Appendix F

Open House Mailers, Exhibits, and Public Comments
The Kitsap County Department of Public Works is performing an Alternatives Analysis for the southern quarter mile of Banner Road SE between Olalla Valley Road SE and SE Banfill Road. This section of roadway is experiencing significant erosion and instability due to wave action, which has caused accelerated slope failure and has led to the erosion of slopes below the roadway.

Based on your proximity to the study area, you are invited to attend a public meeting on October 12th at the Olalla Community Club where County staff and their consultant will introduce the project, explain the scope of work, and solicit your input.

Meeting Time and Place:
Tuesday, October 12, 2010
Open House From 6pm–8pm
20 min Presentation at 6:30 PM
The Olalla Community Club
12970 Olalla Valley Rd SE
Olalla, Washington 98359

For information about the project and the initial list of alternatives to date, please see the project website below. The website also contains comment forms if you are not able to attend the meeting.

Project Website
www.kitsapgov.com/pw/banner.htm

Staff Contact:
Bill Edwards, PE | (360) 337-5777 | bedwards@co.kitsap.wa.us
Kitsap County Department of Public Works
614 Division Street, MS-26, Port Orchard, WA 98366-4699

Let us know what you think!
614 Division Street, Port Orchard, Washington 98366-4699
Reconstruct roadway generally following the existing Banner Rd SE Right-of-Way.

Realign Banner Rd SE to eliminate S curves near SE Banfill Rd

Reconstruct Banner Road SE as a 1 way Southbound road beyond SE Banfill Rd.  
Improve Price Rd SE as a one way Northbound road between Olalla Valley Rd SE and SE Culver St.  
SE Culver St would remain open for two way traffic.  
A turnaround/cul-de-sac would be needed at Culver/Price intersection.

Close Banner between SE Banfill Rd and Olalla Valley Road SE  
Construct new roadway alignment from SE Banfill Rd to Olalla Valley Rd SE behind the back side of the Cairns parcel.

Close Banner between SE Banfill Rd and Olalla Valley Road SE  
Put in turnaround/cul-de-sac at Banfill Rd SE  
Olalla Valley Road SE and SE Banner Rd intersection reconstructed to be a driveway.
**BANNER RD SE**

**ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

**INITIAL LIST OF IDEAS 2 OF 3**

- Extend SE Culver St to Olalla Valley Rd SE
- Close Banner Rd SE at SE Banfill Rd
- New connection to Olalla Valley Rd SE beginning midway through SE Culver St.
- Price Rd SE would be closed.

- Improve Price Rd SE for two way traffic
- Close Banner Rd SE at SE Banfill Rd
A new roadway alignment from the 90 degree bend in Banner Rd SE to Olalla Valley Road SE.

A new roadway alignment from Banner Rd SE. Alignment heads west and south through primarily undeveloped property down to Olalla Valley Road SE.

A new roadway alignment from Banner Rd SE west to Orchard Ave SE.

A bridge structure across ravine likely preferable to extensive fill.
**COMMENTS ON FORMS PROVIDED AT MEETING**

Please keep me informed as to meetings.

With the low traffic volumes on Banner, I believe that the County should work within existing right of ways. Banner Rd from the intersection of Olalla Valley Rd to the top of the hill (1.1) miles is not a safe road. Simple solutions, i.e., closing Banner to through traffic may be best in these times of tight money, tax dollars and budgets.

Do you the residents of our area get to vote on your plan? Who’s paying for this? Will our taxes go up? When do you intend to start the project? Looks like you decided already since Waste Management called and said their trucks can’t come on our street, CULVER – so I cancelled pick up! Wanted one to take 2 64 gal. containers clear down to Banner and Culver corner – I keep thinking how it took nine years for Mull... overpass and then years later for B... Olalla overpass. So will this be a long wait also? I had trash pickup for 8 years and just now the weight of their trucks is too much?

I like options 1 and 9.
I am opposed to options 5, 6, 7, 8.

I will send an e-mail for further comments.

Is it just that small piece of roadway – have there been accidents there?

I’d like a 3-lane driveway – how can you do this without considering costs?

Why not cut trees and plant different plants. B... cuts and stabilize the bottom of the hill.

Have you ever cited anybody for weight of vehicles?
Enforce 15mph speed at the corner.
County declared Banner as “inherently dangerous.”

Alternate 10 seems to impact the fewest homes. Would like to know whether the cost would be reasonable compared to other options.

Options 4 and 6 look like the best compromises.
I prefer Option 6.
9, 10, and 11 are not reasonable.
1, 2, and 3 are not reasonable.
9 and 8 are not reasonable.
10% grades are too steep.

I am completely against any alternative that infringes upon any homeowner’s home and/or property. Alternative 7 would displace my family and at this point in time I am extremely upset that it would even be considered.
I think the traffic should be re-routed on Willock now. $0 option. But in no way do I want lower Banner to revert to the property owners as a private drive. This is the centerpiece of Olalla and should always remain open to walkers and bicyclists and local traffic.

Adamantly oppose any option that significantly impacts any home owner. I would prefer Option 1 if the properties are not encroached upon. Alternatively (not listed today) is to permanently limit traffic along Price/Banner to local access only and re-route arterial across Willock/Orchard to Olalla Valley. Many pedestrians use Price/Banner and any increase in traffic along those roads pose safety hazard to our children.

You mentioned you’ve completed a traffic study 20 years out – please let me know what the future numbers are. 700 is the figure you used for today’s #.

Int.. patrolling of overweight vehicles

3 cars have gone over bank

Want costs before they vote

Over 20 trees taken down in the upper slope

Close Banner/close Price
(Make people go to Willock)

They don’t really use lower banner, 1 way or closure ...... stations of Burley/Olalla and South of Sedg.... on Banner

Sight distance problem at Olalla ... Rd.
(int. needs to be raised)

**COMMENTS ON BOARDS POSTED AT MEETING**

Quantify problems with existing Banner section

Do Alternative 5 now, and see what happens in the interim.

Close a section of Banner Rd north of Willock between Orchard and Willock to reduce traffic on this section of Banner

Adjust the alignment of Alt 10 to follow contours above ravine (more along center of parcel dividing into 2 pieces)

Limit heavy traffic permanently

Need to fix road slope no matter what alt.
I attended the 12 October public meeting concerning the proposed improvements to Banner Rd. Overall I thought the team did a good job presenting an unavoidably contentious proposal.

As an engineer for over 20 years and the author of more trade studies than I care to admit I thought I might point out a couple of areas that could have used a bit of improvement.

1.) The first option is always Do Nothing? This forces the evaluator to fully understand the problem and qualitatively as well as quantitatively assess its impacts. If this was done many of the comments questioning the need for road work could have been answered before they were asked. I suggest the geotech study detailing the risks be made available on line.

2.) Listening involves more than being quiet while another person talks. Beyond item one several other points were made by the public that should have elicited action items on the part of the team. For example, adding to the list of options reinforcing the lower slope and stabilizing the upper slope. If this was considered during the development of the long list and excluded for cause, there would be no harm in including it and citing the reasons for its dismissal at the next public meeting. This would, if nothing else, demonstrate the commitment on the part of the county to cultivate public consensus.

As for my opinion on a path forward, I thought the gentlemen in the front row who proposed diverting thru traffic down Wilcox and making the rest of Banner local access was very reasonable and could likely result in a solution that would not only garner a good deal of public support, but one that may prove the most cost effective. I would like to see this included in the long list of potential solutions.

I wish the team every success in execution of their study.
The Banner Road Meeting did nothing to convince me that Banner road is structurally dangerous but it did convince me that government processes are EXTREMELY dangerous. You really haven't made it clear to people that "reconstruct" on Alt 1 and ALT 3 means NEW road standards and will probably condemn the houses on that stretch and Alt 2 is just abusive. If you have an Alternative that uses the existing footprint or cantilevers out it needs to be clarified. Any vagueness will take the houses because once the the grant process gets started anything can happen. This isn't an issue in the areas where you have more space. Also you need to consider the social impact of including someone's home and yard in the final three in a project that may not happen until 20 years from now.

