

Kitsap County
Non-Motorized Citizens Advisory Committee
DRAFT – January 15, 2019 Minutes

Nancy Whitaker
Chair

Brian Watson
Vice-Chair

David Brumsickle

Bert Cole

Ray Pardo

Douglas Piehl

Scott Satter

Deborah Weinmann

Present:

Bert Cole, Ray Pardo, David Brumsickle, Brian Watson, Nancy Whitaker, Doug Piehl, Debbie Weinmann. (Scott Satter was excused)

Staff Present: David Forte, Melissa Mohr

Called to order 01/15/2019, 7:04 pm by Nancy Whitaker

Introduced new members: Doug Piehl, Debbie Weinmann. Followed by introduction of new staff, Melissa Mohr.

Public Comment: No public present

Minutes were approved.

BOCC NM Committee Briefing

Whitaker: She met with Commissioner Wolfe and David Forte in the fall where she expressed concern about Committee’s mission and effectiveness, and the Committee has had some vacancies.

Forte: Public Works (PW) staff met with Commissioners in December. Forte walked through the Executive Summary report provided to the BOCC for the meeting and which was provided to the Committee by email. The report went over enabling legislation, bylaws, work program, listed accomplishments of the Committee, history, then went over some frustrations of the Committee. Whitaker added that Committee members had concerns with original PW staffing.

Forte explained that as Public Works staff, there are limitations regarding how staff may spend their time, money, etc. Committee has been very useful for identifying and prioritizing projects for plans and the TIP. At start of last year, there weren’t many PW projects that could involve the committee. There was discussion about the scope of this Committee’s staffing by Public Works. Parks has their own Citizens Advisory Committee and park stewardship committees. How do we coordinate non-motorized transportation and recreation? Where do water trails fit into this, and horses?

Whitaker: Exactly, water is generally outside of the County’s jurisdiction, and parking can be a major issue.

Forte: Another thing identified in the staff report is member’s impacts. Volunteers want to see immediate impact, but most of what we do is long-range planning. Even when something is added to the TIP it can be there waiting for 5 year, with Pardo

adding “sometimes 10 years”. Brumsickle suggested that a reminder of the time frame between submitting a TIP project and actual implementation should be discussed yearly. It is a useful reminder that this process usually takes years.

Forte discussed project delivery process and how they can impact TIP schedules and project costs. He continued with a discussion of the cyclic nature of planning and outlined the timeframes for various planning processes the Committee and PW undertake.

Committee Review

Forte set up the discussion on how can we structure this committee, given the environment? Want to make the best use of your time. He explained that some members provided written responses to the questions and those would be handed out at the end of the meeting. The comments would be compiled and would be included in an executive summary to the BOCC. Forte will meet with Parks staff prior to their retreat with their CAC in early February. PW will work with Parks on a staff recommendation which will be presented to the Commissioners. This could range from status quo, a minor tweak, or a major change. Commissioners have been very pleased with the Committee’s work over the last three years.

Whitaker: First meeting of the Committee with old staff member began by asking “would you all approve this map”. Anderson Hill was shown as a good bicycle route and Whitaker disagrees with that classification. The Committee worked long and hard to turn that into a better, more realistic product.

Cole: We need to recognize that this county will not fund the trails to the desires of the citizens, and people need to go into this understanding that. Non-motorized is funded by Public Works’ spare change.

Forte outlined the number of miles and projects in the TIP that had specific non-motorized elements that were appropriate to the situation – from very rural to urban.

Watson: Acknowledging that some projects are small and simple – just a culvert and nothing more.

Cole: As a county, do we have a significantly identified budget for parks? We really don’t, it looks like non-motorized is still just getting spare change, and with increasing costs, eventually we’re going to get nothing. Other communities have managed to find a way to dedicate funding strictly to non-motorized, and until that happens here it seems like we’re looking at constant frustration.

Pardo: Let’s write up that one point, about dedicated funding for non-motorized, and send it up to the Commissioners. Until you can do something about this, we are going to be a frustrated group, and the people we represent are going to be ill served, and we are going to be one of the most dangerous counties to be a pedestrian or bicyclist. They’ve got to dedicate un-touchable funds to this.

Whitaker: I told Commissioner Wolfe if something didn’t change, I would leave this group and form a group to pursue getting a levy to fund these types of projects.

Pardo: A percent of library, schools, anything built by a developer, a percent needs to be set aside for non-motorized. Even the Port is really embracing kayaks. I think this conversation needs to get going, and we’re the group to make that happen.

Weinmann: In looking at this plan it looks wonderful, this group looks like they know what they’re doing, they really listen to their community, they have clear goals... but the reality is this plan was written in

2013 and very little has come to fruition. Thinks shoulders are inadequate for non-motorized. People want separated paths that are safe for families. This plan begins to feel like just a piece of paper.

Pardo: I agree and disagree... I agree on needing a separate funding source for non-motorized.

Cole: Parks needs to be involved in that – getting a separate funding source.

Whitaker: I talked with Commissioner Wolfe about combining this group with the parks group, then we can have subcommittees within that which can deal with the bike map, trails, recreational, heritage parks, etc. But that still doesn't give us any funding.

Pardo: I agree that we need better coordination. But we need to get funding. And we need to set up measurables. We need to define communities (any elementary school is the center of a community, a mom & pop shop is a center...). Silverdale would have several. Then measure/grade A-F the ability to walk to the center from homes within that community. How many parks do we have that have sub-standard bike/ped access to? How many non-motorized routes are up to any kind of a "good" standard? Connections between stores within a commercial area are lacking. Mile Hill is practically the only street with adequate shoulders. Where is the problem? Where it runs into Port Orchard. Wheelchair users have to get into the travel lane. We need to get this in front of the Commissioners.

