TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Oliver
FROM: Patrick Holm
DATE: June 21, 2016
PROJECT #: 738.05
SUBJECT: Belfair Park and Ride Site Selection/Alternatives Analysis Process

BACKGROUND

Mason Transit Authority (MTA) has contracted SCJ Alliance to assist with the MTA Park and Ride Development Project, which will improve four existing park and ride locations and construct two new park and ride/transit facilities. One of the new park and rides to be constructed is in the Belfair area. Currently, there is not a site selected for the new park and ride location. Part of our work with MTA is to establish a process for public involvement and to select the preferred location.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to outline the Alternatives Analysis process we recommend to facilitate the Belfair park and ride site selection and stakeholder involvement.

STAKEHOLDERS AND WORKING GROUP

MTA has compiled a list of stakeholders regarding the new Belfair park and ride. From the list of stakeholders, MTA will recommend a smaller Working Group to participate in workshops and facilitate in the decision making process. As a part of this step, we will prepare a summary level schedule for the alternatives analysis, identifying points of Working Group involvement and share with the Working Group.

POSSIBLE SITES

We wrote a technical memorandum dated June 7, 2016 recommending that the three sites previously put forth in the North Mason Park and Ride Parcel Assessment Technical Memorandum are still the best options to present to the Working Group at the first workshop. This memo is included as an attachment.
PERFORMANCE RANKING

We propose to use a Performance Value Measurement spreadsheet to weigh and score performance attributes used for this alternatives analysis. The spreadsheet uses the following variables and methods to evaluate the alternatives.

Criteria
We will work with MTA to draft preliminary criteria. At Workshop 1 MTA, SCJ and the Working Group will discuss and refine criteria.

Weighting
At Workshop 1, MTA, SCJ and the Working Group will weigh the relative importance of the criteria. Relative weightings will be established by using pair-wise comparisons.

Scoring
Each potential site will be scored against the criteria. A rating of 0 to 10 will be applied to each of the criteria. The rating is then multiplied by the criteria weight to determine the criteria score. The alternative score is determined by the sum of the criteria scores.

Value Ranking
The alternatives are ranked by best value. The alternative value is a function of the cost index and alternative score, where the cost index is the ratio of the individual alternative cost and the sum of all alternative costs. The alternative value is determined by dividing the alternative score by the cost index. The best value alternative will be the recommended alternative.

Workshops
There will be three workshops to complete the process:

- Workshop 1 – Discuss Site Locations, define criteria and weigh criteria.
- Workshop 2 – Review preliminary alternative scores, revise criteria and weighting. Develop different weight scenarios if necessary. Finalize scoring.
- Workshop 3 – Present Alternatives Analysis and final scoring to broader group of stakeholders.

A Decision Process Diagram is included to outline the process.
MTA Park and Ride Development Project
Decision Process Diagram

**Next Step**

**Workshop 1**
Site Locations / Criteria, Weighting & Scoring
- Discuss different site locations
- Present draft criteria
- Assign weights to criteria
- Discuss scoring methodology
- Summarize workshop

**Analyse Different Sites**
- Modify designs
- Estimate construction costs
- Score alternatives preliminarily

**Workshop 2**
Finalizing Criteria, Weighting & Scoring
- Present preliminary scores
- Finalize criteria weighting
- Finalize scoring methodology
- Score alternatives
- Summarize workshop

**Workshop 3**
Alternative Analysis Results
- Present scoring
- Review criteria weighting
- Review ranking of alternatives
- Discuss results and review sensitivity
- Summarize workshop results
- Finalize Alternatives Analysis

**July**

**late July**

**August**

**September**

June 21, 2016
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM SUPPLEMENT

TO: Mike Oliver
FROM: Patrick Holm
DATE: June 7, 2016
PROJECT #: 0738.05
SUBJECT: MTA Park and Ride Development Project

BELFAIR PARK AND RIDE SITE SELECTION

Understanding/Previous Assessment

Mason Transit Authority (MTA) plans to develop a Park and Ride Facility in the Belfair/North Mason County area as a part their County-wide Park and Ride Development Project. Before the project was funded by WSDOT, we carried out research for MTA and wrote the North Mason Park and Ride Parcel Assessment Technical Memorandum, dated August 17, 2015, which is included as Attachment A to this Supplement. That Technical Memorandum listed fourteen potentially suitable parcels and preliminarily evaluated nine parcels with respect to, but not limited to the following:

- Access to Highway 3 beyond central Belfair congestion.
- Access to the future Highway 3 Belfair Bypass.
- Size of Parcel.
- Access to utilities.
- Site Topography.
- Environmental Considerations.