I travel on this section of Banner Road often, as my parents live on the top of Banner, and I live in Olalla Valley, west of the estuary. While I agree that it is a beautiful view, I feel unsafe driving this section as the view is difficult to ignore, and there is no margin of error in driving here, particularly with the narrow lanes and dropoffs. Out of the alternatives offered, option 6 is my preference, followed by option 7. These seem the least disruptive to property owners bordering this section of Banner, but keeps traffic close enough to the area to keep it from being a huge detour, as with alternatives 9 - 11. I think closing this section of Banner and using it as a driveway for the properties bordering it is the safest plan. However, I'd like to see pedestrian/bicycle access continue to be allowed through as before to preserve the public benefit of the view, but in a safer manner. I look forward to seeing how the project will develop.

As I stated in the meeting Tuesday night. I feel option 1 must be done there is no way the county is going to allow the hill to continue to slide no matter what else is done even if that section of banner was closed to through traffic it would still need to be maintained by the county for access for the residents living there. Option 3 would be a compromise we would not like it but we must be flexible sometime. I personally like option 9 and 10 but would bow to the needs of affected residents. Option 5 is selfish and self serving NO. Options 5,6,7,8 No, all change the usage of our property in that we live so close to the road. We wanted to live on a quiet county road. That is why we recently bought the home we live in. We and our neighbors would like it to stay that way a nice quiet country road. The best course of action would be a combination 1/9 or 1/10 this would fix the existing road and lessen the traffic through those tight turns.

Just to recap
Options 1,9,10 Yes vote from myself
Options 5,6,7,8 No Vote from us
Options 2,3,4,11 are neutral to us
It is highly probable under the current transportation improvement plan process that no eventually selected alternative proposed at the October 12th meeting regarding Banner Road safety issues would be implemented for some 5 or 6 years (if at all) such that it would provide relief of a situation characterized by the county as an "INHERENT DANGER" to the public safety.

I suggest, therefore, experimenting with one of two alternatives for immediate mitigation of the Banner Road safety issue while, if necessary, the county continues to conduct studies that would presumably one day result in intelligent, well thought out, thoroughly discussed among dramatically effected home and property owners, a permanent fix to lower Banner Road. The county may discover that only a brief passage of time would serve to mollify folks having to travel a bit out of their way in exchange for public safety and the avoidance of county incursion of private, cherished properties. The county may also discover that no further solution than proposed in my following alternatives would be required.

The purpose of the following two alternatives is an IMMEDIATE and COST EFFECTIVE response to a county concern for the safety of motorized vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian traffic on lower Banner Road, S.E.

Alternative 5.B immediately resolves the "INHERENT DANGER" issue 100%; alternative 5.C. possibly no less than 95%. Both alternatives would obviously require advanced notice of road closure and posting of 'no outlet' signage.

Alternative 5.B.

Close Price Road and Banner Road at their Olalla Valley Road juncture JANUARY 1st, 2011 or on a date in proximity. Traffic would utilize existing roads off Banner Road (e.g. Willock Road leading over to Orchard Road).

Alternative 5.C.

Close Price Road JANUARY 1st, 2011 or on a date in proximity (could temporarily be left open but given the safety issue should eventually be closed). Close Banner Road slightly above Culver Road JANUARY 1st, 2011 or on a date in proximity. Allow Banner Road between Culver Road and Olalla Valley Road to remain open for use by Culver, Price and Lower Banner Road residents.

Finally, it is Kitsap County that has declared lower Banner Road as "INHERENTLY DANGEROUS" to the public. Should the county decide to defer alleviating the danger for 5 or 6 years, leaving property owners in a state of suspension and the public in a state of danger, when an immediate negligible cost resolution is afforded, would constitute a cavalier discounting of public safety and potentially provide an eventual springboard for legal difficulties for Kitsap County.
I think the current process for the Banner Road Design is being channeled to go a particular direction and that public input is not being used correctly.

Very early on I emailed both the County Commissioner and Public Works about my concern in saving my home and my neighbors homes. The result is that the project was turned over to a design group that came up with 3 different options to DESTROY my home. The 3 options were written vaguely and the public was expected to comment on it with no information. Alt 1 could be considered the default for this project because it would be in the same location as the existing road - with Alt 2 & 3 being very similar. It was described as "reconstruct roadway generally following the existing Banner Road SE Right of Way".

It made no mention of the fact that it will knock out 2 to 3 homes - the whole original shoreline neighborhood of Olalla. I repeatedly asked KPFF (through Bill Edwards) to mention this in the public presentation. They refused saying that this is a design detail. They are obviously channeling input and interest into Alt 1, 2, and 3 since there is a normal human desire to keep things the same unless there is a reason to change them.

Now we have approached the detail stage. I have made several requests to add an alternative that would keep Banner in the EXISTING footprint as a local road and combine it with a new road in another area (such as Alt 10). They have refused saying that this is just a derivative of another alternative. An alternative that keeps Banner in the existing footprint is COMPLETELY different than an alternative that destroys homes and yards (and we are talking about very small yards). No normal person would equate the two. I was also told that what happens to Banner if it is closed is not being discussed now. So now, in this never ending game of semantics, you are presenting the 3 alternatives that destroy the neighborhood as the ONLY alternatives that assure the public any kind of access to Banner (the road with a view). Hmmmm, I wonder what direction KPFF is leading us? My suggestion was meant to open up some ideas from people who are supposed to know something.

What's wrong with a one-way existing foot-print repair if we plan for a future road somewhere else? What about a driveway combined with access for pedestrians and bicycles? Isn't there something like that in Kingston? Don't just say no - come up with some ideas! Apparently there will be no discussion until they have slated my home for demolition.

To top it off a ridiculous feature has been added to the website - vote for your 5 favorite alternatives. I had to call to have "likely displacement of homes" added on Alt 1, 2 and 3 even though it was mentioned on Alt 9. You don't even have to sign your name! In fact, anonymous comments are allowed on this project. Maybe I can get all my friends in Hawaii to send in ideas.

I think the starting point for the short list needs to be improved safety and NO destruction of homes. What kind of person opposes that?
You will find that my several inputs to you, as one of the most negatively, prospectively effected home owners among those suggested in the poorly scripted 'Alternatives', is in complete alignment with (***) aptly titled and well stated e-mail.

My proposal 5.C. would immediately resolve many Banner Rd. concerns of the county and critical concerns of the homeowners on the Banner bluff as well as concerns of those in the surrounding neighborhood loop from Price to Culver to Banner to Olalla Valley Road.

I would naturally lean toward a future new roadway alternative to the north, though given the paucity of useful information by the county in the alternatives, I refuse to play the childish alternative voting game not knowing who and how it effects home and property owners.

You have my disgusted view of the 'alternative' poll.

We are thankful that the unsafe Banner Rd SE is finally being addressed. I have read all the proposed alts routes with great interest. I also realize, that the county has done little during the last 20 years to protect this roadway. Lack of proper drainage, no protection on lower bank in the form of a seawall or breakwater, no guard rails, and no enforcement of over weight trucks that are crushing the roadbed on a very narrow roadway.

This roads safety issues are very complex and would require a lot of tax dollars, to correct them. I did some research of the on the orginal plats and found out that county owns the bank and beach below the banner road. Also an easement was given to the county in the early 1900 s for the roadway from the plats of the three homes that exist on this bank. Now if iam reading them correctly alts 1-3 suggest demolishing 1-3 homes and/or requiring additional property from these private homes.

Kitsap county was a poor steward with the first 30 ft of easement granted to them for the road.

Kitsap county mission reads

Kitsap County government exists to protect and promote the safety, health, and welfare of our citizens. Well, Kitsap county government has failed us in South Kitsap. Any government can write a mission statement, but Kitsap County government " Needs to walk the Talk "
I'm not one of the people that ever wanted this project - personally I like the road the way it is, very fun, very Olalla and very dangerous if you're drunk and traveling 60 mph - but since the fun thieves have arrived this is what I believe should happen.

