



Public Safety Committee Virtual Meeting Agenda

Thursday, June 5, 2025

MEMBERS: Michael Goodnow (Chair), Anna Mockler (Vice Chair), and Denise Frey

ALSO ATTENDING: City Attorney Kylie Finnell, Court Administrator Lisa Hardy, Fire Chief Pat McGanney, Assistant Fire Chief John Payne, Police Chief Tom Wolfe, Police Captain Aaron Elton, Contract Administrator Melinda Monroe.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. GENERAL BUSINESS

2A. Meeting minutes for May 2025 presented for approval.

3. NEW BUSINESS/ DEPARTMENT BRIEFINGS

3A. **COURT** – No specific agenda item.

3B. **LEGAL** – No specific agenda item.

3C. **FIRE** –

1. ILA with CKFR for fueling of apparatus.

3D. **POLICE** –

1. Discussion on adding sergeant position and dropping corporal.

3E. **COUNCIL** –

1. Citizen letter re: fireworks (Attachment 1).

4. NEXT MEETING

Thursday, July 3, 2025 at 1:00 p.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT



Public Safety Committee Virtual Meeting Minutes **DRAFT**

Thursday, May 1, 2025

MEMBERS: Michael Goodnow (Chair), Anna Mockler (Vice Chair), and Denise Frey.

ALSO ATTENDING: City Attorney Kylie Finnell, Fire Chief Pat McGanney, Police Chief Tom Wolfe, Police Captain Aaron Elton, Assistant City Attorney Mychael Raya, Assistant Fire Chief John Payne, Contract Administrator Melinda Monroe, and Court Administrator Lisa Hardy.

1. CALL TO ORDER

1:05 pm

2. GENERAL BUSINESS

2A. Meeting minutes for April 2025 presented for approval

3. NEW BUSINESS/ DEPARTMENT BRIEFINGS

3A. **COURT** – No specific agenda item

3B. **LEGAL** –

1. Memo re: Automated Safety Cameras (attached)

3C. **FIRE** –

1. Amendment to BMC 10.36.010 Compression Brakes (attached)

3D. **POLICE** – No specific agenda item

3E. **COUNCIL** –

1. Citizen complaints – July 4th Fireworks.

4. NEXT MEETING

Thursday, June 5, 2025 at 1:00 p.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT

1:53 p.m.

Public Safety Committee Minutes
Thursday, May 1, 2025

Michael Goodnow: Okay, I call the May 1st, 2025 Public Safety Committee meeting to order, and have the minutes of the April meeting that are presented for approval there in your packet. If I have a motion to approve.

Anna Mockler: Move to approve the meeting. The minutes of the April, 2025 public Safety Committee meeting.

Denise Frey: I'll second that.

Michael Goodnow: Alright! I love these 3 person meetings

Denise Frey: Yeah.

Michael Goodnow: All, all in the favor I.

Denise Frey: Aye, aye, aye.

Michael Goodnow: Aye. Minutes are approved or motion passes. So we didn't have any specific items from the court. But if there's court. Do you have anything you are interested in walking on today? Is the court here.

Lisa Hardy: No, I don't have anything.

Michael Goodnow: Okay. Awesome. Thank you, Lisa.

Michael Goodnow: And how about? And then I guess we'll move on to 3 B. Legal, a memo about automated safety cameras, and that was attached into the meeting information, legal.

Kylie Finnell: Thanks that was authored by Mychael, so I'll let him explain his findings.

Mychael Raya: So thanks, Kylie. The intent of the memo is just to really give broader overview of current revenue exemptions that it would be subject to, and then how many additional cameras could be added if the city chose to do so and still fall within those exemptions and then anything beyond that. What revenue restrictions would apply to those cameras?

Mychael Raya: happy to answer any questions about that memo but essentially where we're at right now. City has 9 of those cameras in use. The way the statute is worded means that we could add up to one location for cameras that would still that the exemptions would still apply to because of the time period that the initial program went into effect anything beyond the addition of one camera, and then the those statutory revenue restrictions would apply. The statute is a little bit unclear on whether revenue exemptions apply. If, for example, if we were to add, say, 3 camera. This is the hypothetical I use in the memo. If we were to add 3 cameras to the existing 9. It's a little unclear on where the exemptions would apply then going forward. But my interpretation and the way I read it is that those revenue exemptions would still exist for the 9 original cameras, the one that was added. But then anything beyond that would be subject to those

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

revenue restrictions. So, other than that. I added some links for further reading that I think also help explain the issue. But I'm happy to hear, happy to have a discussion on it, and answer any questions as well.

Michael Goodnow: Well, thank you, Michael. That would have been my 1st question. Where you just clarified Denise.

Denise Frey: Yeah, I just wanted to bring us back. I think this came up when we were specifically looking for additional funding for public safety. What options were out there. So thank you for doing the deep dive on this. That being said, I know we're all aware, and on the same page, that these are really meant to increase public safety, maybe not funding, but have an impact on road safety, speed, and all of that. And I would just like to hear from the chief, if you would, if you feel comfortable, Chief, with us, being so low on traffic officers and speed being such a problem, you know in our community. What's your inkling on, you know, would, regardless of where the money goes would increase traffic speed cameras as well as red light cameras. Would that increase public safety on our streets?

