

**KITSAP COUNTY  
NON-MOTORIZED FACILITIES COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(KC NMCAC)  
MEETING MINUTES**

**DECEMBER 20, 2022 6:30 – 8:00 p.m.**

Virtual Meeting

---

Deborah Weinmann, Chair  
 Jess Chandler, Vice Chair  
 Richard Feeney  
 Ray Pardo  
 Douglas Piehl  
 Scott Satter  
 Brian Watson  
 Laura Westervelt

**Microsoft Teams meeting**

**Join on your computer, mobile app or room device**

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 228 906 241 863

Passcode: JCQ8uT

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

**Or call in (audio only)**

+1 253-617-4979,,307138674# United States, Tacoma

Phone Conference ID: 307 138 674#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

<i>Time</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
6:30	1. Welcome and Introductions		Chair
	2. Public Comment (3 min limit per person)		Chair
	3. Approval of Minutes	Action	Chair
6:40	4. Vice Chair, Recorder Nominations	Action	Chair
6:45	5. Metrics	Discussion	Chandler
7:00	6. NSTO update	Discussion	Chair
7:15	7. 2023 Work Program	Discussion	Chair
7:50	8. Member and Staff Update	Discussion	Chair
8:00	9. Adjourn	Action	Chair

**Attendance:**

<p><u>Members Present:</u>                  Debbie Weinmann (Chair)                  Jess Chandler (Vice-Chair)                  Rick Feeney (Recorder)                  Ray Pardo                  Doug Piehl*                  Brian Watson                  Laura Westervelt</p>	<p><u>Members Absent:</u> Scott Satter  <u>Kitsap County Representatives:</u>                  David Forte                  Melissa Mohr                  Christine DeGaus  <u>Guests:</u> None                  *Note: Doug Piehl announced his resignation effective at end of term Dec. 31, 2022.</p>
---	--

**Enclosure [1]: Pedestrian Metrics**

**Enclosure [2]: North Sound-to-Olympics (NSTO) Update**

## **Topic 1: Welcome and Introductions**

Meeting Called to Order

## **Topic 2: Public Comment**

None

## **Topic 3: Approval of minutes**

Oct: For October's minutes Ray Pardo put out the motion to approve minutes, Brian Watson seconded. All voted in favor.

November minutes delayed until January's meeting.

## **ADHOC TOPIC: Meeting Minutes Protocol**

Though not on the docket, the Chair opened up discussion on what the proper protocol is for reviewing minutes prior to release to the whole committee for approval or comments. It was clarified that the Recorder will release a draft copy to the Chair and Vice Chair for review in a timely fashion (~within a week of meeting) \*. They will review and either approve for release or get additional edits incorporated. When approved for release, the Recorder or Chair will send to the Kitsap County representative for release to the committee (et. al.) approximately a week in advance the forthcoming meeting. If committee approves, protocol then allows small comments/corrections to be adopted. Once approved, the moniker "Draft Copy" will be removed and the county will issue the approved minutes by posting on the county's website in short order.

\* Note: It is beneficial if the entity presenting the topic assists the Recorder (e.g., provides them with a summary and their presentation's display) soon after presented.

## **Topic 4: Vice-Chair & Recorder Nominations (for CY 2023)**

Vice-Chair: Deborah Weinmann nominated Laura Westervelt. Brian Watson seconded. Laura accepted.

For Recorder, Brian Watson nominated himself. Jess Chandler seconded.

Voting will take place at January meeting. Nominations are still accepted.

Rick Feeney was thanked for his Recorder efforts for the past 2+ years.

## **Topic 5: Pedestrian Metrics**

Jess Chandler presented a further discussion on the purpose and evaluation criteria of the sub-committee's Pedestrian Metrics project. Slides are included in Enclosure [1].

The three (3) person sub-committee on metrics was presenting a discussion for the committee to consider how we might want to approach the commissioners with a proposal for a report on Pedestrian Metrics. This presentation included one idea of what might be included in such a proposal. The presentation started with addressing discussion points during the previous meeting on the sub-committee's initial draft of criteria for rating pedestrian facilities on road segments.

Laura Westervelt had provided discussion at the last meeting on how we might rate the qualitative worth of environmental factors such as natural greenery alongside the pedestrian paths/shoulders. At this meeting, Jess Chandler stated that it would be difficult to incorporate into the rating criteria, but it can be denoted in development proposals.

There had been some confusion about gravel vs. paved shoulders in the last meeting. Jess stated that the revised criteria from the metrics sub-committee would give points to gravel shoulders of

adequate width but would not rate these as meeting standard - especially as they are not accessible to all pedestrians.