The Technical Memorandum recommended that three of the parcels/sites had the best characteristics for the proposed North Mason Park and Ride facility (See Figure 1 for site locations):

- Site #1
- Site #2
- Any 5 acre parcel that can be delineated and subdivided from the combined acreage of parcels #3, #4, #6, and/or #7. All of these parcels are adjacent and have the same owner, with whom this option has been discussed.
New Considerations

The factors that contributed to the site selection recommendation in the previous Technical Memorandum have not substantially changed, aside from a rejection of the assumption that a future extension of Log Yard Road would provide a direct connection the Belfair Bypass. We reached out to WSDOT to assess the possibility of future connections to the Belfair Bypass. WSDOT indicated that the Belfair Bypass will be Limited Access. They will allow one connection at the mid-point, but this connection will not be funded by WSDOT as part of the Belfair Bypass project.

Recommendation

Without the possibility of a connection point to the south of the Belfair Bypass/Highway 3 connection, no new sites are recommended for evaluation. We recommend that the three sites previously put forth are still the best options to present to the Stakeholders Group for evaluation as a future location for the North Mason Park & Ride.
TO: Mike Oliver, Development Manager  
Mason Transit Authority  
FROM: Lisa Palazzi, SCJ Alliance  
DATE: August 17, 2015  
PROJECT #: 1225.18 Phase 25  
SUBJECT: North Mason Park and Ride Parcel Assessment

1. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Mason Transit Authority (MTA) needs to develop a Park and Ride Facility in the north Mason County area, near Belfair. There is an existing bus service to the Bremerton shipyards (~4 heavy coaches/day), but the existing Park and Ride facility is a leased parking lot with no supporting infrastructure. MTA has identified fourteen potential parcels that may be suitable at some level as either temporary or permanent Park and Ride facilities. This report provides a preliminary discussion and comparison for nine (#1 through #8 and #13) of the fourteen parcels (Figure 1). The other parcels (#9 through #12 and #14) either have already been assessed or are being assessed by others.

![Figure 1. Approximate parcel boundaries with numerical labels shown in relation to the future Belfair Bypass route. Parcels with same color have the same ownership.](attachment:A)
These nine parcels are on or near Highway 3 north of Belfair near the Kitsap County line. They are of interest for several reasons:

- They have potential to provide direct access to Highway 3 outside of the congestion in central Belfair (safety and access issues);
- Some are larger parcels with potential for future growth in an industrial park setting where all-day parking and bus storage facilities will be less obtrusive;
- Some have potential for improved access to the future Hwy 3 Belfair Bypass, slated to begin construction circa 2021.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a baseline, rudimentary comparison and assessment of the nine listed parcels, using a list of MTA site requirements and assumptions about future growth needs and potential. *This report should not be taken to be a final assessment or comprehensive analysis of site alternatives.*

### 2. PARCEL ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION

#### 2.1 Baseline Infrastructure Needs

According to MTA documentation, the primary considerations for selecting a parcel with characteristics suitable for both short term and long term baseline infrastructure needs are listed below in the left Table 1 (area-based needs) column and in Table 2 (other needs). The estimated square footage of area necessary to meet each Table 1 baseline infrastructure need is provided in the right column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Infrastructure Need</th>
<th>Area Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 to 150 car parking stalls (plus ADA stalls and electric stalls and aisles for bus stop)</td>
<td>1.5-2 acres for parking (depending on design and stall layout)¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - A minimum of 5 ADA-accessible parking stalls  
  - Level 3 fast charge electric car chargers (for this report, assume 5 stalls minimum) | |
| An MTA satellite office building (for this report, assume 1,200 sqft minimum)² with employee parking spaces (for this report, assume 10 employee spaces minimum, 9x20 feet dimensions plus 18 x100 ft driving aisle) | ~1/4 acre for main building plus parking and landscaping, and related infrastructure |
| A minimum of 8 MTA bus storage stalls plus one driving aisle, using a blend of large and small buses (for this report, allow room for future expansion to 16 bus storage stalls and driving aisle) | Minimum 6,720 sqft for 8 mixed L/S buses; 8,640 sqft for 8 large buses; 17,280 sqft for 16 large buses (maximum). |