Tom Wolfe: Yeah, when we initially brought this program in and for those of you that were around, you remember, it was. It was a big, horrible big brother thing back in the day, and everybody's gotten over that. They realize that there is a great place for this. It's why so many cities have installed them. What we have seen our experience has been. If you just set the whole revenue discussion aside the safety that it brings, even if I had a fully staffed traffic unit. There's certain intersections. And I point to like Sylvan and Wheaton, which has historically had, prior to the red light cameras some very significant injury accidents. There's not a way to get in there and set up and do traffic in some of these intersections, and to have the ability to calm traffic that way is. You know, just if we didn't, if it was a net 0, we didn't gain any money, we didn't lose any money, it's a hundred percent worth it from the safety value. If that answers your question, and anything that calms traffic anywhere and the other thing, too, is if we can calm traffic on this stretch of road, then it frees up our traffic guys to go work. The other pieces that we don't have that kind of stuff. So I think it's a great way to go.

Denise Frey: Is there any means of your department advancing recommendations through this committee, or to council about additional cameras at relevant intersections, or, you know, like in school, school, safety zones, or whatever.

Tom Wolfe: They actually, the companies themselves actually come out and do a full blown study and it has to make sense to the company. Also they have to see the volume and the issues. What we see as citizens is that one car that goes down the street at 60 miles an hour at 3 in the afternoon, but then the rest of the day there's nobody speeding on the street. So for a company like that, it doesn't make sense to get that one car. So yeah, they do a pretty robust study on that. And I would kick that back to them. And I think Melinda would probably have some good information on that. Also.

Denise Frey: Yes, since we're switching vendors, Melinda, I don't know if Melinda's on the call, but it would be good to find out if there will, in fact, be that kind of analysis, and whether we could get recommendations on whether or not additional cameras might be useful.

Michael Goodnow: I think that was part of the presentation that when Melinda brought in. Yeah, Melinda, you're welcome to chime in if you want.

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

Melinda Monroe: Yeah. And my answer is just, yep, I can confirm. That's exactly right. They're in process of that. We're getting ready for that 1st 10.

Anna Mockler: So I asked a similar question last month to Denise's less articulate and less far reaching, and one of the things I thought was really interesting. That Chief Wolf said, was that the speed cameras in particular, that there have been review of the video by civilians which would really help your workload. Am I quoting you correctly, Chief Wolf?

Tom Wolfe: That I I don't know about the speed cameras I know about the red light cameras, and I I assume they have. I know they've changed the law in regards to you can have other people do that.

Anna Mockler: That's great. In the past. It had to be a commissioned police officer. That's great. That would be really wonderful.

Anna Mockler: I just want to clarify in the memo. It's the funds have to go to transportation user safety and then further down, when it puts the money to call on somebody fund for for cyclists. I'm assuming that transportation users would include pedestrians and cyclists and wheelchair users.

Mychael Raya: Are you talking about the last bullet point? It wouldn't take effect right away. It's the Cooper Jones Transportation Safety.

Anna Mockler: Dr. Jones. There we go!

Mychael Raya: Yeah, and sorry. Your question is whether pedestrians and cyclists are included within that fund?

Anna Mockler: Yes.

Mychael Raya: I could look into that further. I believe so. But I'm not certain what all that goes to.

Anna Mockler: Okay, thank you. And let me just apologize again for not having video.

Michael Goodnow: We didn't want to make it seem like some sort of police grab for money where these cameras were getting installed in places. So anyways, I just that kind of goes towards what Denise and Ana both just brought up. So

Michael Goodnow: I don't know if that clears up anything, but that's why it's it doesn't go to like the police fund or to specific.

Michael Goodnow: You know, some specific, you know, it doesn't go into like the same fund, I think as like any kind of law enforcement fines and things like that.

Michael Goodnow: Well, then, we're going to move on. Let's welcome Chief McGanney for the amendment to BMC 10.360.010, compression brakes.

Pat McGanney: Yeah, not. Not just fire department, but it also has to do with public works. But we're asking to update the BMC to add muffled compression brakes. Right now, it doesn't specify. We do use. Jake breaks compression brakes. We did have a complaint by one citizen that we're using

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

them, that it's a safety issue for us. Our ladder truck is 80,000 pounds and it needs the help stopping. So this would just help us the vector that the public works uses. Also a very heavy truck that uses Jake Brakes. We've been using them for years.

Pat McGanney: We didn't realize our code didn't allow for muffled Jake breaks like everybody, pretty much the State and the count, you know everybody else in the county. So we're just asking to update the BMC to allow for muffled Jake Brakes.

Denise Frey: Was an email, wasn't there pretty recently from someone with some recommended language for this? Does anybody else remember getting that Michael or Anna.

Kylie Finnell: I saw it.

Denise Frey: Kylie. Was there any substance? I read it briefly.

Kylie Finnell: So I don't think it has to do with whether the descriptor in the code would be sufficient enough to give someone notice of what was required, and I can say I'm not aware of any challenges to these codes. This is what the State law is. It's also what our neighbors have. The same as the code in Kitsap County is the same as the one in Poulsbo. I will note, though, that I did do a little digging in some cities instead, basically just exempt their vehicles and the vehicles of other like authorized fire departments. And so I can put in the chat real quick if you want to see.

Michael Goodnow: Kylie. What you're saying is, instead of just blanketly allowing the muffles compression brakes. We say that we don't allow compression brakes, with the exception of, this is what is in Bellingham and I don't know if this is, everyone can see it. It says it may be unlawful for any person other than a member of a municipal or other duly constituted fire department or district, to use vehicle breaks which are in any way activated or operated by the compression of the engine, or any such motor vehicle, or any unit or part thereof. So that's what Bellingham did, rather than talking about whether it was. You know, the language that says effectively, muffled, and that was the concern that was brought up in our comment. I think either way is probably fine. And we it sounds like we would also want to include like fire and public works, or something like that. If we were going to go this direction, but I think either one would get the job done as far as what we're trying to do here. But.

