

MINUTES OF MEETING
Non-Motorized Trail Plan Update (NMTPU) Advisory Group
Meeting Online Via GoToMeeting

Advisory Attendance List

Don Iverson	Paul Neumiller
Ron Michelsen	Krista Loercher
Greg Richardson	Connie Bowers
Steve Marx	

Consultant Attendance List

Connie Reckord	Matt Donoghue
David Saxen	

Facilitator

Brian Wood, IC Transportation Planner

The meeting began at approximately 3:05 PM.

Action Items:

- Set up next meeting date in January
- Report on project progress since 2006
- Look at goals language to see if mobility challenges are adequately addressed
- Assess survey methodology
- Identify issues for non-motorized uses other than road cycling and water access
- Collect feedback on Wiki Map and survey
- Upload draft issue maps to the website

Look at 2006 Efforts

The 2006 NMTPU was reviewed briefly. It was noted that the plan did a relatively thorough job of inventorying assets and identifying potential projects. Feedback:

- Question: What progress has been made on the projects identified from the last plan? The 1995 plan identified potential projects, but the 2006 plan noted that few of the 1995 projects had been completed. Why pursue an update to a plan that is not implemented?
- Response 1: Island County will take a look at progress to date and report back.
- Response 2: Even when components of a plan are not implemented, it is common practice to maintain regular non-motorized transportation plan updates, often corresponding to transportation element updates. Plan updates ensure that identified projects are current and so more likely to be awarded grant funding when available.

Amended Goals

- The insertion of recommended water references in the NMTPU goals (discussed at the previous advisory meeting) was reviewed, and feedback was requested.
- No comments were made regarding water references, however there was a request to review the goals to ensure that the language adequately addresses mobility challenges.

2017 Planning Model

The consulting team discussed a model that considers network versus facility needs and that these are considered together to build recommendations for improvements to both. Feedback:

- It was noted that mobility challenges were grouped with pedestrian networks, but planning for the provision of access to networks and facilities needs to look beyond improvements that otherwise only target pedestrians.

Survey and Wiki Map

Public feedback tools were reviewed, and advisory members were asked to review them as soon as possible (sending comments by email) so they can be finalized and made public. The Wiki Map provides an opportunity for very focused feedback. Feedback:

- There was a request to consider the best way to get a representative sample of public feedback to inform this plan.

On-Road Cycling Network

Types of cyclists and types of cycling facilities were reviewed. It was noted that the largest cycling group can be characterized as “interested, but concerned”. Facilities that address that group generally involve significant efforts to separate them from higher speed, or higher volume, traffic. Maps of Island County that presented routes of concern were presented. Feedback:

- The routes of concern correspond to some of the most popular routes in Island County.
- Many county roads have less frequent traffic such that drivers can respond safely to the presence of road cyclists.
- Interested, but concerned riders are less likely to embark on long distance county routes.
- There is a current shoulder widening program that can benefit multiple users and allow improvement to more of the network, versus more expensive treatments.
- Interested, but concerned riders may benefit from a small number of comfortable facilities that are much shorter or connect to amenities.

Shoreline Access Prioritization Process

Some of the possible prioritization criteria for shoreline access was reviewed and maps showed the locations of potential access points and beach extents. It was noted that the access points came from the Department of Ecology and do not necessarily align with Island County parcels. Some beaches extended along military property and it was unclear if other beaches were available above the ordinary high water line. Still other “access points” were simply road ends, with no obvious means of accessing the water or providing a useful public facility. Advisory members were asked to use the maps as a reference for providing feedback on identified locations or to suggest new locations that should be looked at. Feedback:

- The maps showed shoreline issues and road based projects, such as bicycle route projects, but did not highlight other users such as mountain bikers, equestrians, or users of various modes that may have mobility challenges.

Closing

- Advisory group members were asked to email Brian Wood (b.wood@co.island.wa.us) with additional, questions and feedback regarding the meeting agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM

Next meeting will be in person, early January