---

¹ Anticipate 100 car parking lot is about 1 acre (including landscaping, driving aisles, stalls and etc.)

² A building this size would accommodate a break room for drivers, staff restrooms, a small kitchen area, a small office and a meeting room large enough to accommodate future public meetings with seating for up to 40 people.

³ Assume large bus is 9x40 ft and small bus is 9x20 ft; bus parking stalls would be approximately 12 feet wide and 5 feet longer than bus.
The area assessment above indicates a 3 acre parcel would accommodate current needs, but would provide no available space for future expansion. A 5-acre parcel would provide for the most logical future expansion needs. Less than 5 acres is likely to prove limiting at some point.

Table 2. Other baseline parcel needs to improve site infrastructure utility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit bus pathway with safe loop drive or turnaround space</td>
<td>About 3,600 sqft turnaround minimum; not possible to account for transit bus pathway area — site dependent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A covered transit stop (for this report, assume to need room for up to 20 people)</td>
<td>500 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserving room for future expansion (additional car parking; bus maintenance facility)</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater treatment/storage facility (for this report, assume 15% of the site is needed for a surface stormwater facility due to expected shallow soils)</td>
<td>0.67 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area needed</td>
<td>~5.2 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the factors listed above in Table 2, having an existing ROW access to Highway 3 (or potential for future access to the Belfair Bypass) is a great advantage, as purchase and negotiations for a ROW can be costly and time-consuming. In addition, having direct access to the site from a highway (major transportation corridor) makes it easier for the rider to find and access the Park and Ride. In particular, having access to a highway with controlled entry, such as the future Belfair Bypass, is an advantage as it is safer, easier to enter and exit, results in minimal diversion from the main travel route and is less congested. The Park and Ride has potential to add significant additional traffic at the beginning and end of each day, and thus having a controlled, well designed entrance and exit is important, in order to minimize local congestion.

4 Availability of a safe loop drive or “back door” will be discussed below
5 A 9x40’ Bus turn-around requires 12-ft lane width and clearance, and a 55-ft exterior turning radius
6 1000 sqft bus maintenance facility – a garage type building with an office/storage room and two service alleys for changing oil; fixing flat tires; changing tires; adding radiator fluid or windshield fluid, and etc.
Pedestrian access to the Park and Ride is not of primary importance, as pedestrians can access the MTA transit system from other areas, and thus can access the Park and Ride from other transit stops. Safe bicycle access is preferred, but is not expected to be a dominant site access method. However, secure bicycle storage facilities may prove useful for attracting bicycle commuters – an increasingly popular mode of local transportation.

Site visibility from the Highway is very important, as it reduces potential for theft and damage to parked vehicles as well as provides protection for the rider when returning to their vehicle. Site visibility also ensures that passing motorists see the Park and Ride, and are therefore aware that it is available for their use. For these reason, sites directly adjacent to the Highway with minimal screening vegetation along the main roadway are preferred.

### 2.2 Secondary Site Selection Factors Affecting Development Costs

MTA has a list of what they consider secondary factors affecting site selection, which have more to do with development costs that primary site requirements. They include the following and will be discussed in the section below:

- Proximity to electrical, water & sewer utilities
- Level ground
- Need for traffic signalization
- Environmental considerations:
  - Contamination
  - Wetlands
  - Protected/endangered species
  - Storm water runoff; flooding
  - Environmental justice
- Historic requirements
- Nature conservancy
- Space utilization partnerships (County, State, fire station, etc.)

### 2.3 Parcel Assessments

Applying the information outlined above, we prepared some tables and figures to provide easy visual comparison between the various parcels. We also provide written assessment below.