Denise Frey: Chief McGanney, do you have any input on one or the other?

Pat McGanney: Well, I think if we just limit it to fire department fire department vehicles, you're leaving out public works, the county, you know other people that drive, you know, drive through the city because we have county roads in, you know inside the city that their public works, you know their dump trucks and stuff like that drive through so.

Kylie Finnell: I mean, I will say that the point is well taken from the comment, though, that any time that we go to prove something in court. So whether it's, you know, prosecution. It's a it's a lot easier for us to say that this was a vehicle that you know. If we get a complaint, and it said, We can put in here. We can reword this to where it would cover. You know, government vehicles or something like that.

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

Kylie Finnell: and then we can say, Hey, you know, sorry that that no ways, you know bothered you, but our code only prohibits those on, you know, non governmental vehicles or something like that. You know, there's going to be a debate about what effectively muffled means anytime, right? Someone's going to say that maybe that they had effectively muffled. And then we're going to say that they had an effectively muffled so I could see the argument. So if the Council wants to. I mean that comment, I think. Just came in either lately, yesterday or earlier this morning. If the Council I know that this is was this going to go to study session next?

Kylie Finnell: well, not next week, because it's a council meeting. But the week after. Is that the plan Pat?

Pat McGanney: That's a plan. Yeah.

Kylie Finnell: Yeah. So what I'd like to do? What if the committee is okay with it is, I can look into it a little bit more just to see a little bit more about like if

Kylie Finnell: there have been any challenges, even though I'm just not aware of them right now. On that. And if I we have a more detailed recommendation by the time we get to study session we can talk about it. Then.

Denise Frey: It does seem cleaner. An alternative my only concern would be if the fire department or public works would have, you know, a different opinion. So yeah, I'd appreciate that clarification, maybe a recommendation. Kylie.

Kylie Finnell: Sure I'm happy to do that. Yeah, we'll have some time between now and then to do that.

Michael Goodnow: Great.

Pat McGanney: Yeah, I don't have a problem with it. I think that you know. I mean, if we, wanna, you know, limit it to government vehicles. I think that's.

Kylie Finnell: Yeah, of course. Then there could be an argument that that's not fair, either, because there's not you know, there's always something right. So we'll decide which ones. The best way to go. But I, you know, always appreciate the public input. And I understand why that could cause some confusion.

Michael Goodnow: So this one, I guess the one question I have is like, obviously, there's other vehicles that operate with these. Are we just like giving them. Basically, you know, advance warning that you need to operate in a way that you're not going to need to use those brakes.

Kylie Finnell: They're almost all muffled. So I actually did kind of a deep dive in this when I was at city of Poulsbo, and the company that makes Jake breaks actually does litigation on this because they don't like people using their name in their legislation because it's a type of break.

Kylie Finnell: It's just it's kind of like it's there's a marketing term when you're the name of your product becomes the name of the product like Kleenex, right? Or something like that, so that they are a compression break company. And but I guess it's like what most people call compression breaks.

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

But my understanding is like since the seventies, or something like most trucks, have muffled ones, not unmuffled ones. And so it's not - I guess, when they're being used, it's because they need to be used for the most part now, and that it's not. I guess, it seemed like it was a less of a problem, I guess now, except on maybe a really, really old truck is what I understood from the last time I researched this, but I can see what I can find out now.

Michael Goodnow: Great. Thank you for this.

Pat McGanney: That makes sense what I'm saying. Yeah.

Pat McGanney: Absolutely. And the only reason I think, looking at muffled versus unmuffled is just so. We didn't give the impression that you know we wanted favoritism as government employees.

Pat McGanney: We just want, you know, I mean, for the safety of the public and everybody else. When you have heavier trucks the compression brakes help with braking along with it saves on maintenance and everything else of the braking system. So we weren't looking for favoritism. We're just looking to be able to continue to use. I've been here for 33 years, had a complaint until just recently. And there was a I think it's a gentleman that lives, I will say, on the east side of town. And I think he drives a truck, and he knew the BMC. So, I mean it was good that he pointed it out. But I think we still, from a safety aspect need to be able to use those piece of equipment. So yeah, I'm good either way.

Michael Goodnow: Yeah, I think, I think, I kind of trust Kylie to look into this, because what we want is we want you know, we want kind of the most solid, simple, clean, you know. We don't want it to make it seem like an exception. It wants to make sense, right? There's an exception, because, you know, we don't want to be seeing. You know the mayor's hybrid. Have Jake breaks on it right like you know what I mean like. So if we kind of define it with a little bit of scope or purpose, I think that's fine. But I really kind of trust legal to just kind of craft up a tweak to. It's really kind of housekeeping. To be honest, we're not actually changing anything. It was the intent all along. So

Michael Goodnow: all right. Anything else on this issue.

Anna Mockler: Nope.

Michael Goodnow: Alrighty, let's see, please. Chief Wolf, anything.

Pat McGanney: Michael, I do have one more thing that will be coming towards you.

Pat McGanney: We've got an updated mitigation plan from Kitsap County that the mayor. It went to the mayor's office. It's updated countywide. And they just need City Council's approval. For FEMA. So you guys will be seeing the updated mitigation plan coming through. Probably maybe the same study session. I think Jennifer is gonna try to get everything uploaded. But I just want to give you a heads up. The Council will be seeing the new mitigation plan from Kitsap County, and that's it.

Pat McGanney: So DEM has to do a mitigation plan for Kitsap County for natural disasters and how we handle them. But they have to reach out to each municipality, and they have to be a part of that planning process. And so

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

they've updated the plan. The plan will work run from 2,025 to 2,029. Then they'll have to update it again, and it is all being.