Alternatives 1-4 should immediately be dropped from further consideration. No one here is interested in selling their property and Alt 1, 2, and 3 knock down homes for a lightly traveled road! This is ugly, abusive and completely unnecessary - not to mention expensive. For whatever reason you didn't bother to inform people at the October 12 meeting about these details and have purposely stacked the deck against this neighborhood. I keep running into people that have no idea what your Alternatives really mean. The popularity poll gives you no information on what people are thinking, how well informed they are, and how they using Banner.

Banner and Culver should be some configuration of local access existing foot-print, and homes and yards should not be taken. There should be a minimum of walking and bicycling for people in the community. One thing I had wondered about is having Banner go one-way going up hill. You wouldn't even have to include Price. I guess it could be considered half of a road closure. All this could be done with very little cost.

For future planning and if funds are available Alt 10 or Alt 11 should be added. They will address future growth - in the area where the most growth would occur - and they bypass all the curves on Banner. They have the least impact on neighborhoods. I believe the impersonal ownership of these properties - and the fact that you are providing new access to some areas - make it likely they would be open to right-of-way acquisition. Let me know if you have heard from the owners.

This little area on Banner is the original Olalla neighborhood. Kitsap County's own rural study says that "Clusters of houses along beaches or shorelines provide more than just scenic or visual value; they are reminders of the pioneer heritage of Kitsap County". This area has welcomed many a new person into the community but you can't expect us to give up our homes just so people can drive to upper Banner on a really wide road. Will you eventually ask the people on the upper curves to give up their homes? At a certain point common sense has to prevail and I'm asking that you do that right now. I would like to be able to sleep again, not have my health ruined, and not have my home stolen. I think it is a very reasonable request especially given the amount of taxes I pay.

The information in the Kitsap Sun was quite disturbing.
1) You have already wasted taxpayer money by wasting $150,000 on a study that could have been done by a county road engineer or an experienced road maintenance personnel.
2) The project manager for KPFF states that "we are not trying to find the cheapest solution here". Taxpayers are.
3) The only low cost change should be a one-way on this road. And a one-way in the other direction along Price Rd. connecting to Culver and on to Banner.

This road which we drive daily has always been a rural residential road, and should remain this way.

I am currently employed as a caregiver at one of the homes that would be knocked down in Alt 1, 2, & 3 and would also be affected by Alt 4. Please do not consider any of these alternatives. I am at the home often and run errands in the area. It is a quiet neighborhood with very little traffic. It doesn't seem like a big deal to drive a different route. I am shocked that these ideas are being considered. As a homeowner in Kitsap County I find it disturbing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO money should be spent on Banner Rd. We need a safe way to cross Lund Ave. and access the Jackson and Lund Park. We need to have an under road walkway so people of all ages can safely cross the road.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any final alternative for this project should not include any destruction of homes. Period! The recent public community meeting, lacked detailed information on possible destruction of homes, cost, and private home and property en-croachment. Public works stated there will be public meeting available to express your concerns, which will play a role in the selection of the preferred alternative. How can the public in the community, express concerns, when the impact on each alt was not fully disclosed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Existing homes should not be moved.  
#10 would have the least impact on homes.  
#9 has a very steep 30 to 40 ft drop where it joins Banner rd that does not show on the contour map. |
| County crews spent three days earlier this week clearing brush and trees from Banner between Banfill and Olalla Valley. The guard rails in the area are now tipped toward the water and have very little soil supporting them, making them totally useless for their designed purpose.  
This is a safety issue!  
Immediately close the sloped portion of Price Rd and close Banner from Banfill to Olalla Valley. Make Banner (and Culver) "local access only" from Willock, with no through traffic to Olalla Valley Rd.  
The only _long_term_ solution which makes sense is #11, and the above actions can be tolerated by the residents between now and the time #11 is put into place. |
| I live at *** SE Culver Street in Olalla and I saw what happened to my grandmother when the duplex she was renting was taken by right of eminent domain to connect Washington Ave & 11th street in Bremerton. It was a terrible thing to do to an elderly woman. Now it's "displacement of 1-3 homes." Is that how one softens the blow? We call it “displacement?” There are plenty of solutions on this list that don’t rely upon taking anyone’s home. |
#2 just seems to be a good choice even with its impact on several homes. It is probably one of the least expensive alternatives for solving most of the problems this stretch of road has. I appears that it will also be able to maintain some of the scenic beauty the existing road has. Most of the alternatives lose this feature.

Closing Banner sounds good at first but will cause other problems, e.g. delaying/restricting access to homes on both sides of the closure by emergency vehicles - police, fire, ambulance, etc.

The one way options are just a temporary band aid, delaying the inevitable, and don' really solve all of the problems. We need to think further ahead than a year or two. What effect will the alternatives have on the community over the next 20, 40, or even longer years?

#9 would probably be the best for me personally, but you'll notice that I ranked it #4 based on the limited amount of information available and best guesses.

#11 will be needed in the future and would be nice to have ASAP, but it is not the solution for this particular problem.

Thank you for including the people of Olalla in the decision making of this project. I work for *** and am angered that they have not taken preventative steps in certain matters. I really appreciate that you have taken initiative to put a new road in place BEFORE a horrible accident occurs. I was embarrassed by my fellow Olallians whining at the meeting. Please keep trying! Alt 10 is my first and only choice.

One alternative not yet considered would be to close Banner Rd. between Willock and Frageria so that Price and lower Banner would be for local traffic only, possibly mitigating the need for drastic improvement, especially if they are changed to one-way roads, Banner going south, Price going north. Thus people going South on upper Banner would be routed to Orchard to reach Olalla Valley. And people going to the Ferry can reach Banner and Sedgwich by Orchard. The barrier closing Banner Road could be made such to allow fire trucks or ambulences to pass through for emergencies, and able to be passed through also by bicycles.

I mentioned this idea to Mr. Edwards at the meeting, and propose it here again as it seems to me the most economical coupled with being the least intrusive on peoples lives. Also, it conceivable might improve the quality of the community in the lower Banner, Culver Street, Prospect Point area.

Thank you for any consideration you can give this proposal.

Believe Banner Road can be shored up to stop sluffing. Road is not causing accidents even tho "S" curves are a problem for trucks, buses etc.

Cost to correct future erosion on the water side of Banner in front of homes while expensive would solve future problems and be less than proposed buying out homes and building new roadways.

Our first two choices would take a lot of traffic away from our house so that would be preferable for us. However, whatever choice is selected we would hope no homes would be displaced.

These are my top three. I can only support these choices if no families are displaced from their homes.
| Keep cost to minimum  
| Do not cause any home displacements  
| Be environmentally friendly  
| Plan for future growth in affected area |

Nobody should lose their home or property because of this issue. Everyone we know in this area chooses to live here because of the quiet rural surroundings. Overweight vehicles are currently restricted to other roadway and the time with which it takes to use existing alternative roadways is insignificant. For me, a Culver Street resident, alternative routing adds 7 minutes to my commute - driving the speed limit. If it means preserving someone's home, 7 minutes is a small price to pay.

Banner road will be preserved in some form or another as it is unlikely that the county will allow the hillside to fall away into the water below. When preserved, the roadway could be restricted to pedestrian and low power 2 wheeled vehicles (scooter/bicycle) for anyone wishing to enjoy the scenic view or to preserve access if Al's grocery ever reopens.

Unless the county is planning on changing zoning from a minimum of 2.5 acres per household, there is no significant impact to traffic that is going to happen to this area in the foreseeable future. Save the money, save our homes, save our property, save our quality of life, and please consider the human impact to the local residents.

My first choice for this project is the one-way option for Banner & Price. A similar project was necessary on the south end of Guemes Island in Skagit County, where my parents place is. A bluff was eroding and creating a hazard for a mile or so of the road, so the county made it a one-way, allowing for one lane of vehicle traffic and a very wide shoulder that is now used for bicycles and walkers/joggers. A similar wide shoulder on Banner would be fantastic - it is a road section frequented by bicycles and the occasional walker (if they dare). I believe the bridge/Al's/bay area is a community gathering spot, and I would hate to have it cut off from us (and the others in our north of Al's/Banner area). Some of the above alternatives would make it difficult for us to get to the elementary school, where we have children, which would be difficult.