Table 3 provides basic parcel information, such as tax parcel number, ownership and acreage. In particular, the table is color coded to show the parcels in single ownership. Parcels owned by one entity have more flexibility as there is higher potential for subdivision, boundary line adjustments or development of easements at lower cost and with less complexity.

Table 4 uses the same ownership color coding, and shows information related to site access – such as whether the parcel has directly adjacent frontage on Highway 3.
Table 5 uses the same ownership color coding, and shows information related to site environmental constraints – such as proximity to known wetlands or streams.

**Table 3. Ownership, acreage, and address.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Assessed value (Mason Cty GIS)</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12321-14-00041</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>Fronts on Hwy 3</td>
<td>$240,415</td>
<td>Schauer, Brad and Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12321-17-00040</td>
<td>6.3+0.8²</td>
<td>410 NE Log Yard Rd</td>
<td>$125,125</td>
<td>C&amp;I Real Estate LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12321-14-00001</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>Fronts on Hwy 3</td>
<td>$237,045</td>
<td>Overton &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12321-41-00000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fronts on Hwy 3</td>
<td>$637,000</td>
<td>Overton &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12321-14-00030</td>
<td>0.71⁸</td>
<td>11178 State Route 3, Allyn</td>
<td>$14,070</td>
<td>Mungra, Mahesh &amp; Nirmala et al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12321-44-00000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>No address; access via #4</td>
<td>$546,000</td>
<td>Overton &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12321-43-00130</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>Fronts on Hwy 3</td>
<td>$595,685</td>
<td>Overton &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12321-43-60100</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>25090 NE State Route 3</td>
<td>$501,675</td>
<td>Dept. of Transp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12321-14-00010</td>
<td>2.93+1.76</td>
<td>412 NE Log Yard Rd, Belfair</td>
<td>$58,070</td>
<td>C&amp;I Real Estate LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Highway 3 and Belfair Bypass Access Opportunities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Existing ROW Access to Hwy 3</th>
<th>Adjacent to Hwy 3</th>
<th>Back-door access (loop drive option)</th>
<th>Adjacent to future Bypass</th>
<th>Traffic Congestion on interior roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None known</td>
<td>Yes (N of Hwy 3 at Logyard Rd.)</td>
<td>Yes, Log Yard Road to rear and side</td>
<td>No, (near end of loop Bypass on Hwy 3)</td>
<td>Anything N of Hwy shares interior industrial park roads with other vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Possible, shared with #13 (adjacent)</td>
<td>Yes (N of Hwy 3)</td>
<td>Yes, Log Yard Road</td>
<td>Yes, (at end of loop Bypass on HWY 3)</td>
<td>Anything N of Hwy shares interior industrial park roads with other vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, but available through #4¹⁰</td>
<td>Yes (S of Hwy 3)</td>
<td>No current back door loop</td>
<td>No, (near end of loop Bypass on Hwy 3)</td>
<td>No current interior roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes – ROW already available</td>
<td>Yes (S of Hwy 3 at frontage at Logyard Rd)</td>
<td>No current back door loop, future through #6 to Bypass</td>
<td>No, (near end of loop Bypass on Hwy 3); future easement access through #6.</td>
<td>Minor interior logging roads; plans for future public roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (S of Hwy 3 at frontage)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No interior roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No, but available through #4</td>
<td>Yes (S of Hwy 3, easement to Hwy 3 possible)</td>
<td>No current back door loop, future direct access to Belfair Bypass</td>
<td>Yes, directly adjacent to Bypass route.</td>
<td>Minor interior logging roads; plans for future public roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No, but available through #4</td>
<td>Yes (S of Hwy 3 on frontage)</td>
<td>No current back door loop, future through #6 to Bypass</td>
<td>No, future easement access through #6</td>
<td>Minor interior logging roads; plans for future public roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes – ROW already available</td>
<td>Yes (S of Hwy 3)</td>
<td>Yes, existing easement to east</td>
<td>No, possible easement</td>
<td>Has a minimally developed private road easement to the SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (N of Hwy 3)</td>
<td>Yes, Log Yard Road through #2?</td>
<td>Yes, (at end of loop Bypass on HWY 3)</td>
<td>Anything N of Hwy shares interior industrial park roads with other vehicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Site #2 and #13 frontage is in Kitsap County; Two areas listed are in Mason County and Kitsap County respectively
8 This area is within Mason County; the rest of this undeveloped 2.5 acre parcel is in Kitsap County
9 Site #2 and #13 frontage is in Kitsap County
10 As indicated by property owner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Soils mapped onsite</th>
<th>Geology mapped onsite</th>
<th>Soil depth(^{11})</th>
<th>Priority spp.(^{12}) on site or near site</th>
<th>Wetland mapped onsite</th>
<th>Stream mapped onsite</th>
<th>Wetland mapped within 200’</th>
<th>Stream mapped within 200’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alderwood Everettna, Indianola</td>
<td>Qgic (ice contact; till/outwash)</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alderwood</td>
<td>Qg, Qgic (glacial till; ice contact)</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alderwood</td>
<td>Qgic, Qgt (glacial till; ice contact)</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alderwood Shalcar muck</td>
<td>Qg, Qgic (glacial till; ice contact)</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft</td>
<td>NO – streams are not F</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alderwood</td>
<td>Qg, Qgt (glacial till; ice contact)</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alderwood</td>
<td>Qg (Qgic) (glacial till ice contact)</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft</td>
<td>NO – streams are not F</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alderwood Everett</td>
<td>Qgic (Qgt, Qgo) (ice contact – some till and outwash)</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft, or deeper to west</td>
<td>NO – streams are not F</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Everett Gravel pit</td>
<td>Qgic (ice contact)</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft, or deeper to west</td>
<td>NO – streams are not F</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alderwood</td>
<td>Qgt</td>
<td>&lt;6 ft</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Soil depth expected from geologic and soil mapping – impermeable glacial till within 6-10 feet.

