NORTH SOUND TO OLYMPICS (NSTO) TRAIL PLANNING STUDY

KITSAP COUNTY

OPEN HOUSE #2 - JANUARY 24, 2023
Why are we here?
Goals of this meeting:

- To review the current NSTO trail planning process to date (Tier 1 analysis)
- To present the result of Tier 1:
  - 3 trail potential NSTO trail alignments between Kingston and Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park that will be studied in more detail (Tier 2 Analysis)
INTRODUCTION

Consultant Team

Parametrix, Inc. (Project Management, Engineering)
- Jennifer Dvorak

Fischer Bouma Partnership (Trail Planning, Outreach)
- Jeff Bouma

Struck Environmental (Environmental)
- Phil Struck

Support firms:
HWA (Geotech)
Aqua Terra Cultural Resource Consultants (Cultural)
SCE (Survey)
INTRODUCTION

Working Group

KC Parks Advisory Board – Grady Martin
NKHP Stewardship Committee – Jay Zischke
Accessibility/Disability Group – Marsha Cutting
Kitsap County Parks Department – Aaron Nix
Rayonier (OPG) – Linda Berry-Maraist
Great Peninsula Conservancy – Adrian Wolf
North Kitsap Trails Association (NKTA) – Don Willott
KC Non-motorized Committee – Deborah Weinmann
Advancing the STO: Community Planning
Purpose & Need of the Study:

- Connecting communities, parks, and open spaces with a shared-use path
What is a "shared-use path?"
INTRODUCTION

What is a "shared-use path?"
INTRODUCTION

Project Schedule (revised)

Tier 1
Screening
Short Segments

Data Collection

Tier 2
Screening
Full Alignments

- Public Meeting #1
  June 21, 2022

- Public Meeting #2
  January 24, 2023

- Public Meeting #3
  TBD

Month:
Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May June Jul Aug
Review of Public Meeting #1:

- Planning History and Project Context
- Introduced the Planning Process
- Preliminary Trail Segments (~60)
- Evaluation Criteria
TIER 1 ANALYSIS

Study Area

PGFHP

WEST ZONE

CENTRAL ZONE

EAST ZONE

NKHP PARKING

KINGSTON
TIER 1 ANALYSIS

Data Collection & Field Study
Evaluation Criteria:

• Identified 17 criteria to rate each segment
• Organized those into (5) categories:
  o Provides access to communities, parks, & open spaces (4)
  o Environmental (6)
  o Safety, health, & function (2)
  o User experience (3)
  o Project delivery (2)
• For each criteria, determined the rating metrics (what constitutes a rating of low/medium/high impacts or positive/moderate/negative outcomes)
Screening of Segments:

Criteria Category #1 Example:
- Description
- Metrics for ratings
- Basis of Rating
### Criteria Category #1 Example:

- **Actual ratings (only 15 of 60 segments shown below)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
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<th></th>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Legend:**
- **A2:** Actual rating 2
- **A5:** Actual rating 5
- **A4:** Actual rating 4
- **A6:** Actual rating 6
- **A7:** Actual rating 7
- **A8:** Actual rating 8
- **A9:** Actual rating 9
- **A10:** Actual rating 10
- **A11:** Actual rating 11
- **A12:** Actual rating 12
- **A13:** Actual rating 13
- **A14:** Actual rating 14
- **A15:** Actual rating 15
- **A16:** Actual rating 16
- **A17:** Actual rating 17
- **A18:** Actual rating 18
- **A19:** Actual rating 19
- **A20:** Actual rating 20
- **A21:** Actual rating 21
- **A22:** Actual rating 22
- **A23:** Actual rating 23
- **A24:** Actual rating 24
- **A25:** Actual rating 25
- **A26:** Actual rating 26
- **A27:** Actual rating 27
- **A28:** Actual rating 28
- **A29:** Actual rating 29
- **A30:** Actual rating 30
- **A31:** Actual rating 31
- **A32:** Actual rating 32
- **A33:** Actual rating 33
- **A34:** Actual rating 34
- **A35:** Actual rating 35
- **A36:** Actual rating 36
- **A37:** Actual rating 37
- **A38:** Actual rating 38
- **A39:** Actual rating 39
- **A40:** Actual rating 40
- **A41:** Actual rating 41
- **A42:** Actual rating 42
- **A43:** Actual rating 43
- **A44:** Actual rating 44
- **A45:** Actual rating 45
- **A46:** Actual rating 46
- **A47:** Actual rating 47
- **A48:** Actual rating 48
- **A49:** Actual rating 49
- **A50:** Actual rating 50
- **A51:** Actual rating 51
- **A52:** Actual rating 52
- **A53:** Actual rating 53
- **A54:** Actual rating 54
- **A55:** Actual rating 55
- **A56:** Actual rating 56
- **A57:** Actual rating 57
- **A58:** Actual rating 58
- **A59:** Actual rating 59
- **A60:** Actual rating 60

