

DRAFT West Bay Yards TIA Comments and Responses

City of Olympia Comments:

Comment: Analyze project impact to the intersection of Division Street and Harrison Avenue. From Figure 5, Site-Generated PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes, it is apparent that more than 20 trips in the peak hour will impact this intersection and by the TIA Guidelines need to be considered as a study intersection.

Action: This intersection has been added

Comment: The model and traffic assignment (Figure 5) does not show any trips through the Northwest Neighborhood via Brawne Avenue or any other street. Re-run the travel demand model with TAZ 454 and centroid connection to West Bay Drive in the location of the project site. Regardless of the model and through engineering judgment there will be some traffic that will impact the neighborhood with destinations to businesses such as the Olympia Food Coop, other commercial businesses on Division Street and schools to the west.

Action: The select zone analysis was refined and the assignment of traffic was adjusted to account for traffic using Brawne Avenue.

Comment: In Section 6 of the TIA, describe the expected level of project impacts to the recognized Northwest Neighborhood and any mitigation strategies needed. Also describe any anticipated traffic impact during any expected project construction street closures or weather events (ice) that temporarily close Brawne Avenue and Schneider Hill Road.

Response: There are negligible expected impacts to the Northwest neighborhood. This project is expected to send little traffic to both Schneider Hill Road and Brawne Avenue, so the diversion of traffic from these roads due to closure will be minimal.

Action: Description of impact has been added.

Comment: Verify stopping sight distance at the intersection of Brawne Avenue and West Bay Drive to determine the available Clear Sight Triangle (EDDS 4B.150,B and Std. Dwg 4-1C) and potential mitigation for the 85th percentile operating speed (approximately 35 mph) on West Bay Drive.

Indicate that the City of Olympia will be improving sight distance at this intersection by relocating streetlight pole, mailbox cluster and vegetation north of Brawne Avenue on the west side of West Bay Drive. This will provide drivers on Brawne Avenue a clear sight-line at 15-feet from the edge of the travel lane on West Bay Drive.

Action: Per City guidance, language has been added.

Comment: In addition to intersection delays for without and with project conditions, provide travel times on West Bay Drive from Brawne Avenue through the Harrison Avenue and the West Bay Drive roundabout.

Action: This has been added.

Comment: Lastly in section 3.3 of the TIA, daily traffic count data is missing from all traffic volume figures. This needs to be updated. Also, provide the dates of the traffic counts and explicitly state that the counts represent "Pre-Covid19" conditions.

Action: Daily volumes and date of counts has been added

Tilghman Comment Letter Comments:

Comment: No Mention of Logging Trucks

Response: The heavy vehicles were included in the existing turning movement counts and accounted for in the operational analysis. Based on the specifics of the logging activity documented in the comment letter, they do not operate during the PM peak hour. Based on the described operation, they would amount to 180-300 total truck trips per day. With an ADT of approximately 8,000 as of 2018, this equates to a truck percent of 2%-4%. This seems pretty typical for roadways and does not indicate the need for special attention.

Action: No Change to Operations. The presence of logging trucks has been added to the existing conditions description of West Ba Yards

Comment: Update the traffic study to include morning traffic conditions

Response: Given the local concerns regarding the congestion on West Bay Drive at the West Bay Dr/Harrison/Olympic roundabout, adding an AM peak hour analysis seems appropriate.

Action: AM trip generation, volume forecasts, and intersection analysis has been added for West Bay Dr/Harrison/Olympic

Comment: No Discussion of anecdotal traffic observations

Response: We do not typically reference anecdotal traffic operations. I don't doubt the queues the local residents have seen, but it is the typical performance we are seeking to report on. However, calibration efforts, described below, have been undertaken to better represent the existing performance of the intersection.

Action: No Change

Comment: No Daily Traffic Volumes

Action: Daily Volumes Added

Comment: Crash history on road segments away from intersections

Response: It is typically intersections that experience more crashes given the presence of conflicting movements and congestion. However, existing crash data for the West Bay Yards roadway was collected and reviewed. Mention of the crashes on West Bay yards related to speeding (1) have been added to the report.