\(^{12}\) Possible requirement to assess for presence of Mazama Pocket Gopher across all sites.
Site Descriptions (in ownership groupings)

Site #1 (12.13 acres) is located at the NE corner of the intersection of Highway 3 and Logyard Road – which is the most likely location for a future lighted intersection (Figure 2). It is owned by Brad and Angela Shauer, with an assessed market value of $240,415 ($19,819/acre). It is 2.4 times larger than the ~5 acres needed for the Park and Ride, but could potentially be subdivided before or after purchase. The site is directly adjacent to both Highway 3 and Logyard Road. It has an apparent access from the north on Logyard Road (easement not verified), but has no developed ROW access from Highway 3. There is potential for a front to back access/egress route, which is desired to minimize congestion at the entry from Highway 3. Assuming that Logyard Road is extended to the Bypass, it would provide direct access along that route. Topography slopes mildly to the WNW; the site is bisected by a 15-20 ft deep swale from E to W, which may conduct overflow from an adjacent stormwater facility (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Site #1: yellow line shows location of swale crossing which might conduct overflow water from the stormwater facility on adjacent parcel to N.
Sites #2 and #13 are directly adjacent to each other, located at the Mason/Kitsap County line, with the northern portions in Mason County and the southern portions in Kitsap County. Both parcels are owned by C&A Real Estate LLC. For Site #2, 6.3 acres are in Mason County, assessed at $125,125\(^{13}\) ($19,861/acre) and 0.82 acres are in Kitsap County, assessed at $61,670\(^{14}\) ($75,207/acre). For Site #13, 2.93 acres are in Mason County, assessed at $58,070 ($19,819/acre), and 1.76 acres are in Kitsap County, assessed at $43,950 ($24,971/acre). The frontage of both parcels is within Kitsap County, at the north side of Highway 3. It would be preferred to develop an MOU with Kitsap County allowing Mason County to manage permitting, but taxation would be complicated by the parcels crossing the County line.