---

**Notes:**
- Specific criteria for each trail segment are indicated in the TI Ratings column.
- The ratings range from 1 to 6, with 6 being the highest.
- Actual ratings are shown for segments A2 to A42, with only 15 segments displayed for this example.
TIER 1 ANALYSIS

Criteria Category #1 - Connections

Criteria Category #2 - Environmental

Criteria Category #3 - Safety
### TIER 1 ANALYSIS

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
<th>Column 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
<td>Data 11</td>
<td>Data 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 13</td>
<td>Data 14</td>
<td>Data 15</td>
<td>Data 16</td>
<td>Data 17</td>
<td>Data 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Maps

- Map 1
- Map 2
- Map 3
- Map 4
- Map 5
- Map 6
TIER 1 ANALYSIS

Evaluation Criteria: Category #1 - Connecting Communities, Parks, & Open Spaces

- Access to communities
- Access to parks and open spaces
- Consistency with adopted County plans, policies and requirements
- Places of interest
Criteria 1.1+1.2: Provides Access to Communities, Parks, & Open Spaces
Evaluation Criteria: Category #2 - Environmental

- Habitat connectivity and fragmentation
- Wetland impacts
- Wetland buffer impacts
- Stream impacts
- Stream buffer impacts
- Restoration potential
  - Fish passage barriers,
  - Invasive vegetation, etc.
Why were these environmental criteria selected and how was the assessment done?

• Criteria reflect regulatory standards for critical area protection (County, state, federal)

• Evaluation used existing mapping (KC Parks, prior studies/inventories), supplemented with on-site assessments

• Tier 1 ratings reflect both impact *quantity* (e.g., approx. feet of path) and *quality* of resource affected (e.g., wetland category, stream type, buffer condition, etc.)
How is the environmental assessment being applied in the overall evaluation of alternatives?

- Environmental criteria not weighted more or less than other criteria in Tier 1
- Consideration of Project Purpose and objective is central to environmental analysis
- All routes/alternatives have impacts & require mitigation
- County, State, and Federal laws require projects avoid and minimize environmental impacts for *practicable and reasonable alternatives*

**Practicable Alternative:**
*Available and capable of being done after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes.*
*Source: 40 CFR 230.10 (CWA)*

**Reasonable Alternative:**
*Feasibly attain or approximate a proposal’s objectives, but at a lower level of environmental degradation.*
*Source: SEPA Rules*
## TIER 1 ANALYSIS

### Criteria 2.1-2.6: Environmental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Tier 1 Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Environmental Resources</td>
<td>Estimated level to which segment results in additional fragmentation or habitat that provides travel corridors and occupancy for a variety of species at regional and watershed scale. See wetland and wetland buffer criteria for impacts to wildlife or site level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Regional wildlife habitat connectivity and corridors</td>
<td>Estimated segment impact to wetlands relative to crossing length, determining estimated wetland category, path type (existing or new), and mitigation sequencing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>Estimated potential impacts to wetland buffers relative to stream type, fish use and crossing type (existing or new).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Wetland buffers</td>
<td>Estimated potential impact to stream buffer relative to stream type, fish use and crossing type (existing or new), and requirements of Kitsap County Critical Areas Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Streams</td>
<td>Estimated potential impact to stream buffer relative to stream type, fish use and crossing type (existing or new), and requirements of Kitsap County Critical Areas Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Stream buffers</td>
<td>Estimated potential on-site opportunity to restore or enhance degraded/disturbed wetland, stream or buffer as part of path construction through removal/modification of existing hydrological routes, culverts and revegetation of cleared degraded areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lower Impact