Thank you.

Start enforcing the no trucks over 10K GVW. Ask neighbors to report violators. Assess the County's liability to the homes in the slide area above and below Banner RD. Shore-up the hillsides both above and below Banner Rd. Logically, and the least costly re-route is Culver and Price RD. Price RD needs widening from Florecliff Stamp. Price Rd also needs to be lengthened to reduce the grade to 10%. This would still be the least expensive solution and not take out any homes.

I own property in Olalla ***. I do not think it is necessary to ruin family homes to fix the road. This would be destroying many people's hopes and dreams. I urge you to choose a plan that is less invasive and that impacts as few people as possible.

The road *** (Banner Rd) should stay a scenic road and not be turned into an "efficient" road. The uncertainty of this project is quite upsetting to people like ***. The road proposal along the water will always have a certain amount of sliding. The road through our property is one of the least practical.
If you did the Culver Extension (Alt 6) it would take care of all types of traffic and would have far less impact on homes and property than most other options. It's also a very short span of road. It seems like the road closure option would use a lot of the same property because you would have to put in a turn-around by the intersection of Price and Culver. You could close Price and combine it with a one-way Banner (no road widening) for use as a very low traffic local road.

I am upset that the county is spending this money to study an unfunded project at a time when there isn't enough money for basic services. I would like to have this expenditure justified in terms of the across-the-board budget cuts.

Please do not continue to build and rebuild ad infinitum a road across the top edge of a crumbling bluff!

Please do not destroy a very lovely little spot in Kitsap from lack of imagination and commonsense.

For Option 3 - Consider closing the road at Culver and making existing Banner South of this point private. This would free up the need for the County to spend for maintenance, snow removal, etc.

For any option, consider making necessary upgrades to Orchard and/or Ollala Valley Rd, including paved shoulders.

I have three comments: 1. There seem to be alternatives that would not have the serious/detrimental impact to either individual's property and/or homes and in a broader sense result in less disruption/impact on an entire community than those proposed for the lower Banner, Culver and Price community. 2. Does building a new road have economic or access advantages to adjoining property owners or the county? Building a new road certainly is advantageous to property/home owners whose property/home/life and lifestyle would be severely impacted by selecting most other options. 3. If Banner and Price were closed is there an option to expand/improve pedestrian/bicycle access in the area and/or on an interim basis (between final decision and implementation of selected option that might be six years in the future); if Banner were closed at Culver or Prospect Point could local car traffic be allowed on the Price/Banner/Culver loop that would have the effect of eliminating heavy vehicles on a passing through route and reducing the total volume considerably.

Homes and yards should not be taken for this project.

The views on that portion of Banner Rd are spectacular and one of the reasons we moved here. It needs to remain open to the public in some fashion.

We were looking at the maps, and there is listed an extension of Fagerholm Ln that runs from Culver down to Ollala Valley. I don’t know the homes there, but from what I can see from the satellite maps it seems that this is a possible alignment

Adjust the alignment of alternative 10 to follow the contours above the ravine.

If you choose the Culver Rd alternative, you need to mitigate the potential high speeds of through traffic along that long straight downhill stretch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why not cut trees and plant different plants. Bench cut and stabilize the bottom of the hill.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternate 10 seems to impact the fewest homes. Would like to know whether the cost would be reasonable compared to other options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options 4 &amp; 6 look like the best compromises. 10% grades are too steep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am completely against any alternative that infringes upon any homeowners home and/or property. I am completely upset that Alt 7 is even being considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the traffic should be rerouted onto Banner now. But in no way do I want lower Banner to revert to the property owners as a private drive. This is the centerpiece of Olalla and should always remain open to walkers, bicyclists and local traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the residents of our area get to vote on your plan? Who’s paying for this? Will our taxes go up? When do you intend to start this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the low traffic volumes on Banner, I believe that the county should work within existing right-of-ways. Banner Rd from the intersection of Olalla Valley Rd to the top of the hill (1.1 miles) is not a safe road. Simple solutions, ie. Closing banner to through traffic may be the best in these times of tight money, tax dollars, and budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’ve mentioned you’ve completed a traffic study for 20-years out. Please let me know what the future traffic numbers are. 700 ADT is the figure you gave us at the meeting for current traffic numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I adamantly oppose any option that significantly impacts any home owner. I would prefer Option 1 if the properties are not encroached upon. An alternative is to permanently limit traffic along Price and Banner to local access only and re-route arterial across Willock/Orchard to Olalla Valley. Many pedestrians use Banner/Price and any increase in traffic along those roads pose safety hazard to our children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives 10 and 11 are most appealing from the standpoint that they do not take anyone's home. I would like to see a more specific map of these two alternatives so that I know better what I am supporting. I see the problem on Banner Road only getting worse. The road is now very narrow and one wonders when a slide will occur. I don’t mind driving a bit farther if it will save someone’s home....or encroachment of their home. When will we know what the final alternatives are?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Before meeting comments:**
I consider the view access for the average citizen to be very important. I hope that no matter what direction the county ultimately selects to go, that bike riders, horses, and volksmarchers or whatever will still have public access from the Culver/Banner intersection down to the beach at Al's.

I had read somewhere that if the road was closed it would be only accessible for those who lived there (coming up from Al's).

For more than a century, the citizens of Olalla and South Kitsap have enjoyed those magnificent views and their access should not be denied in any future plans.

| Will the county be able to provide a ranking so we can see what are the most cost-effective alternatives? |
| Has anyone done an estimate of what each option would cost? When/where is that data available? Cost, while not the only factor, should be an influential factor in deciding which option is best in long run. |
Here are some comments I would like to provide in regards to the Banner Road Alternatives that have just been posted online.

I am writing this email (about) *** Banner Road that has suddenly become the source of much alarm. The first thing I notice is that it is completely vacant which is the case all throughout the night and a good portion of the day. I live on this road and I know there is no way you can justify the destruction you have suggested for some of the homes in this small community. If you are that worried about safety you can make this a one way loop tomorrow. It is low impact, it would cost very little and people would still have access. Any use of eminent domain is unnecessary and a complete abuse of power.

I want to put a face on some of the alternatives and make sure that certain details are not glossed over in the upcoming presentation.

Alt 1 - This will involve road widening on Banner. It will take out my front yard and my neighbor's (***') front yard. We have our drain fields in the front yard and the(y) *** probably don't have enough property to relocate theirs. You will still have a narrow road area above (the) *** beach house unless you completely cut away the slope on *** parcel.

Alt 2 - This will wipe out my back yard, run into my side yard and go right over my well. It's not clear if my house will remain. It also takes out *** front yard which contains a drain field. Again, you will still have a narrow road area above *** beach house unless you completely cut away the slope on *** parcel.

Alt 4 - This completely destroys the parcel *** bought many years ago. He is in the process of designing a small home for retirement. For the same amount of money he could have bought several wooded acres away from the water. It also cuts a cliff by *** house which already has a cliff on 2 sides. Unless *** and *** are for it you should leave them alone.

Alt 8 - This appears to cut right into the front yard of *** beautiful vintage home. Price's used to own this home which is where the name Price Road came from.

Alt 9 - This looks like it will really be destructive to the homes on that section of Banner Road. Unless the homeowners are for it you should leave them alone.

None of these alternatives should be included in the final three. You don't have money for this project yet. This is a tough economy and Kitsap County should not be bankrupting home owners by speculating with their property.

These alternatives are not minor adjustments and could mean financial ruin to some of us. You are HARMING people.

I would like to propose 2 other alternatives:

1 )This would be a one way loop as described in Alt 3 except Culver would also be one way (is there a need for a 2 way Culver?) Banner Road would use the EXISTING FOOTPRINT so as not to harm the 2 historic homes on this stretch. Keep speeds slow and consider it a local access road. This would be in combination with Alt 10 which can eventually be the wide major arterial and truck route. It totally bypasses all the curves on Banner Road. The property is undeveloped land and most of it is impersonal ownership - ***.