Michael Goodnow: Any significant updates?

Pat McGanney: No, just making sure everybody knows what equipment, what resources, how you know how we're going to handle natural disasters, or, you know, man-made disasters so great. It's an extensive document.

Anna Mockler: So I just had a question. Would this cover, like small natural disasters, as it were, like those days? We had a couple of years back when it went up to 104 provision of cooling centers or heating centers in case of winter storms.

Pat McGanney: Yeah, I mean, basically, if they're going to activate the EOC, or you know, for small or big things. How we do that, how they support all the jurisdictions in the county.

Pat McGanney: Great, thank you.

Michael Goodnow: All right. Anything else with fire.

Pat McGanney: That's it. Thank you.

Michael Goodnow: Okay. And now we'll move on to Police Chief Wolf. Anything you want to update us on or introduce.

Tom Wolfe: Nothing, nothing earth shattering other than cap. Melton had a great meeting with all our supervisors, and they kind of came up with some plans on getting more traffic enforcement. So we've been messaging that out to the public to slow it down because we're getting out there, and I think we had 25 stops on the bridge during day shift the other day, and issued out some citations and getting people slowed down again. So the sergeants are looking for creative ways to when they have downtime on their shifts to get their people out and doing more enforcement. So.

Denise Frey: It's great!

Tom Wolfe: We see that as one of our big issues. I got out and made about 5, 6 stops myself. So that's it's a perishing skill, though. It's amazing how fumbly I am these days. I'm not as sharp as I used to be so but they usually send one of the officers to watch over me. So that's always good. Our traffic officer, Jason Jennings, has got Snyder on his to do list so hopefully he's been given that some attention.

Michael Goodnow: I drove Snyder the other day just to kind of reacquaint myself with it. Anna, go ahead.

Anna Mockler: Thank you. Thank you, chief. This is fantastic news. I was just wondering if there's any date like, if there's data on these on how fast people were going and where? That's 1 of our Council goals is to use data to determine where traffic calming is most needed.

Tom Wolfe: Not necessarily. There's an art form to it. What we do is I'm not going to give away the formula. But we, if you're one mile an hour over the speed limit, I could tell you you're not going to get stopped.

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

Tom Wolfe: But there's kind of an Ouch point where we're looking at what traffic is doing, and those people that are outside that are getting stopped and written tickets. The, I think the high speed that day was 57 in the 35 mile an hour bridge zone. So that might give you kind of an idea. There, and then, as far as is compiling data all the time. I don't. I don't know. I want to sit down, probably, and get or just have you email? Me specifically, when you say data, what is it that you want? And then see if we can actually have the ability to give you the data that you want, because what I think you need sometimes, and what you want are 2 very different things. So what I can tell you is that we did a dive into looking at crime trends in Bremerton and in the last 4 years, and we compared ourselves to the county and the State. Violent crime in the city of Bremerton has gone down 2%. It's still up 5% or 5 to 8% in the county, and like 12% statewide. So that is, and I attribute that to proactive policing, our officers not just responding, but actually getting out there and trying to make it harder for criminals to operate, and being proactive and dealing with our frequent flyers.

Tom Wolfe: I was shocked. I thought our property crime, though, I thought, Yeah, that's going to be where we get the big hit. Because violent people, we look for them. We really focus on violent criminals, but I thought our property crime would be up also. It was down, 3% overall with county still being up and state still going up. So I thought, wow! What a great trend it shows you that your police department is getting after it out here, and just kudos to the men and women of this department. And you know, even though we're down, we're down like 7 bodies. Still, they're still making a huge impact with what they're working with. So imagine what we could do, fully staffed, so.

Anna Mockler: Thank you. And congratulations, indeed! That's the mark of a department that's intelligently led and is working well together, that they are catching crimes before they happen, as it were. Well done, you guys. Thank you.

Anna Mockler: But to get back to my question, which was about speeding and traffic, we're looking for data on stops for customized mufflers, stops for speeding stops and collisions that the collisions we used to get from the heat map which you, I think you discontinued last year, early last year, software does.

Tom Wolfe: We had a software that they were trying to sell to us. And we were able. Kara was able to take that data using that software but we don't no longer have that. We didn't purchase it. So it, you know, engineering used to have all the traffic data as far as traffic crashes go.

Tom Wolfe: I will tell you that our focus is on aggressive driving. So people that are running stop signs, stop lights, speeding. They're gonna get our full attention. You know, other equipment violations and things like that. You know, it's probably a bigger conversation for the Council, but just asking for direction from you, because statewide your counterparts in the State Legislature have made it very clear that we don't want law enforcement doing minor traffic stops. They're wrong. Minor traffic stops lead to safer cities, safer communities.

Tom Wolfe: Criminals drive cars, they commit crimes while driving cars and having strong traffic enforcement makes it so that they don't want to operate in your community, and study after study has shown that. But the narrative within the State legislature has been that minor traffic stops lead to police violence, and that is just such a misuse of words and

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

phrasing, and it's very. It frustrates me to no end because it's suggesting that police are looking for violence, and we don't have to go look for it. It finds us so.

Tom Wolfe: That's just nonsense. I'm happy to enforce every traffic regulation, but I think your officers are very cognizant of the overreaching State legislature that has permeated the CJTC. Our certification process, and what they're looking at officers for. So if an officer did a minor traffic stop, and it turned into a big thing, they're gonna make hay with that. So it's still a very interesting time we live in, and our officers are still very, you know. Let's make sure we're on very solid ground. So, and we also try to stay away from what we would call chippy tickets and stuff. I mean, everybody probably knows someone, or you've gotten one that was just stupid from an overbearing police officer or state trooper that was just hadn't you know it's like, Oh, my gosh! This is not what we're here for.