Action: Added discussion of speeding related crashes (1) on West Bay Drive

Comment: No discussion of existing speeding on West Bay Drive

Response: The existing speeding concerns on West Bay Drive are already discussed in Section 6.3. Reference to the city's Street Safety Plan and a broader discussion of existing speeding issues has been added to Section 3.2

Action: Added description of existing speeding issue, and city's Street Safety Plan, to Section 3 of the TIA

Comment: pedestrian volumes at intersections

Response: In my experience pedestrian volumes have to be very large to have an impact to the vehicle operational performance. However, pedestrians were counted for each intersection, and we can add them to the operational analysis.

Action: Added pedestrian volumes to the operational analysis

Comment: Verification of queues at the Harrison/West Bay Dr/Olympic roundabout during morning and afternoon peak hours

Response: Additional traffic data was collected at the West Bay Dr/Harrison/Olympic intersection to perform a calibration of the operational analysis. Using this data, the operational analysis has been adjusted to better reflect the existing performance. This adjustment was made considering the one-day data collected and the standard practice and prevailing guidance for use of the analysis program. Additional narrative regarding the City's two-hour peak average policy, which focuses on a broader timeframe and does not aim to address the worst 15–30-minute congestion issues has also been added.

Action: Intersection analysis has been calibrated to better reflect existing performance

Comment: The study should also include traffic for public shoreline access

Response: This amenity was considered negligible during the PM peak hour. However, we can assume each stall would be used within each peak hour and add the resulting 7 trips to the trip generation calculations.

Action: Added 7 PM Peak Hour trips to account for waterfront recreation parking stalls

Comment: The study should also include a parking demand analysis

Response: The proposed parking supply is directed by the City of Olympia parking code.

Action: No Change

Comment: Inconsistent reference to commercial space between TIA and SEPA checklist

Action: Square footages and uses have been updated to reflect current site plan

Comment: Inconsistent full-build horizon year between TIA and SEPA Checklist

Action: Full build horizon year has been updated to 2027

Comment: Inconsistent parking supply total between TIA and SEPA Checklist

Action: Confirm correct parking supply and update as needed

Comment: TIA does not account for restaurant outdoor seating

Response: The Trip Generation Rate used, Quality Restaurant, specifically does not include the square footage associated with the sites that provided outdoor seating, but still included the associated trips. However, it does recommend using seats as the independent variable for sites with significant outdoor seating. The City agrees that it is appropriate to use seats as the independent variable given the planned size of the outdoor seating area.

Action: Trip generation updated to reflect number of seats.

Comment: The pass-by rate was used to aggressively given the specific use and roadway character.

Response: It is generally considered reasonable to draw as much as 10% of the adjacent existing traffic volumes as pass-by trips. The proposed restaurant seems appropriately assigned as a quality restaurant and while it may be a destination restaurant for some, it is also likely to be more frequented by people driving by the site. The City is in agreement that the assumptions are reasonable.

Action: No Change

Comment: Restaurant may overwhelm proposed parking

Response: We typically don't address the sufficiency of the proposed parking supply, allowing the City parking code to handle that. I don't see any reason to specifically be worried that City parking code is insufficient in this instance.

Action: No Change

Comment: Provide a sensitivity analysis for when left-turn lanes would be warranted

Response: This project is expected to be primarily send traffic to/from the south. As such, the proposed left-turn volumes into the site are minimal (all single digit turns, 11 trips total) and would not be expected to meet warrants at any point in time. These volumes may slightly change with some other revisions, but not enough to change result in needing left-turn lanes.

Action: No Change

Comment: Deviation request lacks essential information

Response: The deviation request pertains to converting planned left-turn lanes into intersection speed tables. The left-turn lanes would create opportunities for pedestrian mid-block refuges but would not have much effect on the existing speeding concerns. With the logging trucks making up 2-4% of the ADT, they do not seem to require special attention.

Action: No Change