

## **Minutes – Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facilities Community Advisory Committee**

**December 16, 2025 – Kitsap Public Works Building, Port Orchard**

### **Members Present:**

Brian Watson (Vice Chair)  
Richard Feeney  
Jessy Osterloh  
Jacob Weber  
Deborah Weinmann

### **Members Absent:**

Janet Kidd (Chair)  
Nathan Menefee  
Scott Satter

### **Public Works Staff Present:**

David Forte

### **Guests/Public:**

None

### **Approval of Previous Minutes:**

- Richard Feeney moved to approve the October 2025 meeting minutes, seconded by Brian Watson. The minutes were approved with one correction.
- It was noted that Jess Chandler resigned a few months ago.

**Public Comment:** No Public comments were received.

### **Discussion Items:**

#### **1. 2026 Work Program**

David Forte noted that we would discuss ideas today and vote on the work program in January. He also noted that he is the only public works staff dedicated to this committee, so bandwidth is limited and the GIS person won't be available to support non-motorized plans until approximately May of 2026 due to workload. The non-motorized update has been pushed to 2027 due to budget. We also don't want to change the comprehensive plan, but one idea is to review the non-motorized routes in the TIP.

David recommended that the committee look at the metrics used to rank projects in the TIP: classification, volumes, and speed and to add those metrics to the routes map. One idea is to look at existing standards, then compare with areas that are going to be redeveloped because the redeveloped areas will all get sidewalks and be brought up to current design standards with context dependent designs like schools

adding some design features. The committee could also look at urban growth areas and rural roads using this framework to help identify what areas might need adjusting. This approach would make the most of redevelopment efforts.

Rick Feeney recommended trying to include sidewalks and bike lanes and identifying scenarios when those can't be added.

David countered that the approach he had described previously would identify what is already included in improvement projects.

The goal is to try to do something that will advance what we have with only David as staff and no money. The committee could prioritize evaluating bike routes on the TIP because the existing bike routes were identified in 2018 and so are dated. The committee could look for gaps in existing routes to make them more usable. (The confidence in road shoulder gap data is low). There is also a road mapping technology service with capabilities that could be very useful for the committee for mapping road and street conditions but the service has not been purchased due to funding.

Rick Feeney also presented ideas for the committee to address in 2026. One idea is to prioritize adding a sharrows on Erland's Point. Rick discussed this idea with the county road manager, and he reported that she was not supportive of it. The project would involve a half mile of road in which the speed would be reduced to 25 mph, a few signs would be added and some lanes painted. This could be a relatively low-cost win.

Brian Watson commented that this section is the only link between Austin and Chico and that it is very narrow. He added that the idea should fit within the committee's process and constraints but that he is not opposed to it.

Debbie emphasized that she is also not against the idea, but that it needs to fit within the process. She suggested that a subcommittee could narrow down roads for options like this because people in North Kitsap are advocating for more signage too. Perhaps more routes could be created?

Rick added another idea for distance signs for cycling between destinations.

Rick and Brian agreed that signage seems to have fallen off prioritization.

David added that there will be a new traffic manager coming on board in January and that some corrections to the mileage on the signs are needed.

Brian asked if there were any additional routes ready for signage.

David answered that this is something the committee would need to evaluate due to road conditions having changed over the last few years. Hansville now has shoulders the whole way and there might be other new routes. Doing a review of old maps and updating routes can be part of the committee's route analysis/evaluation.

Rick asked if a person submits TIP ideas, does the Public Works department see them? And does this committee get to see those ideas?

David discussed that Public Works gets lots of ideas and evaluates them against the priorities identified by the non-motorized committee, scores them, and if they score high enough, they get included on a list for the TIP. This makes the process data driven and less subjective. He explained the priority and rating system and promised to send the list of projects that were evaluated for inclusion on the TIP.

Jacob Weber asked if once a project is on the "short list" does it get a rough estimate for the cost?

David explained that they look at the scope of the project and give an estimate in increments of \$500 million dollars. Then they send it to design engineers to get a concept and price and use those concepts for grant proposals. Everything is prevailing wage.

Brian requested that the committee get briefed on updates to the projects in the pipeline during the year. Melissa did not brief the Perry project, only the Seabeck project. These updates would allow the committee the opportunity to provide input and comment based on their lived experiences that may be valuable to the design process. The committee can offer input on context for the designs.

Debbie noted that some of the committee members visited with each commissioner over the course of the last year and recommended continuing to touch base with them on what they want from this committee. The committee wants them to understand that it supports all the districts and that the districts are not in competition with each other. She noted further that Talking points should be

developed for meetings with commissioners and modified for the specifics of each district.

David mentioned that some of them read the minutes of these meetings.

Brian requested that the committee continue to get briefed on federal funding, active lawsuits, and the effects on projects, as well as more on the Port Gamble Heritage Park.

David provided a brief update of RAISE Grants and the lawsuit Kitsap County filed related to those. Also the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has bumped its grant competition to 2027. There will be 2 small grants for rural town centers and one other.

### **Member and Staff Updates:**

Rick mentioned that PSRC is requesting comments on the new regional plan.

David elaborated that it is specific to principal arterials. Two of these exist in Kitsap County and are in Silverdale. The plan also has some interesting speculative financing options. It is pretty high level and Kitsap County is a low priority in the plan so they have to be careful to voice only the matters that are truly important for the area.

### **Consolidated list of work plan proposals:**

- Compare existing projects on the TIP with redevelopment efforts to identify gaps and make the most of redevelopment efforts.
- Add the metrics of classification, volumes, and speed to the routes map.
- Identify the scenarios where bike lanes and sidewalks can't be added.
- Look for gaps in existing bike routes to make them more usable.
- Add a sharrows at Erland's Point including lane painting, signs, and speed limit reduction.
- Evaluate other similar sharrows projects.
- Create more bike routes.
- Correct cycling mileage on signs.
- Add more distance signs on routes ready for them.
- Review the existing route maps and see what needs to change.

- Receive project updates and have the opportunity to provide lived experience input for the designs.
- Continue to meet with the county commissioners.
- Continue to receive updates on federal funding as well as the status of active projects, such as Port Gamble Heritage Park.

Meeting adjourned at 1846.