I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. EARLY PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION (total session up to 20 minutes)

III. PLANNING
No Items

IV. PROPERTY
No Items

V. MARINAS
No Items

VI. AIRPORTS
No Items.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. IFC: US 101 Elwha River Bridge Alternatives (Pages 1-6)

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS SESSION (total session up to 20 minutes)

IX. NEXT MEETINGS

- January 9, 2017 9 AM/ 1 PM Regular Work Session and Business Meeting
- January 9, 2017 Industrial Development Corporation Meeting
- January 23, 2017 9 AM Joint Work Session with the Board of Clallam County Commissioners
- January 23, 2017 1 PM Regular Business Meeting

X. UPCOMING EVENTS

- January 17, 2017 6 PM-8 PM Department of Natural Resources Public Hearing: Timber Plan and Marbled Murrelet Plan at the Port Angeles High School
XI. EXECUTIVE SESSION The Board may recess into Executive Session for those purposes authorized under Chapter 42.30 RCW, the Open Public Meetings Act.

XII. ADJOURN
**RULES FOR ATTENDING COMMISSION MEETING**

- Signs, placards, and noise making devices including musical instruments are prohibited.
- Disruptive behavior by audience members is inappropriate and may result in removal.
- Loud comments, clapping, and booing may be considered disruptive and result in removal at the discretion of the Chair.

**RULES FOR SPEAKING AT A COMMISSION MEETING**

- Members of the public wishing to address the Board on general items may do so during the designated times on the agenda or when recognized by the Chair.
- Time allotted to each speaker is determined by the Chair and, in general, is limited to 3 minutes.
- Total time planned for each public comment period is 20 minutes, subject to change by the Chair.
- All comments should be made from the speaker’s rostrum and any individual making comments shall first state their name and address for the official record.
- Speakers should not comment more than once per meeting unless their comments pertain to a new topic they have not previously spoken about.
- In the event of a contentious topic with multiple speakers, the Chair will attempt to provide equal time for both sides.
ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION  
BY THE  
BOARD OF PORT COMMISSIONERS  

December 19, 2017  

SUBJECT: Highway 101 Elwha River Bridge Alternatives  

PRESENTED BY: Karen Goschen, Executive Director  

RCW & POLICY REQUIREMENTS:  
Although the Port does not have a written policy regarding the process of taking an official position for a public cause, it is important for the Commission to discuss such matters publically and for the position to be approved by a majority of the Commission. A resolution may be adopted as a way of memorializing the Commission position and as a method for communicating the importance of a policy position to another public board.  

BACKGROUND:  
The Elwha River Bridge is a 90-year-old bridge that is being closely monitored by WSDOT because of erosion that has occurred around the piers, caused by changes in the location and flow of the Elwha River. In early October, WSDOT reinforced the piers by placing over 3,300 tons of riprap (large boulders) around the pier bases. WSDOT also implemented several monitoring systems to help gauge any changes in the status of the bridge. The bridge has remained stable and is open to traffic. Future work will be required to maintain a reliable state transportation system in the area. WSDOT has begun its analysis on seven options for a path forward. The seven options for the bridge range from “do nothing” to building a replacement bridge while the existing bridge remains in use.  

1. No build — Abandon the bridge and construct turnarounds at both ends of it. Use state highways 112 and 113 as a detour: $400,000 to $600,000; one year to build turnarounds.  
2. Replace with state Highways 112 and 113 — Abandon the existing bridge and improve the state highways to National Highway System standards: $40 million to $50 million for immediate upgrades, up to $95 million to reach national standards; up to 10 years.  
3. Alternate highway — Build a new highway between Highway 101 and Highway 112 west of the Elwha River on or near Eden Valley Road: $35 million to $45 million; two to three years.  
4. Retrofit — Fix the existing bridge and stabilize its foundation. Existing 101 traffic would use the bridge with occasional single-lane closures and detours onto 112 and 113: $10 million to $15 million; one to two years.  
5. Existing alignment — Remove the existing bridge and replace it at the same location. Traffic would use detours during construction: $15 million to $20 million; two to three years.
6. Parallel alignment — Build a new bridge adjacent to the old bridge. Existing bridge would remain open during construction: $15 million to $20 million; one to two years.

7. New Alignment alternative – Build a new bridge on a new alignment across the Elwha River. The existing bridge would remain open to traffic during construction: $18 million to $25 million; over 1 to 2 years. After construction was complete, traffic would be shifted onto the new bridge and the old bridge would be removed.