Michael Goodnow: Yeah. And then we get accused of not having good priorities, you know.

Tom Wolfe: Yeah, yeah, exactly. It's why aren't you out catching rapists? I mean that every time I ever did a traffic stop I'd always hear that, and I'd always respond with, well, they drive cars. Is there anything you want to confess to, so that would usually make them slow down? But we don't do those things anymore. So we're very polite.

Anna Mockler: So, chief, you and I have had this conversation several times. So here we go again. Every member of the 23rd Ld. And of the 26th Ld. Has been personally contacted, every single one of them. And has said that no, that was not their intent, that there might have been discussion at some future point at some point in the past, but that it was not their intent, nor is it now their intent to hinder the police in in making traffic stops. So I will be happy to get. I will try to get written testimony now that the session is over. But in the meantime, what the Council is looking for is in our last year's and this year's goals and priorities, which is using data to establish where traffic calming is needed and that would be places where there's a lot of speeding, which is why it would be great to have data on that, and also places where there are collisions, which is why it would be great to have data on that. We can't encourage traffic calming when we don't know where the traffic calming needs to happen.

Anna Mockler: I am. I'm really, really pleased. I'm repeating myself now that Bremerton police are out there catching speeders, and I agree with Denise's face that yes, it's really great that you're doing it on the Warren Avenue Bridge, because 57 miles an hour is slow compared to some people I've seen that's a dangerous, dangerous place. So, anyhow, is that insufficiently clear? Should I get with members of Council and write you something?

Tom Wolfe: Understanding what data does for us, and what it doesn't do is, you know, I can show data that they're speeding vehicles on every street in Bremerton. And so then what we go to is more of a windshield survey. Of what do you observe every day? And where do our you know we're very complaint driven and you know, where are, you know most of our complaints coming from like Snyder Avenue. If I, if we lay out the cables out there and stuff. It's the data is going to tell us there's no speeding vehicles on average, the speed there is going to be within norms. When I sat there the other day for about an hour, there was not a single vehicle that went down the road speeding but the people that live there. They see that one or 2 cars, or those 4 cars throughout the day, and it really draws their attention and

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

that's a safety issue for them. And there's kids there. And we have other issues. So sometimes, yes, it's data. Sometimes it's complaint driven. And we try to catch all of it. We know ourselves because we're out there driving around all day long. We know where the speeders are, and we also know how to overall impact. So when we start on Kitsap way and wheat and way our main arterials, and we really get that slowed down. Then we just we just branch out to the rest of it.

Michael Goodnow: To have all the data in the world would be great. But I still don't have the traffic officers to act on that data. So you know, we're trying to catch as catch can in other ways. If that makes sense.

Anna Mockler: Wanted to say, Thank you. Well done!

Michael Goodnow: Anyways, we need to schedule time for this. But I just to also say that I have now scheduled at 2 o'clock, because there was a very light agenda on this today, and I want to make sure we get to the next item.

Denise Frey: But I do want to make a quick point. And I think I said, this last month public works does have that crash data, and they have been looking at because Gunther Fredrickson is working on the traffic calming policy. He has looked at Snyder and found that it doesn't reach the parameters for traffic calming measures. And so they do. Public works does have the crash data, not the speed data, but they do and are using the crash data. And I believe that's through wash dot.

Michael Goodnow: All right. Thank you. So next up we're there was a recent 4th of July sort of preemptive citizen message about fireworks. I just want to like to me historically. Where I see I would support getting rid of fireworks completely in the city. We're an urban city or metropolitan city. So I would support that. But here's where I think it lands. I think it needs to be a citizen initiative on a ballot to pass, and when it's been on the ballot in the past it has failed, which I don't want to put more time for a bad result. On that. I feel like the people need to come together and make this change. It's you know, it's 1 of those situations where we hear we don't get lots of emails saying, Oh, it was lovely. My family spent the afternoon doing fireworks out in the yard, you know. We you know those are the people we don't hear from. So the tough thing is, the people clearly doing fireworks outweighs the number of people complaining about fireworks. So it needs to be this citizen initiative. So that's my personal opinion. So but let's go to Anna.

Anna Mockler: Thanks, I agree. And I've had informal talks with Kitsap County, because really the ban would need to be countywide, and so far no one I've spoken to is interested in it. But this email was not about prohibiting fireworks. It was about communicating the BMC. That regulates fireworks. They wanted to post it on the Bremerton High School sign, which I don't know how we would get access to that, but to distribute it to libraries and post offices, and to have the information about what you can and cannot do clearly available. Through June and July. That seems like something that we could do and perhaps it would be of no use at all. But you know, perhaps some kid would not like be lying around with burned hands. So it seems like a worthy thing to do, that's all. I agree with you on everything you said about the fireworks, Michael, about banning them.

Denise Frey: The chief did a deep dive on this. What? Yes, last year the year before, and came with the recommendation. And so we did work on it, but

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

I agree the more communication, the better. I know that the chief and others put out you know, notices through the city's website and Facebook and everything. But maybe we can enhance that. I see the chief's hand is up.

Pat McGanney: Just gonna follow up with that. And we do have the information put out at all the stands. Last year we didn't have near as many stands. Fireworks stands in the city.