Kitsap Public Works already owns part of it. The remainder is on the edge of a 40 acre parcel that is currently FOR SALE (as in willing seller). The road might actually be beneficial to the seller by providing access to another building site on the east side of the ravine. Work with them. Give them a fair deal! This alternative also looks like it would give the public access to the historic...
How serious are you considering plan 9? I was a bit surprised to see that this plan cuts my property in half, separating my house from our garage and goes over both my septic and well. Does the county plan on buying us out?

What is the estimate for how many feet you will need for the road (lower Banner in front of my house) in Alt 1 -(2 way) and Alt 3 - (one way)?

Please add Alt 3 to the Alternatives that should be removed if it does not fit within the existing footprint for the same reasons I outlined before.

This will involve road widening on Banner. It will take out my front yard and my neighbor’s (*** front yard. We have our drain fields in the front yard and the *** probably don’t have enough property to relocate theirs. You will still have a narrow road area above *** beach house unless you completely cut away the slope on *** parcel.

I don’t know all the ins and outs of road standards but I would think that you could be allowed to repair the road (rather than reconstruct) in it’s existing footprint and make it one way. It would be much safer than it is now. How you can you go from allowing 2 way to not even allowing one way? And I think you guys are the ones that make the rules. I view it as a compromise between closing the road down and going down Culver. If Alt 10 (or some other option) is added in the future as a major arterial than this road should be less traveled and can be local access just like Prospect Point Drive. If you are going to dump a lot of money into a new road it shouldn’t be on a cliff.

It's has become apparent that Alt3 would ruin 2 homes on Banner if not three (minimum 20 feet paved plus setback from bank). Can the design team present some options that combine keeping Banner one-way in it's existing footprint (as a repair to a road that existed before 2003) with another route that would take on more traffic? I think you might gain some consensus if you preserve homes that are part of the character of this historic community and also give the public access.
I believe we met at the neighborhood meeting in the Spring. We have the *** parcel on Price Rd, between Olalla Valley Rd and Culver Rd, so we are impacted by several of these options. We already contribute to traffic flow in the area due to Price Rd and Olalla Valley Rd being on our property. Our vintage 1914 era home would be severely impacted by some of these options, specifically options 8, 7, 3 and 6, in order of impact.

Option 8 would go right thru our front yard and our septic drain field!

Options 8, 7 and 3 are totally unacceptable. Price Rd was originally a private road and it should return to that status. Too many over size vehicles continue to abuse the little one lane road as evidenced by movement of the bank above the road. It can't take additional Banner Rd traffic and the children in the neighborhood would be endangered by the 100X increase in traffic.

Our preference is option 1: restore Banner road by shoring up the bank with a retaining wall. Option 5 seems reasonable: close Banner and Price and make them driveways for local residents. Access for residents further up Banner could be provided by option 11, with access from Orchard.

Thanks for your consideration. We welcome you to come and walk our property so you can see our concerns first hand.

In Alt 5 what does turn around/ cul-de-sac mean in road standard language? What kind of area are we talking about? Will this be put in for any Alternative that closes the road?

Also in Alt 5 when they say "reconstruct Olalla Valley Rd SE and SE Banner intersection to be a private driveway" what do they mean?

And finally do you think the design geniuses will be able to present any ideas for Banner in existing footprint at the meeting?
I wish to comment on the proposed Banner Road Project. In the first group of proposals there are various plans that either cut into the property that I grew up in or go exactly down the center of the property that I have owned since 1979. *** now owns the *** home and it looks like the ideas encompass either taking her front yard or her back yard. The route across my property takes all of my land. I am not in favor of these proposals.

I think adaptability is needed in the repair of this road. My suggestion would be to downgrade the section from Culver to the store to become a local road and that Culver should be cut through to the Olalla Valley Road because that road could take all size traffic. Alternate 10, which is an entirely new road, should also be built. This road would meet the current standards. (The upper section of the winding part of Banner road is not perfect either) Having these three roads open would provide a grid by which traffic would not use any singular route. The noise and traffic would be spread out and no one would lose their home. My plan is probably the most expensive but I think it would be a better long range plan. Olalla has been traditionally last when it comes to capital improvement and thus might be overdue for consideration.

Finally in reference to Proposal Four. It refers to my property as the back side of the *** parcel. Could you change that to the Banfill Expressway? Were they considering doing a remake of the movie “Thelma and Louise” where the main characters drive off a cliff at the end? That would be the configuration on that particular property.

The process is creating a Catch 22. KPFF won't provide any details so people read ALT 1 - "Reconstruct roadway generally following the existing Banner Road Right-of-Way" - and think that sounds great not even realizing it probably condemns the 2 homes on that stretch. If it doesn't effect their property they won't pay that much attention. So then they send in comments supporting Alt1. That's not a fair process.

You can add the above to public comments. Has KPFF responded to my idea of combining an existing footprint Banner with one of the new road options? Did you get my brother’s comments? He sent a word file on Friday.

There is no money so leave it alone. People have lived with it this (way) for years and years so put a guard rail where needed only. Remember the County is broke no new taxes since you have let Port Orchard take most of taxable properties and now what's left must lose their homes to inorder for the county to carry on??? Use your common sense please! Commissioners as well as Road Dept.
Banner Road SE Alternatives Analysis

PUBLIC MEETING

Olalla Community Club
May 17, 2011 | 6:00pm – 8:00pm

Meeting Location:
Olalla Community Club
12970 Olalla Valley Rd SE

STUDY AREA

KITSAP COUNTY
Banner Road Design Report - Alternatives Analysis
The Kitsap County Department of Public Works is performing an Alternatives Analysis for the southern quarter mile of Banner Road SE between Olalla Valley Road SE and SE Banfill Road. This section of high bank slope is prone to on-going settlement and slides from loose fill soils below the roadway and sloughing of the steep slope above the road.

In October, the county hosted a public meeting presenting a long list of alternatives for input. Based on community feedback and a screening of the alternatives, the list has been narrowed to three for further study. The alternatives include extending Culver Street, extending Road A SE Extension, or closing this section of Banner Road and creating a new roadway through undeveloped land.

Time and Place:

Open House From 6pm–8pm
Tuesday, May 17, 2011
Olalla Community Club
12970 Olalla Valley Rd SE
Olalla, WA 98359

For information about the project and the initial list of alternatives, please see the project website below. The website also contains a comment form if you are not able to attend the meeting.

Project Website
www.kitsapgov.com/pw/banner.htm

Staff Contact:
Bill Edwards, PE  |  (360) 337-5777  |  bedwards@co.kitsap.wa.us
Kitsap County Department of Public Works
614 Division Street, MS-26, Port Orchard, WA 98366-4699

Narrowing the List of Alternatives
Purpose and Need Statement

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of the project is to maintain safe, reliable, and efficient mobility for all travel modes using Banner Road Southeast between Olalla Valley Road Southeast and Southeast Banfill Road.

2. NEED

PUBLIC SAFETY

Future roadway settlement and pavement section failures are likely to continue, creating a safety concern for the driving public who might use the roadway prior to it being closed for repair.

In addition, the current roadway has no provisions for pedestrians or bicyclists. The narrow 9-foot lanes do not allow for two cars to pass safely when a bicyclist or pedestrian is present, and there is no safe refuge for pedestrians when cars approach.

ONGOING MAINTENANCE

This existing roadway, located at the top of high bank waterfront, has been settling due to the instability of the near vertical bank. In addition, a section of the roadway is at the toe of a near vertical cut slope that is prone to sloughing. Ongoing maintenance and repair is problematic and expensive.

ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION

The continued deterioration of the high bank waterfront distributes riprap and other fill material placed at the toe of the slope into Puget Sound.

The existing roadway has no provisions to formally treat stormwater prior to it discharging into Puget Sound.

ROADWAY DESIGN DEFICIENCIES

This segment of Banner Road Southeast does not meet current Kitsap County standards for an arterial roadway classification in several ways:

- The narrow roadway width
- Roadway grades exceeding 10 percent
- Sharp horizontal curve radii near Southeast Banfill Road
- Sight distance limitations at the Southeast Banfill Road intersection and at an existing vertical curve
What We Heard
October 2010 Public Meeting

Summary of public comments from the first open house, and county response.