With recent meeting discussions, there was discussion on this topic's functionality and on how we can use quantitative data. The floor was opened for roundtable discussion:

Brian Watson: As I've previously brought up, we need to take a high altitude look at this. I value the sub-committee's work on it; but I believe the county's standard operations already do this. Like efforts our committee has already performed in the prioritization and ranked them.

Ray Pardo: Brian as you've brought up, we missed areas. I think we have to have better data that this metric can give us (e.g., What is the status of these roads?). Brian, I don't believe this is redundant. This would have been great for data and priority in our previous assessments. I believe we don't have accurate pedestrian data near all the schools.

Rick Feeney: The county has data on virtually all shoulders condition.

Melissa Mohr: We do, but not every bit is current.

David Forte: These metrics can cause some unnecessary difficulty (e.g., rural roads are rural roads). Are we just expending time getting data for data's sake. How do we get maximum results. For instance, we had previously reviewed for focus areas and Port Orchard's Lund Ave got the committee's priority. It just recently got some high priority grants.

Brian Watson: David, that well articulates my concern. I understand wanting to get better data on what we have shoulders and sidewalks. The question I have is where is our effort best spent committee and staff.

Rick Feeney: The county's areas are changing dramatically. In the growth areas, the needs for shoulders are constantly changing. We need to take this into account and look at the growth areas.

Doug Piehl: I'm in agreement with Brian.

Debbie Weinmann: We may want to at least propose to the commissioners an "ask" for having the appropriate county person estimate the cost of updating the data for pedestrian facilities county-wide. In other words, just get a cost estimate for this task to start with.

Jess Chandler: With this input, the sub-committee will table further discussion on this and consider what should be done with the pedestrian metrics at this time.

Team: All member's thanked the sub-committee for their in-depth work on this.

## **Topic 6: North (Kingston link) Sound-to-Narrows (NSTO) Update**

Deb Weinmann is covering this topic for the committee. She stated a lot has changed in the feasibility statement recently. She discussed NSTO meetings minutes provided in Enclosure [2]. The effort is heading into Tier 2, where the working groups are screening the routes (e.g., how to weave the alignment). To make manageable, it has been broken up into 60 segments.

They will apply that methodology to form the alternative routes. Finally, the working group was able to submit their view.

Ray Pardo clarified that "high capacity" is not good for all user groups in the segment. That this should be factored in on the location of the Shared Use path.

David Forte mentioned that Clear Creek Shared Use Path along with trails designed for pedestrians is a good example how STO/NSTO can all user's needs.

## **Topic 7: 2023 Work Program**

David Forte wanted to discuss what Public Works is working on. For example, the Transportation Implementation Plan (TIP), the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition plan, transportation right-of-way's. They are focusing on identifying gaps. He explained the Level of effort (LOE) on inventorying the routes and interconnectivity. With the Comprehensive plan, the staff has a very full agenda. They will be coming back to the committee to inform us on these topics.

With the population influx into the county the manning of Public Works has limitations. The revenue stream is limited for next few months. The TIP already represents our efforts. Money is already being factored in (e.g., which project is getting the money). How much money we're going to get. A recession can impact. In current times there are higher impact fees. Thus, the county has to speculate how it's going to grow.

David also addressed the county's safety plan. How they are analyzing our crash data to reinforce a more robust safety program.

Brian Watson mentioned three (3) ideas he'd like to see on safety in the Comp Plan and he'd like these to fall under our efforts. That is:

- 1: Appropriate of speed limits. Too high of traffic speed is a leading cause of accidents. As such as considering the needs of all users. With a year gone by, he'd like us to relooking at the ones we identified and see some motion on and looking further in depth.
2. Automated speed enforcement. Automatically cite speeders. WSDOT recently made some changes and RCW can now be employed in our school zones.
3. Who decides where to put in the inside and out of school zones signs. Can we change that so school zones are expanded. We do have children walking along roads that are not in the low-speed school zones.

Akin to this, Ray Pardo also asked about School Zones and their Speed Limits: David Forte stated we'd have to work with Sheriff's for assistance. Ray asked if a committee member can directly talk with the sheriff's office for which David stated we can.

## **Topic 8: Member and Staff Update**

Ray Pardo asked "what is our part in the comprehensive report". Do we provide input, support, & endorsement of the comp plan.

Brian Watson asked if items are only going onto the Transportation Implementation Plan (TIP) because high potential for a grant. How Maintenance and Preservation factor in road segments for our committee's road plans.