Pat McGanney: And so we will continue to. You know. I mean, do the best that we could, getting it on, reader. Boards out, you know. For the school district might be a little bit tough. But we'll continue to educate the best we can. But one thing we do have to remember is they can go right outside the city and buy different fireworks and especially on the West side with Rocky Point. Right? That's not the city and Denise, up in your area there is a lot of county that isn't in the city which is going to affect the citizens of the city, and I'm not saying we don't have people in the city lighting off illegal fireworks, but some of it. We can't control. And of course we have the reservation. You know, that's the we'll start selling fireworks way earlier than your safe and sane stands, and when we start hearing fireworks and early June before we start, that's where they're coming from. And again, even if the county were to ban them, you still have a large contingency of people that will go up north and purchase them on the reservation. So I think it's gonna be, I mean, even in California they're banned and they still have fireworks. So it's just a huge challenge. But I you know not that I disagree with any of you, but it's just a challenge.

Michael Goodnow: No, I completely agree. If they were, if we had banned them last year, and it was going to affect for this 4th of July, there's still going to be a ton. We're still going to do the same level of fire response and police response as we've always been able to do. And it's a cultural shift, which is why I think it needs to come from the people so the people can see that their neighbors are the ones who well did or didn't pass it, and not like the man. The government kind of thing.

Denise Frey: If Council had a Youth advisory committee, we could task them with this.

Anna Mockler: So I'm just gonna go back to more widely publicizing the regulations, because I think all of us were a bit well, I, at least was a bit cynical about whether, when our ordinance kicked in last year, whether it would make a difference, and it did so I'm just saying.

Anna Mockler: Are you guys okay with us, with expanding outreach from just firework stands to schools, libraries. I'm gesturing. But of course you can't see that.

Michael Goodnow: 1st of all, when you say us you know, I'm sure you're not talking about Denise myself and you so.

Anna Mockler: No.

Michael Goodnow: So I would basically say, if it you know, if it's the fire department that does the bulk of it. If you have some suggestions. I would hope that if it's a reasonable suggestion you forward it to them. They'll take action on it. I don't know if it needs to, you know, come from this committee to the Council as a whole, unless we feel like we want to institutionalize

Public Safety Committee Minutes May 1, 2025

Michael Goodnow: some of that. But I feel like we all have the same goal in mind. So if there's a something that the fire department hasn't thought about where to put up a poster or send an email to, I would hope they would include it in their outreach.

Denise Frey: You know I was joking before, but not really joking when I you know I you know I'm a big fan of fun communications and colorful with pictures and simple messaging. And we happen to have, you know, staff on this committee with Jon, who did a great job with the DCD Landlord registration infographic posters, and oh, maybe Captain Payne wants to, or Chief Payne wants to be in charge of it. I see his hand up. I'll stop now.

Michael Goodnow: Go ahead!

John Payne: That was a misinterpretation of my putting my hand up. That was not a voluntary hand. I just to add on. So last year, on the 4th of July I walked around Evergreen Park and Lions Park, and talked to the people that were shooting off fireworks and things and let them know that, hey? Technically, these are all illegal. Just know that this is coming to a stop. But I think one of the things. If we're going to build on this and go with the posters. Instagram type thing.

John Payne: I would say, the majority of the people that were shooting them off are not primary English speakers. We need to make sure we communicate this in multiple languages, because the most people I saw in there were not English speakers as a primary language, so.

Denise Frey: Great Point.

Anna Mockler: Were most of them, Mam speakers.

John Payne: I'd say most of them were Spanish speakers.

Michael Goodnow: Okay. Any last thoughts on this?

Michael Goodnow: All right. Well, thank you, everybody for your time. The next meeting will be on Thursday, June 5th at 1 P.M. The Public Safety Committee meeting is adjourned today at 1:53, thanks.



Office of the City Attorney
Kylie Finnell, City Attorney

Memorandum

To: Bremerton Public Safety Committee
From: Mychael Raya
Kylie Finnell
Re: Automated Traffic Safety Camera Revenue
Date: 4/25/25

The following is a general overview of revenue with respect to automated traffic safety cameras and how it can be used, as well as exemptions that exist for Bremerton:

Bremerton has nine (9) automated traffic safety cameras in use within the City.

- Effective June 6, 2024, RCW 46.63.220 restricts how jurisdictions can use traffic camera revenue. This is located within RCW 46.63.220(12) but primarily within RCW 46.63.220(13). I have provided a link below to a MRSC article that does a good job of summarizing those restrictions but will provide explanation within this memo as well. It is important to note that these restrictions DO NOT apply to the current nine (9) cameras in use, and would not apply to the addition of one (1) location for the use of camera(s), based on statutory exemptions within RCW 46.63.220 (exemptions explained in further detail in next bullet point). A synopsis of the restrictions applicable to Bremerton that would ONLY apply to any cameras beyond the current nine (9) cameras plus one (1) additional camera is as follows:

Traffic camera revenue can only be used to cover certain camera program costs and to pay for specified traffic safety activities (such as road design projects to reduce speed or projects to enhance transportation user safety).

Jurisdictions with populations of 10,000 or more must direct a portion of their traffic camera revenue toward projects that “provide direct and meaningful traffic safety benefits” to: 1) areas with household incomes in the lowest quartile; and 2) areas with injury crash rates above the jurisdiction’s average. The directed revenue portion must be at least proportional to the population within these areas.

Jurisdictions that initially place and use a traffic camera after June 6, 2024, must deposit 25% of the camera’s non-interest revenue (after deducting certain allowed camera and infraction processing costs) into the [Cooper Jones active](#)

transportation safety account. These deposits must start four years after the camera's placement.