A. Do not demolish any homes and limit impact to private property.
   This was reflected in screening applied to the alternatives and ultimately affected the decision on which three alternatives should move forward. The alternatives for further study do not demolish any homes. All of the alternatives (except closure) involve purchasing portions of private property to accommodate a new or realigned roadway.

B. Leave existing roadway alone and fix existing guardrails.
   A guardrail project was attempted a few years ago; however, the soft unconsolidated soils combined with the steep slope at the edge of the roadway prohibited installation of a guardrail system and the construction was cancelled.

C. Keep improvements within the existing Banner Road footprint.
   The existing Banner Road width is approximately 18’ with minimal or non-existent shoulders. The existing width does not meet current design standards even for a one-way roadway. There is not an acceptable roadway section that would accommodate motorized vehicles within the existing footprint.

D. Make Banner Road "local access only" through the use of signage and/or physical barriers.
   Subjecting the roadway to less traffic will not prolong the life of the roadway. In addition, historically, local access signage is difficult to enforce, and generally doesn’t influence traffic patterns significantly. Physical barriers are the equivalent of closing the road.

E. Convert Banner Rd to One Way Road.
   First, this does not address the structural stability problems on Banner Road Second, the width required for a one way roadway would still be wider than the roadway that exists today, because the paved lane and shoulder must be adequate so an emergency vehicle can pass oncoming traffic. When combined with the improvements needed to upgrade Price Road to accommodate the other direction of the one way traffic, this alternative is more expensive than a two way roadway along the existing alignment.

F. The County can’t close the roadway. Residents need property access.
   If Banner Road is not improved, the County will continue to maintain the road until which point a repair is no longer feasible. At that point, if there is inadequate funding for the scope of repair needed, the road would be closed. Access to the private properties would be provided by new driveway construction on either side of the closure.

G. Close Banner Road now due to narrow width and outdated guardrail.
   Closing a County road is a big impact to the community. Closing the road would also increase response times for emergency services. Price Road would also likely be closed as it cannot safely handle additional traffic.

H. Widen this section of Banner Road to safely accommodate all modes of users while providing a scenic view.
   Whatever reconstruction solution is reached, the design will accommodate all modes of users, consisting of adequate shoulder(s) for pedestrians and bikes. This is a requirement of County road standards. The desire for the roadway view will be a factor in the social acceptance criteria.

I. Alternatives extending Culver Street to Olalla Valley Road will increase traffic, no longer making it a quiet county road.
   The public road does have adequate capacity to handle the additional traffic. Minor shoulder widening may be needed.

J. Provide construction costs and more detail prior to ranking alternatives.
   The first public meeting, while early in the process, was helpful in providing feedback as to what was important to the community, thoughts on the initial list of alternatives, and provided a forum for suggesting additional alternatives. The website ranking was a tool to gauge public opinion on the initial alternatives. It was only one aspect of the evaluation criteria and did not dictate which alternatives were chosen for further study. Cost information was developed after the first open house; it was shown on the County’s website and was used to help refine the list of alternatives for further study.

K. When do you intend to start the project?
   There is no design or construction funding yet allocated for the project. The earliest the project could get funding is during the County’s 2011 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) process. The six year TIP coordinates the County’s future plans for road and transportation projects and provides a ranking system to prioritize construction. At the very earliest the project could be included in the 2011 TIP. Due to the expected project cost, the County may need to obtain federal grants or other means of funding to construct the project.
Summary of Roadway Stability
Concerns along Banner Road
Southeast between Southeast Banfill Road and Olalla Valley Road
May 2011

Banner Road was originally constructed between 1885 and 1912 by cutting into the hillside on the upslope side of the roadway and side casting excavated material downslope to provide a bench for the roadway. This side cast fill has resulted in a layer of loose to medium dense soil underneath portions of the roadway, which is subject to settlement, creep, and sloughing on steep slopes. Sloughing typically occurs when the side cast fill becomes saturated. Geotechnical borings encountered approximately 12 feet of side cast fill near the downslope edge of the roadway. Evidence of instability has been observed over the years, as cracks and small landslides have developed. Most evidence of slope movement has been found between the center of the road to the downslope edge of the road.

Most of the native soil is glacially overconsolidated, resulting in densely compacted, strong soil. However, natural wave action at the slope toe causes slow erosion and steepening of the bank that supports the layer of loose side cast fill. This bank steepening leads to the sloughing and shallow landsliding of the fill soil above it. While the rate of erosion at the bank appears slow, this will be further evaluated during design. Groundwater plays a key role in stability. In general, the more saturated the native and loose fill soil layers become, the weaker and more unstable they are.

The southern half of this roadway segment also has a slope above the roadway that is prone to sloughing material onto the roadway. The soil here is densely compacted glacial soil. As the soil weathers, it loosens and becomes prone to sloughing on the steep natural and cut slopes. We anticipate that typical sloughs from the slopes above the road would be a few cubic yards or smaller.

If the road subgrade is not improved, we anticipate soil creep that causes roadway settlement and cracking will continue. Small landslides that could affect at least one lane likely will occur periodically during exceptionally wet conditions. With this information in mind, improvements for roadway reconstruction to correct these problems could include:

- Constructing a fill wall on the downslope side of the roadway to replace or contain the existing layer of loose material. The wall should be embedded into the underlying dense native soil.
- Installing surface drainage that reduces stormwater infiltration and a subdrain system to collect groundwater underneath the roadway.
- Protecting the cut slope on upslope side of the roadway from weathering using shotcrete. If the cut slope was made at a slope of 3/4 horizontal to 1 vertical, little reinforcement would be needed. We anticipate short dowels would anchor the shotcrete to the cut face. While this proposal would be less steep than what exists today, it would require little encroachment onto private property. Laying the slope back even further to a typical slope of 1 1/2 horizontal to 1 vertical or flatter, which could then be vegetated, would eliminate the need for shotcrete to reduce weathering, but would cause greater property impacts.

These geotechnical observations and recommendations are generally derived from field observations and from four borings performed in the early 1990s for a geotechnical study along this section of Banner Road Southeast. Additional borings are not being performed for this study, but will be necessary for the final design.
IDENTIFIED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION:

ALT 1 - Reconstruct and Widen Existing Banner Road - $5.4 MILLION
ALT 6C - Close Banner Rd SE Between SE Olalla Valley Rd and SE Banfill Rd, Close Price Rd SE, and Extend SE Culver St north and west to Olalla Valley Rd - $3.5 MILLION
ALT 10 - Close Banner Rd SE Between SE Olalla Valley Rd and SE Banfill Rd, Close Price Rd SE, and Construct New Roadway from Banner Rd to Olalla Valley Rd SE - $6.4 MILLION

DROPPED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION:

ALT 2 - Banner Rd SE Realignment - $4.8 MILLION
- Lack of community support
- Property impacts

ALT 3 - One Way Banner Rd SE and One Way Price Rd SE - $9.2 MILLION
- High costs
- Safety concerns

ALT 4 - SE Banfill Rd Realignment and Close Banner Rd SE - $10.9 MILLION
- High costs
- Lack of community support

ALT 5 - Close Banner Rd SE and Close Price Rd SE - $188 THOUSAND
- Lack of community support
- This is effectively the eventual “no build” alternative

ALT 6 - Extend SE Culver St and Close Banner Rd SE, Close Price Rd SE - $9.1 MILLION
- High costs
- Lack of community support

ALT 6B - Extend SE Culver St north and west to Olalla Valley Rd and Close Banner Rd SE, Close Price Rd SE - $4.2 MILLION
- Property impacts
- Lack of community support

ALT 7 - Realign SE Culver St and Close Banner Rd SE, Close Price Rd SE - $7.9 MILLION
- Lack of community support

ALT 7B - Realign SE Culver St down Fagerholm Lane SE, Close Price Rd SE - $3.6 MILLION
- Lack of public support
- Private property impacts

ALT 8 - Improve Price Rd SE and Close Banner Rd SE - $6.0 MILLION
- High costs
- Property impacts
- Lack of public support

ALT 9 - Close Banner Rd SE and Construct New Roadway from the 90 degree bend in Banner Rd SE to Olalla Valley Road SE - $5.7 MILLION
- Lack of community support
- Property impacts

ALT 11 - Close Banner Rd SE and Construct New Roadway from Banner Road SE to Orchard Ave SE - $18.4 MILLION
- High Cost
BANNER RD SE
ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
ALT 1: RECONSTRUCT AND WIDEN EXISTING BANNER RD BETWEEN SE OLALLA VALLEY RD AND SE BANFILL RD

SECTION A
EXISTING GROUND
RETAINING WALL

SECTION B
EXISTING GROUND
RETAINING WALL

NOTES:
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE = $5.4 MILLION
- ROADWAY WOULD BE CLOSED FOR CONSTRUCTION, DURATION LIKELY 6 MONTHS
BANNER RD SE
ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
ALT 6C: CLOSE BANNER RD SE BETWEEN SE OLALLA VALLEY RD AND SE BANFILL RD, CLOSE PRICE, AND EXTEND SE CULVER ST NORTH AND WEST TO OLALLA VALLEY RD.