Site #2 is 1.4 times larger than the ~5 acres needed for the Park and Ride, but part of the acreage includes a rear access to Logyard Road. Site #13 acreage is adequate for immediate needs, but does not provide as much area for future expansion, and currently is only accessible from Highway 3 (no loop drive possible). Thus it has no throughway to Logyard Road unless that easement can be arranged across co-owned Site #2. There is a developed ROW entry on Site #13 from Highway 3 (easement not verified), which might be shared with co-owned Site #2. The front to back access/egress route is desired

![Figure 3. Parcels #2 and #13: yellow dashed line shows portions of the two parcels that lie within Kitsap County.](image-url)
to minimize congestion at the entry from Highway 3. Both parcels are located at the terminus of the loop connector to the Belfair Bypass, thus can be developed for direct future access to the Bypass. **Sites #3, #4, #6 and #7** are located south of Highway 3, directly adjacent to each other. All are owned by Overton and Associates, who also own connecting acreage on the other side of the Mason/Kitsap County line.

- **Site #3** is 5.98 acres, assessed at $237,045 ($39,640/acre)
- **Site #4** is 35 acres, assessed at $637,000 ($18,200/acre)
- **Site #6** is 40 acres, assessed at $546,000 ($13,650/acre)
- **Site #7** is 21.8 acres, assessed at $595,685 ($27,462/acre)

The per acre value of these various parcels varies significantly, but on average, those with more acreage close to the Highway 3 frontage have higher value. These co-owned parcels can essentially be considered as one parcel, with potential for creating the optimal Park and Ride parcel through subdivision or boundary line adjustments. It would be important to develop future easement rights to access the Belfair Bypass to the east\(^\text{15}\), across the co-owned parcels The most desirable combination of primary characteristics would be a 5 acre parcel with a current developed ROW access to Highway 3 near a potentially light intersection, and with a guaranteed rear easement to access future onramps to the Belfair Bypass. For that reason, 5-acres subdivided from the 35 acre parcel at the intersection at

---

\(^{15}\) As indicated by property owner
Logyard Road (#4) provides the best initial characteristics. This area already has a ROW access to the Highway at the intersection, and meets all other site requirements with some caveats. It has no immediate rear loop access to a secondary entrance/egress, but it may be possible to minimize congestion at the Logyard Road intersection by providing for a secondary exit to Highway 3 (across from existing driveways 600-700 feet to the north or south) until such time as the rear access easement to the Belfair Bypass is available (circa 2021). If the Logyard Road intersection has a traffic light, that would provide for a safe, cross-traffic left turn entrance onto Highway 3. The temporary, secondary access to the north or south could be specifically designated as right turn only (only for north bound traffic with no need to cross two lanes).

Figure 5 below is a subarea within a larger figure, developed by Mason County GIS (File Name: Belfair_Bypass_Exhibit_Map_April_2013_w_Future_Roads.mxd) showing preliminary plans for future roads within the future industrial park on the south side of Highway 3, and connectors to the future Belfair Bypass. This provides additional support for the discussion above. This plan shows a connector road is planned through the Overton parcels from the intersection at Logyard Road (orange line), providing access from one of the four conceptual 5-acre parcels displayed above in Figure 4.

Figure 5. The yellow dashed oval shows the future planned road access to the Belfair Bypass from the Logyard Road intersection. The conceptual 5-acre parcel from Figure 4 is overlaid (blue rectangle with yellow outline).
Site #5, like Sites #2 and #13 is located at the Mason/Kitsap County line, with the northern portion in Mason County and the southern portion in Kitsap County. 0.71 acres are in Mason County, assessed at $14,070 ($19,816/acre) and 1.76 acres are in Kitsap County, assessed at $43,950 ($24,971/acre). The frontage of the parcel is within Mason County, at the south side of Highway 3. There is no developed ROW, and no readily apparent way to develop a rear loop access, as the property owners (Mungra, Mahesh & Nirmala et al) do not own adjacent parcels.

Site #5’s total acreage (2.47 acres) is not large enough to meet minimum Park and Ride needs, and does not provide for future expansion.

Figure 6. Site #5, located along the Mason/Kitsap County boundary, north of Site #3.
Site #8 (7.63 acres) is located south of Highway 3, southwest of Site #7 (Figure 7). It is owned by the Dept. of Transportation, and is currently used to store road sweepings and other DOT road maintenance materials, such as de-icer chemicals and sand for winter roads. The assessed market value is $501,675 ($65,750/acre) due to it having some improvements (a loader shed and pole building), but no water or septic. There is apparently a road easement to the east, which may be used to ensure access to the future Belfair Bypass (not verified).