- EXEMPTIONS - However – Cities with traffic camera programs that were in place prior to January 1, 2024, do have limited exemptions from the revenue restrictions. This is where the number of traffic cameras Bremerton has in use becomes important. (Note: Bremerton adopted BMC 10.42 “Automated Traffic Safety Cameras” in 2007 and amended 10.42.070 re: revenue in 2021). A synopsis of the exemption language is as follows:

In jurisdictions that have implemented traffic camera programs predating January 1, 2024, the revenue restrictions (listed above in my first bullet point) do not apply to stoplight or school speed zone traffic cameras placed before that date, or to stoplight or school speed zone cameras placed after that date that increase the jurisdiction's overall traffic camera numbers by 10% or less. In addition, if these jurisdictions have 10 or fewer stoplight or school speed zone cameras in their pre-January 1, 2024 program, they can add one additional stoplight or school speed zone camera to the program that will be exempt from the above revenue restrictions.

Note: Because Bremerton has 9 cameras in use, only the highlighted language applies to our situation. I only included the “10%” language from the statute to provide context for the Committee.

Here's the exact language from the statute with highlighted language applicable to Bremerton:

46.63.220(13)(d):

(d)(i)(A) Jurisdictions with an automated traffic safety camera program in effect before January 1, 2024, may continue to allocate revenue generated from automated traffic safety cameras authorized under RCW 46.63.230 and 46.63.250(2)(c) as determined by the jurisdiction, as well as for the purposes established in (a) through (c) of this subsection, by:

(I) Up to a 10 percent increase in the number of traffic safety camera locations authorized to detect violations for automated traffic safety cameras authorized under RCW 46.63.230; and

(II) Up to a 10 percent increase in the number of traffic safety camera locations authorized to detect violations for automated traffic safety cameras authorized under RCW 46.63.250(2)(c).

(B)(I) Any automated traffic safety camera program in effect before January 1, 2024, with fewer than 10 traffic safety camera locations for automated traffic safety cameras authorized under RCW 46.63.230, which adds automated traffic safety cameras to one additional location for the use of cameras authorized under RCW 46.63.230, may continue to allocate revenue generated from automated traffic safety cameras authorized under RCW 46.63.230 as determined by the jurisdiction, as well as for the purposes established in (a) through (c) of this subsection.

(II) Any automated traffic safety camera program in effect before January 1, 2024, with fewer than 10 traffic safety camera locations for automated traffic safety cameras

authorized under RCW [46.63.250](#)(2)(c) as of January 1, 2024, which adds automated traffic safety cameras to one additional location for the use of cameras authorized under RCW [46.63.250](#)(2)(c), may continue to allocate revenue generated from automated traffic safety cameras authorized under RCW [46.63.250](#)(2)(c) as determined by the jurisdiction, as well as for the purposes established in (a) through (c) of this subsection.

- Synopsis: If Bremerton adds just one (1) automated traffic safety camera, the revenue restriction exemptions would apply to all nine (9) cameras currently in use, as well as the newly added camera. My interpretation of the intent of the statute is that the revenue restrictions listed in my first bullet point in this memo would apply only to any cameras added beyond one (1). For example, if Bremerton decided to add three (3) new cameras in total, then the exemptions would still exist for the nine (9) previously in use as well as the one (1) addition. The exemptions could not be utilized for the 11th and 12th cameras, in which case all the revenue restrictions listed above would apply to those two (2) cameras. In that scenario, Bremerton would need to determine how much revenue each new camera brought in and make sure the statutory restrictions were complied with.

Links for additional reading/information:

MRSC article 1: <https://mrsc.org/stay-informed/mrsc-insight/february-2025/traffic-cameras-limitations>

MRSC article 2: <https://mrsc.org/explore-topics/public-safety/traffic-safety/traffic-safety-cameras#revenue>

RCW 46.63.220: <https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=46.63.220>

BMC 10.42:

<https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Bremerton/#!/Bremerton10/Bremerton1042.html>

-end-

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE of the City Council of the City of Bremerton, Washington, amending BMC Chapter 10.36.010 entitled "Compression Brakes".

WHEREAS, this ordinance seeks to align the provisions of City code with State law and County code, and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that equipping a vehicle using compression brakes with an operational muffler, exhaust system or other lawful apparatus may adequately dampen noise that would otherwise disturb and disrupt the public peace and quiet, and

WHEREAS, muffled compression brakes serve a legitimate purpose of enhancing safety and reducing the rate of deterioration of a vehicle's primary braking system, and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to amend provisions relating to compression brakes within the City of Bremerton. NOW THEREFORE,

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BREMERTON, WASHINGTON, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 10.36.010 of the Bremerton Municipal Code entitled "Compression Brakes" is hereby amended to read as follows:

10.36.010 UNMUFFLED COMPRESSION BRAKES PROHIBITED.

No person shall use motor vehicle brakes within the city limits of the City of Bremerton which are in any way activated or operated by the compression of the engine of any such motor vehicle or any unit or part thereof, unless the motor vehicle is equipped with an operational muffler, exhaust system or other lawful apparatus that effectively muffles the noise. It shall be an affirmative defense to prosecution under this section that said compression brakes were applied in an emergency and were necessary for the protection of persons and/or property.

10.36.020 VIOLATIONS - PENALTY.

Any person violating the provisions of BMC 10.36.010 shall have committed a traffic infraction and a maximum penalty of \$250.00 shall be imposed.

10.36.030 AUTHORITY TO POST SIGNS.

The City Engineer is authorized and directed to post appropriate signs consistent with the provisions of BMC 10.36.

SECTION 2. *Corrections.* The City Clerk and codifiers of this ordinance are authorized to make necessary corrections to this ordinance including, but not limited to, the correction of scrivener, clerical, typographical, and spelling errors, references, ordinance numbering, section/subsection numbers and any references thereto.