NOTES:
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE = $3.5 MILLION
- BANNER RD BETWEEN SE BANFILL RD AND OLALLA VALLEY RD WOULD BE CLOSED
- MINIMAL OBSTRUCTION TO EXISTING TRAFFIC PATTERNS DURING CONSTRUCTION
BANNER RD SE
ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
ALT 10: CLOSE BANNER RD SE BETWEEN SE OLALLA VALLEY RD AND SE BANFILL RD, CLOSE PRICE RD, AND CONSTRUCT NEW ROADWAY FROM BANNER RD SE TO OLALLA VALLEY RD SE

NOTES:
- PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE = $6.4 MILLION
- BANNER RD BETWEEN SE BANFILL RD AND OLALLA VALLEY RD WOULD BE CLOSED
- CONSTRUCTION WOULD NOT IMPACT EXISTING TRAFFIC PATTERNS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>COMMENTS ON FORMS PROVIDED AT MEETING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer Alt. # 1 and think it makes the most sense and disrupts things the least.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| We prefer option 1 if road standards can be eased (10ft. lanes, 1 4ft. shoulder) and properties not impacted.  
2nd preference is #10 because it diverts traffic away from our quiet, residential neighborhood and would better handle growth in the upper Banner area. |
| Lower Banner and Price Rd should revert back to local use in any case. (Closed at Banner, just above Culver.)  
If Price Rd is closed to the public, it should at least be left open at Olalla Valley Rd as our driveway since it is totally on our property, as is Olalla Valley Rd for 500’. |
| Closing Price, why close Price with Alternative 6C. The alternative route is so close to Price that traffic would not use it. Today we don’t use Price with Banner coming out at Al’s Store.  
With Alt. 6C and 10, please keep the conde... part of Banner open to biking and walk. People use the road exercise and kid use it for get home from friends.  
I would support Alt 1 or 6C. |
| Alternative 6C seems to reduce the length of the Banner Rd “dead end” that would impact emergency vehicle response time/access.  
What are the chances if you block off Banner that the view “area of concern” that is sloughing off will become a teen hangout/place to park and look at the view? What kind of congestion could that create?  
What kind of “turn around” option can be created for someone that drives toward Al’s down the hill on Banner past the last driveway? |
| If you go with a plan that involves closing Price Rd., leave it available to Price and Culver residents as a local road/driveway. |
| Please do not close Price St. Could it be left open for local people on Culver to use. |
| Alt 6C looks good to me.  
How many home owner will be affected? Will there be serious reaction from them? |
| We oppose alternate 6c due to loss of two propertys, privacy and additional traffic noise  
Not in my back yard |
First, thank you for the excellent information and visual description of the alternatives. Kitsap Co. representatives were very helpful.

My comments:
For years my wife and I would intentionally drive from Gig Harbor out Ollala Valley Rd to Al’s Market – stop then go up Banner Rd to Fragaria then home because it was uniquely charming. As a result we chose to move just up the hill from the spit 6 years ago. Olalla has a rich history surrounding the Olalla Spit, Al’s Store, and Banner Rd North. It is one of the few unique and charming parts of Olalla. I fear that both the sensational view and charm of Banner Rd will be lost forever if any other alternative but #1 is chosen. This would be a tragedy. Secondly, Olalla has for generations used the market at the Spit (was Al’s) not only for groceries and gas but as a social community gathering place. This store has recently been purchased after the death of a previous owner forced its closure last year. My friends and neighbors have been looking forward to its reopening. Because primarily of the sense of loss of community we felt with the store closure I'm very concerned that the loss of Banner Rd might significantly impact tourists (like I once was) and some local traffic to the store and may make it fail. The loss of this store is a loss to the historic legacy of Olalla. This also would be a tragedy. I hope that the social aspects and unique beauty and charm recognized by many of Banner Road will be given high value in the final decision made by the County. Please choose Alt 1 – Repair Banner Rd.

Preference for Alt 1 as long as there is no impact on Al’s Store etc to maintain beauty and ambience of area. Thank you for input opportunity.

Make Banner one way – north (up the hill) put barrier on water side of road. The only traffic would be going up the hill of Banner. Then go down Price – one way. There should be minimal cost to make these 2 roads one way.

One-way
Would north on Banner Rd.
Southwest on Culver Rd. work?

It seems like it would be cheaper and homeowners would be less impacted.

1. Please let me and my neighbors know what the # of car trips for Culver TODAY and what the # is projected if Culver is extended as a main road.

2. Please consider keeping Price open for local traffic in Alt #3. Dead end at Culver and Banner.

Please look into impact of closing Banner at Olalla Valley increasing traffic on the private rd “Fagerholm Lane SE.” This private drive is access for four houses, if traffic diverts up the road due to closure, the road is unpaved for last approximate 1/3. It is also one lane with a blind turn at top of hill if traffic diverts up and then turns around to return to Banner. Concern regarding safety of access with increased traffic look for an alternative and/or just getting lost.
Alt 6C seems the best – least cost and least impact on homes. Getting to ["Costa"] et al will be a bit less convenient but tolerable in view of the more expensive alternatives.

I think alt 1 would be the least desirable, causing major impact for residents in the area and would be very difficult to build and maintain.

Alt 6c would be undesirable because of impact on residents and steep, unstable terrain.

Alt 10 is left although it also has problems and is very costly.

The cheapest and most practical solution would be to have a roundabout at SE culver and Banner Rd SE routing traffic back to Willock Rd to Orchard Ave to SE Olalla Valley Rd.

1. Please let me and my neighbors know what the # of car trips for Culver TODAY and what the # is projected if culver is extended as a main road.
2. Please consider keeping price open for local traffic in alt #3. Dead end at Culver and Banner.

**COMMENTS ON BOARDS POSTED AT MEETING**

**ALT 1**
1. NO!
2. Compromise on the road standards so existing properties are not impacted. We don’t need 11 ft roads and 6 ft shoulders – this isn’t I-5! Good Point!
3. Yes we do not need a freeway expansion!
4. Push design towards water

**ALT 6C**
1. Best solution cost factor-!
2. NW of price/Culver very wet
3. Close Price at top of hill for local use
4. Don’t need 3 n/s arterials: block Banner between Fragaris & Willock, local traffic only, one way. De-classify Banner as an arterial so one way banner is less costly
5. Fagerholm goes through to culver – it would need to be closed
6. Carl votes for #1
7. Closing Banner & extending Culver significantly impacts properties along Culver/Price – increased traffic poses safety concerns for the multiple children/animals in the neighborhood. Also the increased noise decreases value of homes and quality of life.

**ALT 10**
1. If closing Banner Rd & Price Rd, residents would like local access to still be able to use these roads until they fail.
*We second this motion! (Minteers)
2. How will 911 response time be affected by closing Banner/Price?
3. This option seems to best serve growth in the upper Banner Road area rather than options 1 and 6 which would be choke points to traffic flow.

**COMMENTS SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY OR EMAILED:**
I attended the May 18th open house presenting the three Banner Rd. options for review. My choice is ALT 6C - SE Culver to Olalla Valley Rd. It is the least expensive and invasive to homeowners. Culver St. requires minimal improvements to become a full width county road compared to the other two options.