Site #8 is 1.5 times larger than the ~5 acres needed for the Park and Ride, and it has potential issues with contamination due to use as an area to store road sweepings and chemicals. However, it has a developed ROW to Highway 3, and a rear easement that could be used to create a rear loop access. It does not provide a direct guaranteed access to the future Bypass, but one could be developed using future planned interior roads.

Figure 7. Site #8 is shown in reference to Site 4, 6, and 7, discussed above.
2.4 Secondary Site Selection Factors Affecting Development Costs

This list was initially provided in Section 2.2, but is expanded in the discussion below. This is a list of secondary factors affecting site selection, which have more to do with development costs that primary site requirements detailed above.

**Proximity to electrical, water & sewer utilities**: These parcels are all located along a major transportation route within the Belfair UGA, in what is called “The North Neighborhood” in the Belfair 20-Year Vision Plan. Those parcels located north of the Highway are located within an existing industrial park, and so have immediate access to existing utility infrastructure. Those parcels located south of the Highway are sandwiched between Highway 3 and the future Belfair Bypass, and are already slated for expansion of industrial park development. Areas farther south are planned for development as mixed residential development with related utility infrastructure. The Belfair Sewage Treatment Plant is located about 1.5 miles to the south, and expansion to cover the “North Neighborhood” area is planned. The mostly easily developed will be those parcels north of Highway 3 or immediately adjacent to the frontage, which contains the main utility easements and infrastructure.

**Level ground**: These parcels are all relatively flat, with slopes ranging from 1-5%, generally sloping to the southwest. Topography does not appear to be a major limiting factor on any of the parcels, in areas near Highway 3.

**Need for traffic signalization**: There are no current traffic lights along the stretch of Highway 3 north of Belfair. The most likely intersection for a future signalization would be at Logyard Road. Therefore, any parcel with direct or easement access to that intersection would have an advantage. We also note that Logyard Road is slated for development as an access route to the Belfair Bypass (Figure 5), thus will inevitably be signaled at some point within the next 5-6 years.

**Environmental considerations -- Contamination; Wetlands; Protected/endangered species; Storm water runoff; Flooding; Environmental justice**:

- **Contamination**: Some of the parcels are currently cleared and developed to some degree; some are undeveloped forest land. There is no record in the Ecology database of documented contamination on or adjacent to any of the nine parcels. However, some testing may be prudent on the partially developed parcels or in areas with a history of dumping. In particular, Site #8 has been used to store road sweepings, road-kill animal carcasses and other related DOT waste materials, thus seems likely to have potential clean up needs. Sites #2 and #13 are mostly cleared and graded, and have piles of what appear to be wood chips and gravel which may require assessment and testing, but did not appear to contain be hazardous materials.

- **Wetlands**: There are known wetlands and streams on or near the parcels south of Highway 3, but in general, there is room to work around and avoid most impacts to those systems and their buffers.

- **Protected/endangered species**: There is no documented presence of endangered or threatened animals on any of the parcels; the streams are not documented as being fish-bearing. However, some site specific work may be required to verify this information.

- **Storm water runoff; Flooding**: The area is not mapped as a flood hazard zone, and we found no records of past flooding in the immediately surrounding area. Stormwater facilities are expected to be
somewhat shallow, as an underlying glacial till will limit vertical drainage and infiltration potential. Thus occasional groundwater flooding may be possible during periods of extended rainfall.

- **Environmental justice**: The immediately surrounding area east of the railroad and on both sides of Highway 3 is industrial park or forestland with no residential neighborhoods. There will be no displacements as no existing residential neighborhoods will be affected by developing a Park and Ride on any of these parcels.

### 3.0 Summary

A few of these parcels have, in combination, what may be considered fatal flaws, particularly when compared to other parcels without those particular limitations.