David Forte stated they are working on this. He stated the Comprehensive Plan issue is in the spring of 2024. The NMFCAC will update our non-motorized plan right after the Comp Plan issue.

Doug Piehl let us know it was his final day. He was congratulated for his valuable efforts.

## **Topic 9: Adjourn**

With no further comments, the Chair closed the meeting.

2022-12-20

# PEDESTRIAN METRICS

Interim report to Non-motorized Facilities Citizen Advisory Committee

## DRAFT PURPOSE OF PEDESTRIAN METRICS

Kitsap County Pedestrian Facilities Metrics/Evaluation Report will:

1. Provide a complete evaluation of pedestrian facilities across the county down to the segment and side of road
2. Present an aggregated quality rating for pedestrian facilities in specific areas
3. Target missing facilities critical to connecting communities or to connecting residential to local services, recreation, and shops
4. Show measure of progress (over time) of pedestrian facilities improvements

# DRAFT CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING FACILITIES

Evaluation criteria are both for scoring and also for interpreting aggregate scores

- Scoring/evaluation of Road Segments
- Aggregation to Whole Unincorporated County or smaller areas of interest, such as in different commissioner districts or within walking distance of a school, library, or other pedestrian generator
- And then you need to interpret the scores and aggregate scores into a qualitative label (not just numbers)



# DRAFT CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING FACILITIES - SEGMENTS

Pedestrian facilities on road segments will be scored based on the sum of the score of the sides. A side of the road for a segment will be scored:

- **5** if it has a sidewalk or paved shoulder of adequate size (based on road classification & standards) or a sidewalk is present where a shoulder is the standard
- **4** if the sidewalk or paved shoulder is present and is minimum AASHTO requirement (like a 4 ft shoulder)
- **3** if a paved shoulder is present of adequate width when a sidewalk should be present (based on road classification & standards)
- **2** if a gravel shoulder is present of adequate width (based on road classification & standards)
- **1** if there is any sidewalk or shoulder
- **0** if none present or no data



A segment can range in score from 0 (Nothing) to 10 (Meets Standard - Good)

# PROPOSAL TO THIS COMMITTEE

## PROPOSAL

- The non-motorized community advisory committee will (after deliberation and agreement on items) propose to the county commissioners and staff that they adopt a plan to evaluate pedestrian facilities
- Items to include in that future proposal to commissioners
  - 1. Purpose
  - 2. Sample Report (using our scoring methods) with this outline:
    - Executive Summary (includes overall score for county)
    - Introduction (includes purpose)
    - Methods (includes scoring)
    - Results
      - Full county Interpreted results (map of county)
      - Few select pedestrian generators [ we need to pick ]

**ENCLOSURE [2]: NORTH KITSAP SOUND-TO-OLYMPICS (NSTO) UPDATE**

<b>North Sound to Olympics (STO) Trail Feasibility Study</b> <b>Working Group #6 Meeting</b> November 17, 3-4:30 PM Virtual (Microsoft Teams)	
Agenda Item	Summary
1. Overview	Prior to the meeting the working group was given the spreadsheet showing the Tier 1 criteria analysis for all segments. We were asked to review segments we were interested in and provide feedback to the team. The focus of the meeting was to discuss the methodology for taking the Tier 1 criteria analysis of all the segments and linking specific segments to form 2-3 alignments. The 2-3 alignments will then undergo a Tier 2 criteria analysis. David Forte stated the specific purpose is to determine an east-west connection between Kingston and Port Gamble with connections to Poulsbo.
2. Review of Draft Tier 1 Criteria Spreadsheet for All Segments	Jeff Bouma (Fischer Bouma Partnership) provided an overview of the draft Tier 1 criteria qualitative analysis spreadsheet for all segments. As was done with the first 10 sample segments, the ratings for all segments were established initially by the consultant with expertise related to the category, then, the other members of the consulting team and county personnel weighed in to determine the rating depicted in the spreadsheet.
3. Discussion of Methodology for Identifying Segments to Form 2-3 Alternative Routes	<p>David Forte stated the two primary policy needs are addressed in Criteria 1.1 and Criteria 1.2 referring to those as a starting point for identifying route segments. Jeff explained Criteria 1.1 and 1.2 would be used as a filter to identify segments with a higher value for those two criteria. Next, Criteria 4.2 would be used to filter segments that had a slope below 8%. All other criteria would also be considered, starting with environmental criteria. At this point in time, the methodology to be used is under review. The working group and team are continuing to discuss different scenarios for using the Tier 1 criteria analysis data to identify segments that will be linked to form the 2-3 alternative routes.</p> <p>The consultant team presented a view of the project map area showing all segments that remained after applying the filter using Criteria 1.1 and 1.2. Subsequently, the map was shown after applying the filter for Criteria 4.2. The following summarizes some of the discussion topics regarding the methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are we favoring an alternative with less environmental impact, but still meets the project objective? Response: Environmental criteria will meet project goals in a practicable manner at the same scale as cost and user experience.</li> <li>- Are we weighting Criteria 1.1 and 1.2 to narrow the number of segments? Response: Criteria 1.1 and 1.2 best address the policy needs of connection between communities, connections between/within parks and open space, and accessibility.</li> <li>- There is a challenge in comparing segments of significantly different distances.</li> <li>- Are we looking for opportunities to enhance what's there (referring to restoration opportunities)? Response: Yes, both Criteria 2.5 and 2.6 address enhancement and restoration.</li> <li>- Will the entire route be a Shared Use Path or will other types of pathways be considered? Response: Route will be a Shared Use Path.</li> <li>- How will deed restrictions be addressed in the criteria? Response: Criteria 5.2 addresses ROW. Parks department is currently working on this topic concerning North Kitsap Heritage Park.</li> <li>- Think beyond ADA requirements. Screen for universal design, what's best for all versus one group.</li> </ul>
4. Next Steps	Next steps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working group will provide feedback to the team regarding the Tier 1</li> <li>- Working Group and team will meet virtually on December 13 @ 3PM.</li> <li>- The 2-3 alternative routes will need to be decided in order to be ready for the second public meeting in January. (No date yet)</li> </ul>

