION