

## Kitsap County Draft Non-Motorized Plan Public Comments with Responses

No.	Commenter	Comments or Original text from the Draft Plan.	Responses
1.	Mayor Poulsbo	Route into Poulsbo from south should remain on Fjord Drive and Front street (not on highway 305)	Change will be proposed.
2.	Mayor Poulsbo	Poulsbo is working on some tough connections extending our waterfront trail from downtown with a paved shared use path to Fish Park, and developing bike/pedestrian connections across Bond1305 toward Big Valley. Given the unknowns about the final routes for projects it is best to show these areas as a "variable route segment". (The circle indicating a variable route segment area should include the waterfront trail north of downtown east to Liberty Rd and north across 305/Bond road)	Change will be proposed.
3.	Mayor Poulsbo	It is important to show the E-W connection across Poulsbo, please show in area near Lindvig Road.	This route is outside the scope of the unincorporated plan as it is within the City of Poulsbo. The City is currently developing a preferred trails map for their jurisdiction.
4.	Mayor Poulsbo	The steep uphill route west should be shown through Stendahl Ridge--we can't fit a full bike lane on the lower segment of Finn Hill road. The downhill route can remain shown on Finn Hill but will be integrated w/ traffic at the bottom of the hill.	This route is outside the scope of the unincorporated plan as it is within the City of Poulsbo. The City is currently developing a preferred trails map for their jurisdiction.
5.	Mayor Poulsbo	Poulsbo prefers the route south to Silverdale be considered along Clear Creek Road, to link to Bangor base & Olympic College. A shoulder route on Clear Creek partially exists and is less duplicative of the existing direct but high traffic route on Viking/Silverdale way. This could be developed as shoulders or a shared paved path adjacent to Clear Creek road.	Change will be proposed.

6.	Mayor Poulso	The current map appears to bypass Silverdale. A well thought out safe bike link into Silverdale from multiple directions is essential. Silverdale Way has such complex traffic patterns that it would be best to avoid placing bikes on that road in town. We would encourage exploring options to utilize the Clear Creek trail corridor.	The regional route does connect to Silverdale via the Clear Creek Trail from the north and Anderson Hill Road from the south.
7.	Mayor Poulso	The County adopted North Kitsap Trails Plan shows the Sound to Olympics Trail reaching from the Bainbridge and Kingston ferries to connect to and through north Kitsap communities including Poulso. Although Poulso's ability to accommodate a continuous shared use path is not resolved at this time, the city is currently embarked on planning a route for that regional shared use path north from our downtown waterfront and has plans to focus on providing a similar connection across 305 and Bond Road to connect to the Edward rose project and Big Valley Road. It is best to show the Sound to Olympics Trail as a proposed shared use path at this time.	Change will be proposed.

8.	Demi Allen	<p>I am writing to provide some comments on the Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facilities Plan, specifically as it relates to Bainbridge Island. My comments focus on the designated "safety focus areas" on Bainbridge. Squeaky Wheels and the Non-Motorized Transportation Advisory Committee have identified five specific locations as top-priority areas for improving the safety of non-motorized users; these areas were prioritized by non-motorized transportation advocates as part of the "Safe Roads Initiative" on Bainbridge, due to the combination of high potential for conflict between transportation modes and the absence of adequate infrastructure for non-motorized users. The top five safety priorities include the following sections of roadway: (1) Wyatt Way from Madison to Grow Ave; (2) Miller Road from Tolo to Pederson Hill; (3) Eagle Harbor Drive from Wyatt to past Bucklin Hill; (4) Bucklin Hill Road from Blakely to Fletcher Bay; and (5) Fletcher Bay Road from New Brooklyn to High School Road. The necessary safety improvements in these areas have not yet been made.</p>	<p>The county plan recognizes and will work with city and municipal non-motorized plans. The county plan does not impose or direct actions within the incorporated boundaries of Kitsap County. These comments should be directed to the city plan.</p>
9.	Demi Allen	<p>In addition, there are critical safety issues with certain sections of SR 305 on Bainbridge that are lacking adequate shoulder. These include the section from the WSF Terminal to High School Road and from Reitan Road across the Agate Pass Bridge. The high speeds on SR 305 and the relatively large numbers of cyclists who use the route make these sections a critical area of focus for improving safety.</p>	<p>These changes will be proposed to the St. Hwy. 305 corridor.</p>

10.	Clear Creek Task Force (CCTF)	Clear Creek Task Force (CCTF) is writing to about the proposed KC “trail plan”, reference (a) with comments, concerns and a request to be included future planning efforts. The CCTF strongly supports the adoption of a county trail plan that sets policies and guidelines to facilitate and coordinate a network of trails. We endorse the goals listed in the email of September 16, reference (b) that served as a cover letter and distribution mechanism.	The Clear Creek Task Force (CCTF) is a recognized and respected volunteer organization in Central Kitsap and will be included in future planning efforts.
11.	CCTF	The draft plan and the referenced maps cover a wide scope, and perhaps inevitably when viewed by any specific group, the plan has gaps in the proposed policies and numerous errors and omissions within the community and local citations of existing facilities and plans. In general, we are disappointed that the plan is mostly focused on “facilities” for bicycles or shared use, and short changes the network of community trails. As an example, the action plan, presented under Implementation on page 70, directs project prioritization and “... competition in the TIP process with all other local transportation needs.” Although TIPS may be appropriate for road shoulders and paved trails, it does not work well for the typical Clear Creek recreational and community connector trails, or the water trails.	Additional Implementation language has been added to the plan. See page 73.
12.	CCTF	We are also concerned by the proposed requirement for formal maintenance agreements for all trails. In our opinion, the County is ultimately responsible for, and liable for, the maintenance and condition of facilities on county land and right-of-ways. Perhaps a maintenance plan is a sufficient and more appropriate means to assure planning and funding for trail and bicycle route maintenance.	Regional off-road facilities transect multiple jurisdictions, agencies, Cities and Counties; many composed of easements, public ROW, and Air rights. The inherent complexity and the limited County resources to maintain constructed facilities necessitates having agreements in place. This will help provide certainty to the public of the longevity of any specific set of improvements.

13.	CCTF	To be specific about the Clear Creek Community Trail Facilities, (existing and planned) as designated with a link to Clear Creek Trail map, we hope to have the opportunity to work with the KC Special Projects staff to include our plans for trails connecting the Ridgetop community with Silverdale and expansion to the trail network near Harrison Hospital. We can also provide the “ground truth” corrections to the county maps of the existing community connector and recreational trails that extend from Old Town Silverdale, through the Silverdale Hotel district, along both sides of Clear Creek, wind through Schold Farm up to the Trigger Avenue access to SubBase Bangor.	Most existing community trails have been included in the Plan. Proposed trails will be added to the local facility maps as they are developed.
14.	CCTF	We see two options for the BOCC: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hold the draft for further review and edits to resolve discrepancies and community issues, or</li> <li>2. Approve a basic plan which must include an ongoing process to provide timely updates and corrections. Perhaps elements the TIPs (Transportation Improvement Plan) plan that are plan time line focus. The comments are confined to the applicant’s offsite mitigation proposal for creation of wetlands on a portion of the Schold Farm, a Kitsap County Open Space.</li> </ol>	The Plan includes an implementation section for further steps towards prioritization and construction.
15.	North Kitsap Trails Association (NKTA)	We do appreciate the opportunity to comment now, and would like to be involved as trail plan is developed. Our goal is to provide timely and constructive input based on our local knowledge and experience to make this plan successful and enduring document to guide our community.	The NKTA’s participation is greatly appreciated.

16.	NKTA	<p><b><u>Trail Plan Ten Essentials:</u></b></p> <p>1. Adopt a plan with clear, comprehensive routes and adopt a process to complete an Implementation Plan with prioritized routes and phased priorities within those routes.</p>	Changes will be proposed.
17.	NKTA	<p>7. Allocate transportation funding effectively to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a regional non-motorized spine connecting population centers.</li> <li>• Support safe routes to schools in populated areas.</li> <li>• Implement high priority sections of the Mosquito Fleet Trail Plan. (Note: many sections of the MFT, such as Port Orchard to Southworth and Keyport to Manette, are also preferred regional routes.)</li> </ul>	Changes will be proposed.
18.	NKTA	<p>This trail plan seeks to address the needs of all user groups. The goal is to increase use by providing facilities for a wide range of users on trails of all types, including walking and bicycling for active (non-motorized) transportation. Previous Kitsap County active transportation plans have had many high priority projects which, combined with a policy of building "opportunity projects," have not produced continuous routes. Active transportation routes must be continuous to be effective. Kitsap County will prioritize a spine of paved bike routes combining separated shared use paths and on-road community connector bike routes. This paved spine will connect to a much wider network of unpaved trails which can be built by volunteers at low cost, many of which will connect to the spine.</p>	<p>See page 35 first paragraph recognizing previous focus and shift to the importance of continuity of connections.</p> <p>See also page 66 the first 3 paragraphs.</p> <p>This plan sets up a process to identify, find collaborative solutions and give the "missing links" and "spot issues" a high priority for correction and implementation.</p> <p>See Goal 11 page 27, Draft matrix criteria 1, page 75, and Context Sensitive Solutions Page 69.</p>
19.	NKTA	<p>The North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan was adopted 11/28/2011 by the BOCC please clarify it remains as official adopted Kitsap policy.</p>	Clarification has been added in multiple places throughout the document. See statement page 16.

20.	NKTA	Need to establish a 2014 Implementation Plan, add reference in Executive summary; see attachment.	Language of attachment has been incorporated. See page 73.
21.	NKTA	Maps of existing shoulder conditions have substantial errors, these maps need to be corrected for entire County. NKTA submitted revisions for North Kitsap, we understand County wide maps are currently being evaluated and will be corrected.	Shoulder information mapping has been modified for North Kitsap. See revise map.  Shoulder information for Central and South Kitsap will be evaluated for accuracy.
22.	NKTA	Maps of Roadway safety focus areas have substantial errors. NKTA mapped 11 hazard areas in north Kitsap (see map and locations on pages 29 and 30). In addition the shoulders of highway 305 for about 1/2 mile south of the Agate Pass Bridge should be added.	Safety focus areas on North Kitsap have been modified to match areas in the adopted North Kitsap Trail Plan.
23.	NKTA	District maps: Sound to Olympics Trail, a regional priority route and shared use path is not shown accurately on Indianola and Kingston district maps through NK Heritage Park, or on Port Gamble map. The Hansville District map needs to show shoulders along Hansville road as a regional route. Also Clear Creek district map does not show a regional route or shared use path. This map should show a priority connection into Silverdale, even if it is indicated as "fuzzy" for now.	The community trails maps now show connections to the regional routes.  Other changes will be proposed.

24.	NKTA	Many numbered routes in the original maps are not safe for cycling use. We support staff's pending changes, clarifying existing signed bike routes, but leaving other numbered routes in as placeholders and reminders that many of these are used by cyclists. Please complete route 66 Indianola to Poulsbo by showing Port Gamble-Suquamish Road between Gunderson and Lincoln, and the completion of Lincoln into Poulsbo. Also Please leave 27 Clear Creek to Kitsap Memorial Park on this list, it is widely used as the safest cycling alternative through our County. Also, please indicate Port Gamble-Suquamish Road from Gunderson to 307--with the WSDOT traffic diversions on the highway, there is less auto traffic, making this route safer for cyclists.	This map has been modified to clearly distinguish signed bike routes versus future bike route designations which do not have complete shoulder segments of other facilities.  The other routes will be proposed.
25.	NKTA	Please add description of Sound to Olympics Trail.	Language has been added to the plan. See page 15
26.	NKTA	Insert explanatory paragraph in Executive summary clarifying array of maps and hierarchy.	Language has been added to the plan. See page 4
27.	NKTA	Consider putting time sensitive material into appendix, instead of body of plan. Table of contents would be helpful	Table of contents will be added after comment period and changes to content and organization.
28.	NKTA	Mosquito Fleet Trail: the ideas of trails did not "catch fire" in NK because of MFT, it was "String of Pearls idea and fear of losing Port Gamble land and trails. Photo of OPG meeting and statement from page 9 needs to be moved to NK String of Pearls paragraph on pg. 14	Changes and clarification has been made. See page 15
29.	NKTA	Funding priorities: The Draft scoring matrix from page 71 needs additional analysis. It should be removed from the current document and be refined with input from the community during the Implementation Plan process.	The matrix is a tool for future decision making. Will restructure the section to provide greater detail.



30.	NKTA	Correct the plan to assure consistency with the statements on page 43, "Facilities should avoid high traffic arterials and state highways unless no other feasible direct connection exists" and pg. 61 highway conditions for bicycling "are often marginal or inadequate for rider comfort and safety". Pages 27, 28 and maps should be made consistent with that statement.	Regional routes avoid high traffic areas such as state highways.
31.	NKTA	Standards: Non-motorized facility standards should be clarified to allow flexible standards as suggested in July 18, 2013 joint letter from the bicycle community. 6-8' bike shoulders page 47--there are some conditions that justify exceeding the AASHTO standards of 4' but this needs to be carefully evaluated. 42" high Barriers for a bike path if adjacent speed exceeds 35, seems excessive. (pg. 48) Don't understand statement on page 49 that all bridges should have 6' bike lanes + 2-3' graded areas?	<p>The ability for a local jurisdiction to modify standards for facilities funded by state and federal dollars is limited. Entities such as the County Road Administration Board (CRAB board) and Departments of Transportation may be lobbied for project specific exceptions.</p> <p>Further lobbying of these agencies may lead to further flexibility at the state and federal level.</p> <p>Class I, II. And III trails are subject to the unified standards of all federal land agencies. These references are indicated in the classification chart (pg. 53)</p>
32.	NKTA	Clarify the import of allowing trail standards to be built by volunteers and evolve over time (see pg. 110 NKTA plan).	<p>This plan has several trail classes that can and are built by volunteers. These will evolve over time. The continuing challenge will be realizing this goal in agency owned land that does currently not allow deviation from current standards.</p> <p>The concept of phased construction is discussed in the implementation section, but ultimately will be determined by the entity owning the facility segment.</p>

33.	NKTA	Not all trails are required to meet the low grades of handicap accessibility. Change pg. 37 of proposed County Plan to be consistent with adopted NKTA plan pages 118-119 addressing ADA accessibility. A statement should be added clarifying that many volunteer built and recreational trails will not be able to be handicap accessible, though some should.	<p>ADA accessibility is a goal of the Plan. It should be accommodated to the best extent possible. The Plan contains specific exceptions to this goal which includes topographic obstacles.</p> <p>The plan also focuses this standards on on-road and shared use paths and not on lower order community or neighborhood trails.</p>
34.	NKTA	Goal 15 pg. 16 why say commute routes are on road and recreational routes are off road? Are we really planning to build two systems?	Goal has been modified.
35.	NKTA	Goal 16 T-68 pg. 16, emphasize import of public access to road ends for water trails. Goal 17 T-71 add that public access to shoreline should be signed from both land and water. On pg. 26 goal 10, add bullet about public access and signage at waterfront road ends.	This language will be modified to strengthen public recognition of accessible public lands from along the waterfront.
36.	NKTA	How to require/encourage/incent developers build trails at time of development?	Kitsap County Code Chapters 16, 17, 19, and 22 are applicable to code development to promote trail development.
37.	NKTA	KRCC Looking for Linkage decision was to "refine" MFT, this was the consensus of all county wide staff and user groups in that effort. Adopted County policy (NKTA Plan) states "refining" mosquito Fleet Trail. Pg. 14, item 7b.	The Mosquito Fleet Trail will need to be addressed through Context Sensitive Solutions to better determine the type of facility that best meets the topography and constraints of specific segments. A similar process should be conducted for all facilities located in County plans as they move from planning to project construction.

38.	NKTA	Pg. 26, goal 12 add develop locally adopted standards.	<p>The ability for a local jurisdiction to modify standards for facilities funded by state and federal dollars is limited. Entities such as the County Road Administration Board (CRAB board) and Departments of Transportation may be lobbied for project specific exceptions.</p> <p>Further lobbying of these agencies may lead to further flexibility at the state and federal level.</p> <p>Class I, II. And III trails are subject to the unified standards of all federal land agencies. These references are indicated in the classification chart (pg. 53)</p>
39.	NKTA	Pg. 28 passenger only ferry Bremerton to Seattle?	Will be noted.
40.	NKTA	Pg. 2 bullet 2, change paddle boaters to paddlers	Change will be proposed.
41.	NKTA	Pg. 77, July 9 Plan accuracy review should be replaced with regional route map review. NKTA did not see Plan until 9/17.	Acknowledged. Change will be proposed.
42.	NKTA	Add reference to Washington Water Trails and need for overnight sites, and goal of Kitsap Water Trail Alliance, to water trails section. Eliminate mention of float tubing (pg. 53), include other non-motorized craft in discussion.	Change will be proposed.
43.	NKTA	Verify that Water Trails Map is the most current & higher quality graphic. Should list of water trail sites be included or in appendix?	The map was provided by others. The county will use a more current, higher resolution version as it is provided.
44.	NKTA	Consider adding more information to the water trail section from the NK String of Pearls Trail Plan, changing the references to Kitsap County:	This shall be discussed and implemented through further discussions with stakeholders for water trails.

45.	NKTA	<p><b>Kitsap Water Trail Plan</b></p> <p>The plan is a guide to water trail implementation for the agencies, organizations and volunteers that will develop and manage water trail access points and programs. Recommended policies and procedures in the plan define how the water trail will take shape over time. The initial stage of the plan is adoption by Kitsap County, followed by additional stages of development as other property owners join the plan.</p> <p>The plan establishes a water trail backbone of existing and planned access points for non-motorized small boats that are intended as launches, open to the public, and do not have conditions that would prevent inclusion in the water trail. A subset of these are designated as Phase One projects and are high opportunity sites that require minimal planning, management changes and improvements (i.e. signage) on which initial implementation should be focused.</p>	This shall be discussed and implemented through further discussions with stakeholders for water trails.
46.	NKTA	Target water trail user groups are boaters in paddle and small sail craft, such as kayaks, canoes, rowing shells, dragon boats, tribal canoes, rowboats, paddleboards, windsurfers, and more.	This shall be discussed and implemented through further discussions with stakeholders for water trails.

47.	NKTA	<p><b>Issues and Needs</b></p> <p>Implementing a water trail on Puget Sound addresses a range of issues and needs. Non-motorized small boating access is often limited by lack of signage or community knowledge of sites, launch design, availability of parking and other launch site facilities (e.g., restrooms). For multi-point trips, water trail users need access points that are near to each other. Multi-day trips require overnight accommodations at trail heads. Additional access issues are launch site safety and security, user conflicts, and accessibility for persons with disabilities.</p> <p>The potential for many more boaters using the water trail necessitates care to protect wildlife and habitat resources. Primary concerns are disturbances of harbor seals, birds, special status species or damage to sensitive shoreline habitats. Appropriate location and management of trail heads, signage and establishment of good trail behavior and boating practices through a water trail education program are essential tools for protecting these resources. Challenging conditions on Puget Sound can create personal safety and navigational safety and security problems for water trail users who may lack boating skills and familiarity with its unique conditions. Safe boating requires good boating skills; knowledge of Puget Sound conditions, navigational safety and security rules; and good planning for each trip.</p> <p>Implementation of a comprehensive education, outreach and stewardship program is essential for a successful water trail. Primary tasks for the trail are to coordinate among existing outreach and education programs; to develop and promote consistent trail-related messages throughout the Puget Sound; to fill in educational programming gaps, such as targeting new users and tourists; and to provide trail-related guidance.</p>	<p>This shall be discussed and implemented through further discussions with stakeholders for water trails.</p>
-----	------	--	--

48.	NKTA	<p>After Tuesday’s meeting it dawned on me that I had been misinterpreting the use of the term “preferred route”. To me it implies a priority. Rather than connoting “priority”, it is probably meant to mean the “selected routing option” for a particular corridor. As an example, there are several ways to get from Poulsbo to Port Gamble: Hwy 3, Bond Road &amp; Hwy 104, Big Valley Road &amp; Pope lands, etc. When deciding on the route for a regional trail it is necessary to select one option as the shared use regional trail. The other routes will still exist and compete for funding on their merit, but not as part of the regional trail. It is necessary to establish routing for the regional trail to prevent communities or organizations from working in locations that will not work together.</p>	The term regional routes will be used.
49.	NKTA	<p>That said, I think my comment Tuesday still apply. The term “preferred” might be explained better, but would still have a priority connotation. If it is made clear that routing for the regional trail was selected as the best option, the document can thereafter simply cited the term “regional route” without preceding it with the term “preferred”. In places where that would cause confusion different words or phrases should be used to show that the selected regional route was considered the best option. Possibilities include, but are not limited to: selected trail option, identified option, chosen regional route. I continue to believe that priority should be removed in regard to trail possibilities since priorities are yet to be determined. There will be priority regional segments, priority on-road locations, and priority local paths. Whether funding should go towards a regional segment on an on-road segment should be determined by the implementation process and not biased by wording in the non-motorized facilities plan.</p>	The term regional routes will be used.

50.	Rick Fenney	The SR 160 Sedgwick rode has the wrong weak links lists (i.e., Poulsbo & Hood Canal Bridge). They were obviously cloned and not updated. Sorry should have caught this. Needs fixed post comment period because its data is wrong. Maybe revise to: This route includes deficient roadway segments predominantly in areas east of Port Orchard towards the Southworth/Vashon/Alki Ferry run.	This change will be proposed to correct the language.
51.	Central Kitsap Community Council	Make sure that there are public restrooms along the Regional Trail Routes.	Efforts will be made to identify commercial and public facilities on public plans when the trails are developed and functional.
52.	Kingston Citizens Advisory Committee (KCAC)	It is not clear how current plans relate to this plan. Duplication creates ambiguity on areas of trail plans and policies. Where overlap exists the plan should defer to the UGA and Regional Trails plans already approved by the BCC.	Further clarification has been added to the document. It is stated on page 16. “Local Community and Parks Plans Non-motorized facility needs have also been addressed through multiple community sub-area plans throughout Kitsap. These have included adopted plans for Kingston, Suquamish, Manchester, Keyport and Hansville. Other facilities are planned for heritage parks in North, Central and South Kitsap as well as other smaller community parks. These plans are key reference documents in the development of non-motorized facilities and smaller community trails in these communities.”
53.	KCAC	Where community participation appears, the plan should identify the role of the County BCC approved Community Advisory Councils (CACs) as community representatives.	Community plans will have a credit to the CACs responsible.

54.	KCAC	<p>The draft document presents numerous maps that attempt to show both a common vision for the future – both regional and local-and to provide an inventory of current routes, trails, and facilities. Trying to reconcile all of these maps to the draft plan and proposed policies was very confusing. This can be rectified by having the plan focus on the county wide, long term policies vision and the major on-road and county connector routes. Maps would then be referenced as a separate independent document or placed into an appendix, but structured for easy and frequent updating. Specifically, the 8 individual community maps, Roadway safety maps, Roadway Shoulder Quality maps, 12 district maps, and the water trails map. These require updates and corrections and should be cited by reference, rather than be an inclusion in the policy document to be approved by the BOCC.</p>	<p>The maps have been included as links to a site on the Special Projects Page on the Kitsap County Web Site. This is done to easily allow updates should they be necessary.</p>
55.	KCAC	<p>Implementation needs detail on public participation and community organization participation in the prioritization, funding and implementation of projects.</p>	<p>The implementation chapter has been expanded to address this concern. See page 73 in 10/17/13 revision.</p>
56.	KCAC	<p>Material of a time sensitive nature or related to project details should be either put into an appendix or referenced (see comments #5 below). The plan should serve as a policy document where details, such as maps identify safety issues, road shoulder issues, and potential right-of-way problems are independently maintained. The plan itself should show policy information such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where trails from point A to B are needed/desired,</li> <li>- The type or general purpose of the trails (shared use, connector, etc.),</li> <li>- The general construction requirements,</li> <li>- Method of determining priorities</li> </ul>	<p>The maps have been included as links to a site on the Special Projects Page on the Kitsap County Web Site. This is done to easily allow updates should they be necessary.</p>