Meeting summary written by Deborah Weinmann December 1, 2022.



## ENCLOSURE [2]: NORTH KITSAP SOUND-TO-OLYMPICS (NSTO) UPDATE

<b>North Sound to Olympics (STO) Trail Feasibility Study</b> <b>Working Group #7 Meeting</b> December 13, 3-4:30 PM Virtual (Microsoft Teams)	
Agenda Item	Summary
1. Overview	Prior to the meeting the working group was provided multiple DRAFT layer maps depicting various data from the Tier 1 criteria analysis for all five categories. The maps would be used in the discussion at the meeting. The focus of the meeting was two-fold. First, discuss the process for filtering and mapping segments to identify alignments consisting of the most suitable segments. Second, discuss potential alignments for Tier 2 analysis. Though there were extensive discussions about identifying the most suitable segments, we did not have time to dive into discussions about specific route alignments.
2. Review of methodology used to identify alignments using the most suitable segments.	Jeff Bouma (Fischer Bouma Partnership) provided an overview of how the team decided to map the Tier 1 criteria. It was stated not all criteria would be mapped. The draft maps shown were based on the criteria ratings by category derived from the Tier 1 qualitative analysis data.
3. Discussion of DRAFT layer maps depicting segment criteria ratings for five categories.	The strategy explained was to find alignments across three general map sections identified as follows: WEST-Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park to Miller Bay Road, CENTRAL-Miller Bay Road to Norman Road, EAST-Norman Road to Kingston. The DRAFT layer maps were shown to the working group by section for each category of criteria. Working group members were given an opportunity to ask questions about specific segment ratings and the team responded with detailed information. Questions arose about the following topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-ratings for long distance segments with varying characteristics</li> <li>-use of segments unable to meet ADA requirements</li> <li>-environmental classifications, regulations, and permitting</li> <li>-environmental mitigation, and environmental restoration</li> <li>-purpose of prior North Kitsap Heritage Park land purchases and related segment ratings for Criteria 5.2</li> <li>-ROW issues and their impact on ratings</li> </ul> Ultimately, the team is aiming to identify two routes across each general section (West, Central, and East) forming 2-3 alignments, as well as one “all road” alignment.
4. Next Steps	Next steps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using the approach discussed at the meeting, the working group members were asked to submit to the team several alternative routes for potential Tier 2 analysis by December 19.</li> <li>- The working group will meet in early January to review and discuss the alternative routes to be presented at the upcoming January public meeting. And, it was stated, the second public meeting will have the same format as the first Public Meeting.</li> <li>- New information will be posted on the NSTO website prior to the January public meeting for community members to review including the Tier 1 criteria data spreadsheet and maps of criteria ratings by segment.</li> <li>- Public Meeting #2 Tuesday, January 24 at the Village Green Community Center in Kingston. Meeting invitation forthcoming.</li> </ul>

Meeting summary written by Deborah Weinmann December 29, 2022.