- **Site #5** is greatly limited by being too small, mostly in Kitsap County -- complicating permit processes and taxation issues. It has no developed ROW access to Highway 3, and no apparent way to provide for a loop road access to minimize congestion at entrance/egress point.

- **Site #8** has potentially significant cleanup issues, which could greatly increase site development costs or could complicate purchase negotiations, and potentially outweigh the advantage of having an existing ROW access to Highway 3. It is also more costly than the other parcels, as a result of having some onsite buildings that may not be useful for the Park and Ride site layout and operations.

- **Site #13** is a bit smaller than the optimum size, and has rear access limitations, unless allowed an easement through Site #2. It is also complicated by being partially located in Kitsap County, in particular along the vital frontage ROW, complicating permit processes and taxation issues.

**Better Sites**

- **Site #1** (12.13 acres) is more than two times larger than the desired ~5 acres, but it could be subdivided. This parcel has several advantages, being located at the NE corner of the intersection of Highway 3 and Logyard Road, which will most likely be a lighted intersection in the near future. It has an apparent access from the north, and it is our understanding that there is an available developed access near the Highway 3 intersection (not verified). Therefore, there is potential for a front to back access/egress loop route, which would minimize congestion at a single entry. Based on plans for the future roadway development, the extension of Logyard Road will eventually connect to the future Belfair Bypass.

- In terms of limitations, the parcel is covered with Scotch broom, which might create a maintenance challenge with future landscaping. Topography slopes mildly to the WNW, and the site is bisected by a 15-20 ft deep swale (per Google Earth topography) from E to W, which may conduct overflow from an adjacent stormwater facility. If there is seasonal flow in the swale, it may be regulated as a stream, but that would have to be verified onsite. Assuming these issues can be worked around, **Site #1** is a viable alternative.
• **Site #2** has the same problem as **Site #13**, by being partially located in Kitsap County, in particular along the vital frontage ROW. This will complicate permitting as well as future taxation, but could probably be worked out through an MOU between Mason and Kitsap County. In addition, the developed ROW access to Highway 3 appears to be on **Site #13**, and thus would need to be shared with **Site #2** – a less than ideal alternative when trying to minimize congestion at the Park and Ride entrance. But otherwise, **Site #2** has some good characteristics in terms of total acreage, potential for a rear access loop road to Logyard Road, which also provides for future access to the Belfair Bypass across the future traffic-lighted intersection with Highway 3. (One possible drawback to that rear access might be that Logyard Road is already somewhat congested within the active industrial park, and thus may not provide an optimal exit pathway for the buses.) In addition, **Site #2** is already cleared and graded, which should simplify site development, reducing costs and complexity. Barring potential contamination issues associated with stockpiled materials onsite, **Site #2** is a viable alternative.

• The combinations of **Sites #3, #4, #6 and #7** allows one to rearrange parcel boundaries to meet site layout requirements, as long as the property owner is amenable. The existing developed ROW at the Logyard Road intersection (**Site #4** frontage) is slated for future extension to the Belfair Bypass, and will be a traffic lighted intersection. A 5-acre parcel (subdivided from Site #4) oriented along the Highway 3 frontage directly SE or SW of that planned intersection has potential for a main controlled entrance at the Logyard Road intersection, and a secondary right turn only exit farther north or south – reducing congestion at the main entrance. This would require acquisition of the second access point at the far end of the parcel, but may be worth it. Otherwise, the 5-acre parcel (subdivided from Site #4) could be reoriented, turning 90° along the east or west side of the future Logyard Road ROW with the second exit/entrance located to the south along the future Logyard Road extension. The orientation along Highway 3 provides for excellent site visibility and minimal screening in the period prior to development of the Bypass access roadways (Logyard Road extension), and provides ready access to bicyclists willing to ride along Highway 3 north of Belfair, taking a safer, right hand turn into the Park and Ride. There are no known environmental limitations (contaminants, wetlands, streams, or endangered species) in these two possible 5-acre sites. As long as the price for this created parcel is acceptable in comparison to the Site #2 alternative parcel, subdividing a 5-acre parcel near the intersection at Logyard Road from **Site #4** appears to be the most flexible alternative for meeting most primary and secondary site selection requirements.