### Higher Impact
Evaluation Criteria: Category #3 – Safety, Health, & Function

- User safety and health
- User-vehicle conflicts at driveways
- User-vehicle conflicts at roadways
## Criteria 3.1-3.2: Safety, Health, & Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Tier 1 Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Safety, Health, &amp; Function</td>
<td>Level to which segment provides a safe and healthy experience for users based on location (roadside versus open space), including consideration of health impacts related to poor air quality near high volume roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>User safety and health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>User-Vehicle conflicts at driveways</td>
<td>Potential for user-vehicle conflicts based on driveway/path crossings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Draft Trail Segments Filtering - Safety, health, and function (Criteria 3 Average) (Project Team)_

- **3**
- **2.5**
- **2**
- **1.5**
- **1**
- **Not scored**

*Legend:*
- **3**
- **2.5**
- **2**
- **1.5**
- **1**
- **Not scored**
Evaluation Criteria: Category #4 – User Experience

- Low stress path design
- Meeting ADA criteria in the built condition
- Quality of outdoor experience
Criteria 4.2: Accessibility
Criteria 4.1 & 4.3: User Experience

- **4.1 Low stress path design**: Level to which segment provides a low stress/enjoyable experience for "all ages and abilities" based on topography (steep versus flat).
- **4.3 Quality of outdoor experience**: Supports an outdoor, quiet/serene, natural experience based on the character of the environment the segment is located in.
Evaluation Criteria: Category #5 – Project Delivery

- Design/construction & mitigation/restoration costs
- Rights of Way/easements
Criteria 5.2: Right-of-Way (ROW) & Easements
North Kitsap Heritage Park (NKHP)

Recreation & Conservation Office (RCO)

• Kitsap Parks is working with RCO on the nature of any potential conditions on a share use path within the area of the Park which was partially acquired by the County utilizing a RCO grant.

• RCO conditions vary by specific grant.
Results of Screening & Mapping: What Patterns Emerge?
TIER 1 ANALYSIS

Combining the Maps – Optimal Segments
Combining the Maps – Optimal Segments
Combining the Maps – Identifying Alignments & “Gaps”
ALTERNATIVES FOR TIER 2 ANALYSIS

Determination of Alignments for Further Study:

- Reviewed criteria table & maps
- Focused on connections
- Discussed options & alternative routes with Working Group members
ALIGNMENTS FOR TIER 2 ANALYSIS

Alignments for Tier 2 Analysis
Alignments for Further Study: “Road Option”
Alignments for Further Study:
West Zone #1
Alignments for Further Study: West Zone #2
Alignments for Further Study: West Zone #3
Alignments for Further Study:
Central Zone #1
ALIGNMENTS FOR FURTHER STUDY:

Central Zone #2
Alignments for Further Study: Central Zone #3
ALTERNATIVES FOR TIER 2 ANALYSIS

Alignments for Further Study:
East Zone #1
ALIGNMENTS FOR FURTHER STUDY:
East Zone #2
ALIGNMENTS FOR FURTHER STUDY:

East Zone #3
ALTERNATIVES FOR TIER 2 ANALYSIS

Next Steps:

- Secondary Alignment Screening (Tier 2)
  - Detailed analysis and refinement of the 3 selected alignments
  - Apply more detailed evaluation criteria
  - Identify a “Preferred Alternative”
  - Public Open House #3
QUESTION & ANSWERS

• Staff available by boards

• For those online: questions can be submitted in the comment box or via link on website

• Written questions deposited in box at entrance

• Electronically via link on website
THANK YOU!