SECTION 3. Severability. If any one or more sections, subsections, or sentences of this ordinance are held to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portion of this ordinance and the same shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force ten (10) days from and after its passage, approval and publication as provided by law.

PASSED by the City Council the _____ day of _____, 20__.

ERIC YOUNGER,
Council President

Approved this _____ day of _____, 20__.

GREG WHEELER, Mayor

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ANGELA HOOVER, City Clerk

KYLIE J. FINNELL, City Attorney

PUBLISHED the _____ day of _____, 20__.

EFFECTIVE the _____ day of _____, 20__.

ORDINANCE NO. _____.

To: Public Safety Committee, City of Bremerton
Copy: Bremerton City Council, Mayor, Fire Chief, Police Chief
From: Teresa Walker
Date: May 2, 2025

Dear Council Members:

I listened in on the Public Safety Committee meeting of May 1, 2025. I would like to address some statements that were made.

First, the Chair indicated that any action to ban fireworks, to be effective, must come from the citizenry banding together to file an initiative. In my opinion, this view constitutes an abandonment of responsibility. We elect governmental officials to carry out certain sworn duties, such as to protect and defend the public - including its most *vulnerable citizens*, who may not be able to vote, collect initiative signatures, fund an initiative, or even speak for themselves.

The rationale appeared to be that those being harmed by fireworks must spend considerable time and money to generate an initiative to do what council members are elected to do – safeguard the public.

It also appeared that the Council's issue is "who is in the majority?" – those that like fireworks or those that don't? The problem with this rationale is that it allows the popular "majority" to injure, impair, or damage the "minority." It astounds me that consumer fireworks harm is exempt from the sound logic that is employed elsewhere in the public arena. To give one example, year-round we do not allow cigarette smoking in public places, yet for weeks in June and July fireworks fill the air with harmful smoke and chemicals, impairing the health of those with respiratory illnesses.

May I remind the Council that the U.S. government is not a democracy but a Constitutional Republic in which the rights (e.g., to breath and sleep) of even the minority are to be respected and protected?

Second, the Chief indicated that it would be of no use to ban fireworks in Bremerton as long as there was not an accompanying fireworks ban in Kitsap County. That is, as long as fireworks are sold within Kitsap County and by the Tribes, there would still be consumer fireworks discharged in Bremerton. My rebuttal to this view is:

- A ban on the sale and discharge of fireworks in Bremerton would reduce the amount of fireworks put-off. At least *some* law-abiding citizens that currently discharge fireworks would refrain from discharging them. Any reduction would be an improvement over the current level.
- A ban on the sale and discharge of fireworks in Bremerton would make it easier to enforce the City's fireworks ordinance. Police and Fire Department personnel would no longer have to identify whether this was a "legal" or "illegal" firework, or whether it was discharged from a public street or private property. ANY discharge of fireworks would be subject to a fine.
- Fireworks bans are being enacted all over western Washington, as the population density increases. Bainbridge Island and Gig Harbor have joined King County, Tacoma, Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater, Shelton, Port Townsend, Port Angeles, and many other cities that ban fireworks, regardless of whether this extinguishes *every* illegal discharge. To protect the growing citizenry, it's time Bremerton did, too. As I recall, doesn't the City's new comprehensive plan project a 40% increase in the City's population by 2040?

Finally, I would like to address the view that fireworks are just a “nuisance” and that the number of complaints is decreasing. I have resided in my current location in Bremerton since 1996. In that time:

- My yard was set on fire by a neighbor’s firework discharge. It burned about a quarter of my front yard, up to within a foot of the house. I was left with a black yard. Nothing was done to the perpetrator.
- My hedge was set on fire another year. Again, nothing done to perpetrators.
- Two years ago, the fireworks explosions from the street blew the downspout off of my gutter.
- Two windows that face the street now have broken seals from fireworks explosions.
- I have had Roman candles whiz across my corner lot by male tenants chasing each other and firing them like paintball guns. This was while my young child was in the yard.
- I have had to endure nerve-jarring, window-rattling explosions at all hours of the day and night for weeks before and after the July 4th holiday.
- In June and July for several years, I was repeatedly harassed, threatened, and verbally abused when I asked the apartment tenants to not set fireworks off in the street or on the sidewalk in front of my house. Police and fire personnel do not respond to this type of fireworks “nuisance.”
- Due to the high level of stress that negatively affects my health, for several years I have had to post “No Fireworks” signage and retreat to a city that bans fireworks. This causes me travel/lodging expenses that I would not have to incur if Bremerton banned fireworks and enforced that ban.

Fireworks are not just a tolerable “nuisance” – they cause harm!

It is likely that fireworks complaints have decreased because people are bailing out of Bremerton since there is no relief or protection for the citizenry.

Thank you for considering this feedback.

Sincerely,

Teresa Walker
Bremerton, WA 98310

Enclosure

Consumer Fireworks:

- injure adults and children every year (both in the production and discharge of fireworks)
- frighten service animals, endangering their disabled owners
- distress infants and persons with anxiety disorders, including veterans with PTSD
- cause fires that destroy lives and private property (millions of dollars)
- cause a burden to firemen, police, and emergency room personnel, who have *repeatedly requested that the public abstain from private fireworks*
- pollute the air with smoke and chemicals that impair respiration and sicken persons with asthma, allergies, and immune disorders.
- cause fires that destroy state/federal lands and forests (requiring mobilization of national guard units – at taxpayer expense)
- cause hostility between neighbors and throughout the community over the noise, smoke, litter, and property risk
- frighten and sometimes kill pets, livestock, and wildlife – animals fleeing fireworks noise cause vehicle accidents
- raise insurance rates
- leave hazardous waste debris on our streets, yards, and waterways