Sorry I did not make it to the 5/18/11 meeting. My "vote" would be for the EXTENSION OF CULVER; ALT 6 & 8 combination. A route that would not cut through undeveloped land. Thank you for taking community input on this issue.

Thanks for listening to me yak on the phone. Here's my public comment:

Just as I was opposed to Alt 8 because it took out a front yard and drain field, I am opposed to Alt 1 if it takes my yard and drainfield or those of my neighbor. The parcels are small and the front yards are tiny. Bringing the road closer to homes located on the last curve of a steep hill is a bad idea. It would have the highest property impact of any of the final three alternatives. I can't pick up my house and move it back to create a buffer.

Previous public comment requested keeping the road in existing footprint to limit property impact. Currently the designers estimate that they need 4-5 feet of our yard. That's too much! I don't think there is enough slope to anchor a wall with natural soil so I suspect this estimate will increase. The only way I see this option working is if you push the wall out towards the water (far enough so you don't have to take the front yard) and drive it all the way down to beach. The toe of the bank is undercut and sandy and needs to be protected anyway. I also like the idea of cantilevering out.

I want to emphasize that details really matter with Alternative 1 because of the confined space. Six years from now I don't want an acceptable plan to turn into something that takes my whole front yard because someone is worried a fish might bump his head. You need to draw your line in the sand and say we are going out this far no matter what! If that's not possible then don't do this option. I would also like to see ideas for the upslope bank that are attractive and minimize property impact.

If Alt 1 cannot be done without impacting front yards then 6C should be selected. Existing Culver is wide, straight and less steep than Banner. The new portion goes through undeveloped land, on the edge of parcels, and does not cut close to houses. Traffic would increase some on Culver but Banner traffic really isn't that big of a deal. It is the least expensive option and still maintains access to the lower Banner/Culver area.

If Alt 10 or 6C is selected public access can still be maintained on the existing road. At the minimum it should be a bicycle trail. I would also like to maintain access to my front driveway.
I didn’t write anything on the big note pads at the open-house, so here is my anonymous public comment just in case you are posting them:

Alt 1: I enjoy having the road in front of my house, and I wanted to be excited about Alt 1, but I’m not. The current design lacks detail, and there is no clarity on what the impact would be to my small front yard. Alt 1 might have worked in the past when there was some land on the water-side of the road, but the beach was never rip-rapped to protect the toe of the bluff and the run-off from the road has not been controlled. Time and neglect have taken its toll. The slope required by the design no longer exists.. I do not believe Alt 1 can maintain the footprint of the current road’s inside edge, and so I do not support this solution.

Alt 10: Keeping lower Banner and Price Rd open for local traffic should be part of both Alt 10 and Alt 6c. The county should be expected to maintain the same access the homes on these roads have always had. If lower Banner and Price Rd were to remain open and maintained for local traffic, then Alt 10 would be a great solution. However, that is not the plan, and I feel this would leave many homes too remote. I do not support the current Alt 10 plan.

Alt 6c: This option is brilliant in its simplicity. That, combined with the shortcomings of the other two makes the relatively inexpensive Alt 6c my favorite.

In online poll style, my preferred choices would be:
1st Choice: Alt 6c
2nd Choice: Alt 10

By the way, I really liked the open-house format.

I think Alternative 6C makes the most sense in terms of least cost, least impact on residents and simplicity of construction. Alt 1 seems like it has a lot of potential for cost overruns in addition to already having an estimated cost of $2,000,000 more than Alt 6C. With tax dollars in very short supply these days I would consider it irresponsible to choose anything other than the cheapest option, especially considering this is also the simplest option and causes the least impact on the neighborhood.

Alt 1 as planned would nearly double the width of the existing road and would cut into the yard of the Banfill home. Considering the unknowns of cutting a wider road on an unstable bank it seems highly likely that much more of the yard would need to be taken. This is my family home and it has been there for a century. It would be very unfortunate to have the yard taken by the road when there are better alternatives. Thank you

I strongly feel that option 1 is the best solution for everyone in fact one of the property’s at the curve in the road is for sale if purchased by the county, the severity of the turn could be lessened and careful terracing of the hillside could elevate the width problem of the road I don’t want to see either Price or Banner closed even if option 10 is taken there is no need to close these roads.

If the option 10 is taken to close the end of Banner Price road really should be fixed this is not hard thing to do a retaining wall could be built to sure up the hill and the road could be repaired and widened.
This note is sent in response to the May 18 Open House request for input on the three Banner Road alternatives selected among the initial dozen or so.

No matter who is specifically funding this project, it is always the public purse at some level, therefore, cost should be a significant consideration in solving a safety problem on the subject ¼ mile stretch of road. The least complicated solution would have fewer opportunities for the unforeseen and complications in planning and engineering during and after the construction process.

Reviewing the data available from the Open House, it seems that the most reasonable option would be Alternate 6C. 1. The cost is lower 2. No road would be closed during construction and 3. Adjacent property impact would certainly be less daunting than if Alternate 1 were selected.

The selection of Alternate 10 seems like an enormous expense when existing crossing streets just a short distance further north on Banner could carry additional traffic. Alternate 1 seems the least desirable choice due to the problematic variables associated with that choice. My neighborhood, for example, has heard from county officials that ‘renovating Banner road on an unstable bank would be a waste of county money’ – now we hear that ‘with enough money you can make anything work’.

Numerous inquiries made to involved officials regarding alternate specifics were not answerable needing more study, survey, engineering, etc. Questions abounded and were left lying flat regarding the issues and complications of upper and lower bank stabilization, acquisition/right of way/easements encroaching on multiple homes/properties, environmental and shoreline management issues/permits, boring and cantilevering.

Taking an existing footprint of 18 feet and expanding it to 32 feet would clearly dictate an encroachment onto adjoining properties. Stabilizing the upper bank with shotcrete and bulkheads may be a grand engineering solution but I would question the aesthetics of a long expanse of ‘concrete’ above and below the road given all vegetation and trees having been removed (more senseless incursion).

No answer has been offered regarding an alternate route during construction estimated to be of six months duration. What is the detour route? Surely not Price Road.

Commissioner, Alternate 1 is a poor choice.
Culver St Extension (ALT 6C): We vehemently oppose the Culver St Extension (ALT 6C) option for the following reasons;

1. The most property owners will be directly and negatively impacted by this option. Every property owner along Culver St will be impacted by the changes entailed in this option. We moved here to live in a safe and rural environment and the Extension of Culver St impacts both safety and the environment.

2. Increase Traffic and Noise. We are guessing at least a 10-fold increase, although there are no studies on this site that demonstrate how few vehicles currently use Culver St. This not only impacts our quality of life, it impacts our property values. We moved here to live in a safe and rural environment. When Banner was closed last year due to a mudslide, the increase in traffic was dramatic.

3. Decreased safety due to increased traffic and speeding. People tend to speed down Culver anyway, but with increased traffic, it becomes even more of a problem. The Culver Street Extension puts our children, our livestock, and the abundant wildlife that travel down our street at serious risk. I cannot emphasize my concern about safety enough.

4. This option impacts the environment by reducing greenspace by extending the road through a swath of undeveloped land.

ALT 10, New roadway through undeveloped land: We oppose this option due to the impact on the environment and reduction in greenspace. It is also the most costly option.

ALT 1, Reconstruction and Widening of existing Banner road:
We strongly support and urge selection of ALT 1 for the following reasons:
The reconstruction of Banner road is the choice we believe is most fair to everyone. The fewest property owners (2 or 3) will be impacted by this choice. It is already used as the thoroughfare, so there will be no changes for these owners in the level of noise or traffic patterns for them. There is no environmental impact in terms of greenspace reductions. People appreciate the view and don't mind the lower speed limit at the end of Banner. There is also no change to safety and there will actually be an increased level of safety. Although the price is slightly higher, I believe it is worth the extra money in terms of safety, quality of life, and beauty, for all the residents of Olalla, to fix and maintain the end of Banner road.