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 it’s 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 it needs to be clarified. Any vagueness will take the houses because once 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 public safety 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 18). 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). Hmmm, 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 I am 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 experience 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 effected 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.

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.

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 encroachment. 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.

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 improv. 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.

(1)Keep cost to minimum
(2)Do not cause any home displacements
(3) Be environmentally friendly
(4) 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 quite 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 Florenclif 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 Olallala Valley Rd, including paved shoulders.

I have three comments: 1. There seem to be alternatives that would not have the serious/deterrential 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 Olalla 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.

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

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

Options 4 & 6 look like the best compromises. 10% grades are too steep.

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.

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.

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?

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.

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.

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.

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?

Lower Banner Road is not designed to handle the high volumes of traffic it currently it experiencing. I favor Alternatives 9, 10, and 11. Making Banner Road a one way or closing it other than to local traffic is preferred.

Simple as pie, just make each road one way. Save TONS of tax payers money, doesn't bother existing homes, doesn't close any roads. Only sensible option.

Alternative 10 is by far the best option because it crosses only undeveloped property and provides good access for all who live in the vicinity and those who are passing through. Any alternative that causes
displacement of any homes (1,2,3,6,8 & 9) or significantly alters the property of existing homes (4) should be eliminated. There are reasonable options that do not involve displacing homes. In addition, it is not environmentally appropriate to realign a road that passes along an unstable waterfront and then have to deal with the run off when there are other feasible options. There is a big effort going on the clean up Puget Sound. Why contribute to the problem unnecessarily.

Alt 10 provides a safe route for all types of traffic and doesn't ruin homes and yards. With the exception of road closure all of the alternatives are expensive so why not pick the one that does the least harm to the community and plans for the future. This could be a very scenic road and a new asset for an area that has long been ignored.

I live and travel in this area. I only support alternatives that do not destroy homes and yards. At this point I only like Alt 10.

For another alternative could you go West to the end of Culver St and go NW on Florenciaff Dr SE and then end up on the last section of Alt 9 (Samis Foundation Parcel) where you then go downhill to Olalla Valley Road? It looks like you would avoid homes and not have to build retaining walls because you would have lots of room to slope.

Long ago the lower section of Banner Road was private. The county assumed ownership of the road, and then neglected it for decades (e.g., not correcting run-off that flowed over the edge eroding the bluff, failing to install riprap on county owned beach at the toe of bluff). It would be shameful for the county to choose an option that goes through yards or houses to correct the situation that they allowed to happen. Taxpayers should not be subjected to that type of tyranny.

I completed the survey, but have serious concerns about your process. Have any engineering feasibility studies been performed on the various alternatives? How are the alternatives ranked in terms of costs to taxpayers? How can a sound decision be made without this information? The information included in the descriptions of the various alternatives made it difficult to decipher exactly what the impact to homeowners would be. I am disturbed that the first three alternatives your team came up with would result in the destruction of the original Olalla community. *** It seems cavalier of the county to put these options up for an informal vote considering the devastating impact on three homeowners. Furthermore, it is disturbing that the county is considering reconstructing this portion of Banner road to code when there has been little or no effort to shore up the eroding bank in the past. This so-called "hazardous roadway" has carried traffic in pretty much it's present condition since my family moved there in 1952, with very few accidents. If the county is truly concerned about safety, close the road to through traffic and let people adjust to going a little out of their way and reroute to Orchard Avenue or Willock Road. This would cost taxpayers virtually nothing and give the county time to see if an alternate road is even needed.
Final Three:
1) Alt 10 and local one-way Banner (no road widening).
2) Culver Route (no home displacement or significant yard damage) and local one-way Banner (no road widening).
3) Local one-way Banner (no road widening).

I agree with earlier comments that any options that include the displacement of homes and families, or severely affecting the aesthetics/value of any residential properties, should not be considered by the county. Such plans show little concern or respect for the families, property owners, and tax payers of the county; and create a dangerous precedent and mindset against which all county residents should be vigilant. And all over what everyone seems to agree is a lightly travelled road.

I also agree with, and want to reinforce, an earlier comment that highlights the fact that over the course of several generations the county has demonstrated very poor stewardship of its easement/right-of-way of this road. Rather than reinforce/rip-rap the bank and enforce load limits that would have preserved the road as a resource, these simple - and relatively inexpensive steps - were ignored by the county. Now the county wants all county residents, and especially those whose property is adversely affected any of the options - even to the point of losing one's home - to pay for for the county's malfeasance of many years. Kitsap county residents should be outraged that all this expense, aggravation, time, and possibly heartache for any eventually "displaced" families could have easily been avoided by the county if it had been a better manager of its resources. I hope as this process moves forward that the local media are kept well informed of the fact that all these options are now only being considered because of the county's lack of action and poor management. Kitsap residents should be looking closely county-wide right now to see what other Banner Road-type situations are currently brewing which will haunt them and cost them dearly in the future, but may be avoided by effective action now. Too bad such an examination didn't occur for Banner Road years ago.

Regarding at least options 1 and 3, and to a lesser extent option 2; don't these, by adhering rather closely to the present road's footprint, only set the stage for similar scenario in another 20-50 years, especially given the county's track record in managing it's road resources. It would seem rather logical that if the present road's location is a major cause of all the problems, dangers, and controversy, then the better long term solutions would be those that are well away from the current road's footprint.

Kitsap County ... please think long term; protect and manage your resources and assets well; and show respect and concern for your residents. Don't make them pay, especially at the cost of their homes, for your decades of neglect and inaction regarding Banner Road.