57.	KCAC	<p>There needs to be more emphasis on users other than bicycles.</p> <p>The executive summary says the plan needs to address the needs multiple user groups (commuters, recreational bicyclists, pedestrians, equestrian, tourism, boaters, etc.), but the plan seems to give priority to recreational bicycle riders. Pedestrian and water trails, for example, receive little coverage. For example, no trail is shown to Arness Park on the local maps.</p>	<p>Local maps will be corrected and updated as appropriate.</p> <p>Water trails section will be expanded to include mention of state and national recognition. Scheduled discussions with stakeholders will establish the extent and language for the plan.</p> <p>Pedestrians and other users in our rural areas also rely on road shoulders. The improvements for bicycle facilities will also benefit most other users.</p> <p>The plan focuses on regional routes likely funded through public dollars. Community, soft surface trails are left at the discretion of local communities as shown in multiple sub-area plans.</p> <p>This plan did not address sidewalks as the inventory and documentation is often inadequate or inconsistent.</p>
58.	KCAC	<p>Eliminate the term “preferred route.” This term is based on an assumption as to why particular route are used, which has yet to be established.</p>	<p>The term “Regional” will be used in place of “preferred” or “priority”.</p>
59.	KCAC	<p>Due to limited time for review similar examples have not been included for other comments. The Kingston Parks, Trails and Open Space sub-committee of the KCAC is available for this level of collaborative review and considers this important to the Plan adoption.</p>	<p>Staff will continue to work with Stakeholders in Kingston and elsewhere to clarify and refine any maps to improve consistency with other local documents.</p>
60.	Molly Lee	<p>There is a parcel west of Highway 3, just south of Poulsbo that the DNR is proposing to transfer. The County should acquire this parcel which is in the Johnson Creek Watershed. I would appreciate you noting this area, including this parcel, that would be well suited to a north south trail instead of following highway 3 on the east side.</p>	<p>The parcel is noted and is being evaluated. The value of the parcel in the regional north south trail will be examined as a potential route. The property is critical area constrained and continuity of the trail with private property to south to Silverdale must be assessed.</p>
61.	Rick Feeney	<p>New stormwater standards have drastically affected the ability for jurisdictions to provide adequate non-motorized facilities (widened shoulders). It has escalated the costs to a point where fewer improvements will be able to be made.</p>	<p>Point noted. A portion of the plan discusses this obstacle.</p>

62.	Chico Creek Task Force	Supports the shared use path on through the Kitsap Lake area. However, they propose an additional route on the east side of the railroad tracks that connects West Kitsap Lake Road with West Belfair Valley Road through the Bremerton Watershed.	While there will be constraints from the built environment along West Kitsap Lake Road, the Plan will show it as an alternate route due to the existing logging road system to the south of Kitsap Lake.
63.	Chico Creek Task Force	You left out the Chico Creek Task Force from the Advisory Committee. I guarantee you we are a lot more active than other groups in Central Kitsap. We need to be included.	<p>There is no portion of the draft plan that formally creates a citizens advisory committee including or excluding any specific group. From public comment received on the Plan, it was requested that the Plan discuss the size and potential membership of such a committee and thus staff proposed the following language:</p> <p>PG. 74-75 It will be important to have broad representation on the committee, but also to keep it to a size reasonable for efficient decision-making. The NMCAC should consist of between 12-15 members and could include stakeholder groups such as, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Kitsap Trails Association</li> <li>• Clear Creek Task Force</li> <li>• Heritage Park stewardship committees</li> <li>• Central Kitsap Community Council</li> <li>• Other park stewardship groups</li> <li>• Members of the community citizen advisory groups (Manchester, Suquamish and Kingston)</li> </ul> <p>The list is not all inclusive nor does it guarantee representation of the listed members.</p> <p>The Board of Commissioners has yet to adopt the Plan and any concept of a CAC (due in December). If approved, the Board would then set up any CAC through a separate public process in 2014. I would expect the Chico Creek Task Force to apply to be on such a committee for consideration by the Board at that time.</p>