Attachment:
- WSDOT’s Design Alternatives - US 101 Elwha River Bridge
- US Highway 101 detour if closure of Elwha River Bridge

ANALYSIS:
From a general economic development perspective, support of freight mobility and emergency response, ability to make a living and general quality of life, it is important to retain connectivity with the west end of the County utilizing Highway 101 across the Elwha River bridge instead of the circuitous and substandard route along the coast. From a Port perspective, staff is concerned with the potential interruption on timber related harvest activities and deliveries into the Port and its customers.

It is important that WSDOT takes quick action in identifying and building a solution to this compromised bridge. Staff recommends support for alternative seven because it has the least disruption on current activity and provides for a long-term solution while making the bridge crossing safer by improving the alignment to the approach on the east side of the bridge.

Attachment:
- December 13, 2016 letter from Clallam County Board of Commissioners and Sheriff supporting alternative 7.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT: not applicable

FISCAL IMPACT: not applicable

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Commission to discuss alternatives and determine if the Commission would like to take a formal position in supporting a specific alternative and direct the Executive Director to provide official comments to WSDOT on the Port’s preferred alternative.
Mr. Troy Cowan, Regional Maintenance Engineer  
Ms. Claudia Bingham Baker, Communications Manager  
Washington State Department of Transportation, Regional Maintenance Office  
5720 Capital Boulevard  
Tumwater, WA 98504

RE: Design Alternatives for US 101 Elwha River Bridge

Dear Mr. Cowan and Ms. Bingham Baker:

This letter is to offer the Clallam County Commissioners’ and the Clallam County Sheriff’s recommendation concerning the replacement of the Elwha Bridge on Highway 101 west of Port Angeles.

We most strongly recommend option 7 listed in WSDOT’s Design Alternatives - US 101 Elwha River Bridge document released in December 2016.

From a purely vehicular traffic perspective any option that closes the existing bridge (for in-place replacement) and detours traffic on State Highway 112 for access to the western half of Clallam County is unacceptable. Highway 112 is in exceptionally poor condition from milepost 35 to 37 due to unstable ground. About a quarter mile of roadway near milepost 36 is gravel because the ground is so unstable it will not support paving. Requiring detouring traffic to use the Joyce-Piedmont Access Road and East Beach Road to return to Highway 101 is also unacceptable because of the poor condition of these roads. It would be prohibitively expensive to widen the road to accommodate the expected commercial traffic that presently uses Highway 101.

The only acceptable solution is one that keeps the present bridge operational and builds the replacement bridge either next to it or at a location nearby. A location slightly to the south is preferable as it will mitigate the existing steep approach and 90 degree bend in the current bridge.

Highway 101 is the most important roadway in Clallam County. The economic livelihood of our County is dependent upon this lifeline. The existing bridge is over 90 years old – well past its useful lifetime. From a public safety, economic well-being, and political standpoint we strongly urge the replacement of the Elwha River Bridge while keeping the existing bridge operational until completion.

Sincerely,

MARK OZIAS, District 1  
MIKE CHAPMAN, District 2, Chair  
BILL PEACH, District 3  

File: A14.09  
13 December 2016

W.L. Benedict  

CLALLAM COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

Jim Jones, Jr. County Administrator  

BOARD OF CLALLAM COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
Design Alternatives - US 101 Elwha River Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>#1 - NO BUILD</strong></td>
<td>No permitting or right of way required</td>
<td>Extended travel and emergency response times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the ‘no-build’ option, the Elwha River Bridge would be abandoned without plans to reopen or reconstruct the bridge. Turn-arounds would be constructed at both ends of the bridge. SRs 112/113 would be signed as the alternate route. <strong>Schedule:</strong> 1 week to close. 1 year to construct turn-arounds. <strong>Cost:</strong> $400,000-$600,000</td>
<td>Signing and barrier can be quickly installed</td>
<td>Reliability - SR 112 is frequently closed due to slides and downed trees during winter months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>#2 - REPLACE US 101 WITH SRs 112 &amp; 113</strong></td>
<td>Limited easement and R/W requirements from state/local agencies</td>
<td>Right of way required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the ‘replace with SRs 112/113’ option, the Elwha River Bridge would be abandoned without plans to reopen or reconstruct it. SRs 112/113 would be improved to better accommodate the increased traffic volumes. Necessary detour upgrades would require 2 to 5 years to complete, with full upgrades to National Highway System standards requiring up to 10 years to complete. <strong>Schedule:</strong> 2 to 5 years for necessary upgrades, 10 years for full NHS standards <strong>Cost:</strong> $40-50 M for immediate upgrades; up to $95 M to reach full National Highway System standards</td>
<td>Modern design provides pedestrians and bicycles safe transit along US 101</td>
<td>Multiple construction seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>#3 - ALTERNATE HIGHWAY WEST OF SR 112 BRIDGE</strong></td>
<td>Roadway service life expectancy 20 years</td>
<td>Would require purchasing large amount of right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the ‘alternate highway’ option, WSDOT would construct a two-lane highway on or near Eden Valley Road between US 101 and SR 112. The existing Elwha River Bridge would be used until the new route was complete,* after which the bridge would be removed and traffic would be routed onto the new highway. WSDOT would also upgrade existing US 101 and SR 112, including building new intersections, repaving, and adding safety features. <strong>Schedule:</strong> 2 to 3 years <strong>Cost:</strong> $35 M to $45 M</td>
<td>Provides pedestrian facilities for safe transit along US 101</td>
<td>Extended emergency services response times, extended commute times between Forks and Port Angeles (10-15 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Assumes bridge remains structurally sound.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost:</strong> $1.2 M cost of eventual bridge removal</td>
<td>Utilities would require relocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilities would require relocation. | **Schedule:** Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years | Extended travel and emergency response times |