Cole: Is that model going to lead to different solutions than we've come up with?

Pardo: No, but it tells the story in a glaring way, and it would lead to a report. We could do those statistics ourselves.

Weinmann: Good point on density – start from the center and improve outward. Improving the higher-density areas will do more to improve pollution.

Piehl: I agree with beginning in areas with higher density. But I don't understand the funding... do we have any purview in funding, or organizing non-funding opportunities like volunteers and land donations?

Whitaker: All parks are maintained by volunteers.

Cole: All the projects Forte is in charge of involves paid staff.

Whitaker: The chainsaw certification that's going on tonight is for the parks volunteers.

Cole: Attacking high density first may not be the best for our community, but it certainly is rational.

Forte: After this discussion, does the group's project prioritization change? I think one thing this committee does well is messaging that connections within communities and between communities have equal value – one should not dominate the other. The other aspect is: who are we serving? While density is where it's at, what percent of the unincorporated county is in the UGA?

Pardo: Don't forget the LAMIRDs. We get nothing, except when we got a stormwater project that brought sidewalks to us. Alaska is still very dangerous, and Beach is a nightmare. That project dates back to 2008.

Whitaker: As far as where the committee should go, I like Cole's suggestion. This is a good time to explore the feasibility to come up with a list of measurables.

Watson: I think that would be redundant. I think we need to make a case to the Commissioners for non-motorized transportation. But I don't think we need to do anything more than just making a stronger case for this (NM Routes Map).

Pardo: I disagree, the communities are being lost. You have no idea which areas are being well-served. We need something that says to the Commissioners "we're doing a great job over here but a poor job over here."

Cole: We need these plans to build upon the concept of community.

Whitaker: These are bicycle routes.

Pardo: Think about it: the TIP process prioritizes links to schools, libraries, parks. But it doesn't measure it. We need some numbers. I like that we debate this, but we need more substance. This is something we can work on in the short-term.

Weinmann: Another way you could do it is look for areas that are done well, and identify them as examples to aim for. Use pictures, etc. to better describe what a multi-modal community looks like, instead of primarily just bike paths.

Cole: I'm worried our map is going to become fluid again, and we'll be back where we were two years ago. Lock this in (NM Routes Map), it's consistent with Planning, Public Works, Engineering, etc. What Pardo's talking about should be a *supplement* to this.

Pardo: The primary problem is it's Port Orchard's responsibility.

Forte: Actually it's the State. Keep in mind, legally, we cannot spend one penny over the city boundary. Take for instance Jarstad – until it becomes a priority for Bremerton, we can't move forward on it.

Pardo: We need to get in front of electeds.

Forte: It needs to be measurable. How will you measure it?

Cole: Take Mile Hill – it's great, and then suddenly it's all higgledy piggledy and it disappears. If this line is to mean anything, we've got to bring this up to the Commissioners and Councils.

Forte: How do you find actionable items you can influence. You can't control facilities outside of unincorporated County. Port Orchard's priority isn't Mile Hill, right now it's Sedgwick and Tremont. So how will you line these up? From an advisory perspective, you want to come up with useful ideas.

Pardo: That's what you want to do, I'm going to walk up there and give them an earful.

Watson: Cole's point is that route is already on our TIP – Mile Hill Road. Kitsap County can do something about it, up to the limits of Port Orchard. After that it's Port Orchard's deal. Cole's point is it's already

identified on the TIP for the County. The real issue is that there is a lack of sufficient funding to get this done in the time frame we would like.

Pardo: I'm bringing this up because the Kitsap County side is an absolute roaring success, while the portion inside Port Orchard needs a lot of work.

Whitaker: the county line is a sudden, dangerous break. The Commissioners could work with the Port Orchard politicians, and it can't come from Forte (PW), we need to pursue this.

Cole: Maybe that becomes a subcommittee, a legit function of this group. If we've got money and political issues, we need a long-term solution, and parks has this issue too.

Weinmann: If there's gaps between coming up with plans and implementing them, I'd like to work with someone who knows something about grants, and pursue funding avenues. If everything is on hold until a plan needs updating... I don't think any of these plans are going to come to fruition without new funding sources. This should be an important element of this committee.

Whitaker: I don't know if we can get into an official discussion about pursuing levies if the general public attends these meetings.

Weinmann: No, I meant grants, not levies.

Forte explained the PW approach to selecting project for grant opportunities.

Whitaker: We're running out of time, so let's get a members' update.

Forte: Commissioners are going to be reviewing until April. I recommend that the Committee keep same Chair structure for now, because other things might be getting restructured. Bylaws say Chairmanship changes in February.

Brumsickle: One of our original members, Ducky, is now involved with Bremerton Public Works & City Council. Paul & Charlie Michelle spearheaded a project to identify high-priority roads that could be improved with just paint. Template on New York – narrowing/restriping. Bremerton Public Works was a little reticent at first. Bremerton applied for \$1.5 million from WSDOT, but got \$7.5 million. For Kitsap Way. Which may also lead to a road diet on 6th. So if we had someone who lived in Port Orchard that could knock on that council's doors...

Forte: West Sound Cycle Club has a quarterly meeting with Bremerton Public Works. Although sometimes just paint doesn't work, and engineering identifies other issues.

Cole: Can we agree to not change the plan for three years? It needs to be credible.

Whitaker: I don't think there was interest in changing it, we were just thinking about an overlay.

Watson: When I first started here, I had to learn that our routes don't identify places that are great to ride *now* – it identifies routes that are important, and maybe it's good now or maybe we need to build more.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35pm