Extended travel and emergency response times |

Reliability - SR 112 is frequently closed due to slides and downed trees during winter months |

Traffic on SR 112 would increase 3-fold, from 1,144 vehicles per day to 4,554 vehicles per day, with 16% truck traffic |

$1.2 M cost of eventual bridge removal |

Extended travel and emergency response times |

Lower speed limit for new route according to geometric design |

$1.2 M cost of eventual bridge removal |

Multiple construction seasons |

Intersection improvements needed for permanent rerouting |

Extended travel and emergency response times |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |

Another approx. $95 M investment to bring SRs 112/113 up to National Highway System standards over 10 years |

Utilities would require relocation. | **Cost:** | **Schedule:** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#4 – RETROFIT EXISTING BRIDGE</th>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the ‘retrofit’ alternative, WSDOT would retrofit the existing bridge and stabilize its foundation. Existing bridge traffic would use the bridge with occasional single lane closures and detours onto SR 112/113 until the project was complete.*</td>
<td>• Extend bridge service life expectancy by 10-15 years</td>
<td>• Existing bridge is over 90 years old and new bridge would be required within 10-15 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Assumes bridge remains structurally sound.</td>
<td>• Limited interruptions to traveling public</td>
<td>• Future deck replacement within 5 years would cause significant traffic impacts, including a detour, during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule: 1-2 years with future deck replacement. Cost: $10 M to $15 M</td>
<td>• Minimal environmental impacts</td>
<td>• Utilities would need to be relocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#5 – NEW BRIDGE ON EXISTING ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the ‘existing alignment’ alternative, WSDOT would remove the Elwha River Bridge and build a new bridge at the same location. Existing traffic would be routed onto SRs 112/113 until the construction was complete.</td>
<td>• Limited easement and R/W requirements from state/local agencies</td>
<td>• Long term detour required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modern design provides pedestrians and bicycles safe transit over Elwha River</td>
<td>• Extended emergency services response time, increased commute time between Forks and Port Angeles (due to detour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New bridge with 75-year life expectancy</td>
<td>• Increased construction timeline; construction on new bridge could not begin until existing bridge was removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimizes environmental impacts, but they’re greater than retrofitting</td>
<td>• Utilities would need to be relocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule: 2 to 3 years Cost: $15 M to $20 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#6 – NEW BRIDGE ON PARALLEL ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the ‘parallel alignment’ alternative, WSDOT would build a new bridge adjacent to the existing bridge. The existing bridge would remain open to traffic during construction.*</td>
<td>• Limited easement and R/W requirements from state/local agencies</td>
<td>• Right of way needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Assumes bridge remains structurally sound.</td>
<td>• Existing bridge is detour during construction</td>
<td>• Requires permanent alignment shift onto bridge, making curve at end of bridge sharper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited interruptions to traveling public</td>
<td>• Utilities would need to be relocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modern design provides pedestrians and bicycles safe transit over Elwha River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New bridge would have 75-year life expectancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimal environmental impacts, but they would be greater than using existing alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule: 1 to 2 years Cost: $15 M to $20 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#7 – NEW BRIDGE ON NEW ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the ‘new bridge on new alignment’ alternative, WSDOT would build a new bridge on a new alignment across the Elwha River. The existing bridge would remain open to traffic during construction.* After construction was complete, traffic would be shifted onto the new bridge and the old bridge would be removed.</td>
<td>• Existing bridge is detour during construction</td>
<td>• Increased right of way and permitting deadlines for construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Assumes bridge remains structurally sound.</td>
<td>• Limited interruptions to traveling public</td>
<td>• Utilities would need to be relocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modern design provides pedestrians and bicycles safe transit over Elwha River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New bridge would have 75-year life expectancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better roadway geometrics at east end of bridge, including the intersection at Olympic Hot Springs Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule: 1 to 2 years Cost: $18 M to $25 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>