



**Steering Committee Meeting Summary
West Kitsap Way
Teams Virtual Meeting
March 29, 2023**

This was the second meeting of the Steering Committee for the West Kitsap Way project. The meeting topic was focused on the review of the alternatives for the corridor developed by the Project Team.

Attendees

Katie Ketterer, City of Bremerton – Project Manager
John Davies, KPG Psomas – Project Consultant
Shane Webber – City of Bremerton, Engineering
Tom Knuckey – City of Bremerton, Public Works & Utilities Director
Marco Diccio – Kitsap School District
Edward Coviello – Kitsap Transit
Bridget Glasspoole – Kitsap Mental Health Services
Colette Berna – City of Bremerton, Parks Department
David Forte – Kitsap County, Public Works
Garrett Jackson – City of Bremerton, Planning
Nichole Leaptrot-Figueras – Bremerton Naval Base
Allison Satter - Bremerton Naval Base
Christine Salo – Resident
Crystal Koch – Kitsap Health District

Meeting Highlights

Introduction

Each attendee introduced themselves.

Project Overview Presentation (John Davies):

John (consultant) used a PowerPoint presentation to provide update on the project since the last meeting. The presentation included:

- Welcome and introductions
- Recap of 1st Steering Committee meeting
- Project Update
- Roles and responsibilities
- Evaluation criteria
- Draft alternatives
- Next steps

Recap of 1st Steering Committee

John (consultant) reviewed items covered in the first steering committee meeting and the changes to the overall schedule including the movement of the 2nd open house to June.

Project Update

John (consultant) reviewed the findings of the 2050 forecast that indicated that Kitsap way can be designed with one through travel lane in each direction. The Project Team prepared draft alternatives, which are presented for the steering committee's review today.

Evaluation Criteria

John (consultant) also provided a list of suggested evaluation criteria that would be used to help define and evaluate the alternatives. John showed a draft of the matrix that will be used to evaluate the alternatives. The results will be incorporated into the Open House 2 presentation to provide information to the public when reviewing the alternatives. Information would likely be displayed as pros/cons for each alternative.

- Safety – addresses existing deficiencies
- Pedestrian and bicycle – provides an all ages and all abilities facilities
- Traffic operations – improves intersection and corridor operations
- Transit operations – improves corridor bus operations
- Vehicle access to properties – improves property access and parking
- Property impacts – amount of property and right of way required
- Cost comparison – construction costs

Discussion

Katie (City) clarified that that we would like feedback from the steering committee and whether we are missing any evaluation criteria or if the criteria need to be changed.

Tom (City) – suggested that we include the likelihood that an alternative might receive grant funding and in assessment of how an alternative might be implemented. He also suggested that the ROW criteria should consider the areas of the corridor when ROW is being utilized as parking for businesses. For the cost criteria he suggested that the scoring should be more detailed than a ranking.

Shane (City)– Suggested including storm water or corridor esthetics as part of the alternatives.

David (Kitsap County) – Mentioned that Kitsap Way serves a regional travel need, and attention should be given to the connection to Kitsap County especially since points north of the City/County line have rural zoning designations and are not included in the urban growth area. He also suggested that the roundabouts and u-turns are not essential for the median alternative and that we should consider their benefits independently. The median alternative may provide more traffic capacity than the 3 lane section alternatives.

Bridget (KMHS) – Expressed the need for pedestrian crossing near Crawford and that the alternatives did not show Crawford. Katie mentioned that the alternatives provide concepts for the major intersections of the corridor and that further analysis would be done on minor corridor intersections. Katie suggested that we consider pedestrian crossing spacing as one of the criteria.

Ed (Kitsap Transit) – discussed level of stress as a measure for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Draft Alternatives

John (consultant) reviewed the three alternatives which reflect the level of impact, level of improvement, and the level of cost associated with each alternative. These are divided into low impact, medium impact, and high impact. John went over first the general cross sections, the business district cross sections and layouts, and the proposals for the intersection alternatives.

Discussion on General Cross sections

Ed (Kitsap transit) suggested that a climbing lane might be beneficial to transit. Marco (school district) shared the same concern. Later clarification indicated that both Kitsap transit and the school district might want pullouts near Pendleton place.

David (Kitsap County) expressed the need for transitions at either end of the corridor to connect between the improvements through the business district and the county bicycles/pedestrian shoulder facilities within the county particularly on Chico way.

Shane (City) mentioned that this corridor is important because it will connect with the 6th St. east West bicycle corridor which is currently being developed. Shane mentioned an alternatives bike route through NAD Marine park would be outside of the City's control because it passes through DOD property. Shane also mentioned the issue of bicycles gaining high speeds when travelling down Kitsap way and the importance of having facilities for different level of ability bike riders.

Discussion on Business District Alternatives

John (consultant) review that the business district evaluation required looking at both the cross section and the plan view (looking down from above). John also mentioned that the City's roadway standards do not allow parking along arterial roadways.

Tom (City) indicated that some alternatives remove parking used by businesses, especially on the north/east side of the road..

Marco (schools) wondered if a school bus could access the parking aisles as the school bus has pickups point on the South side of the street in the business district.

Shane (City) raised the concern about alternative B, because the City has concerns about maintaining the parking areas. He also noted that businesses might not like it because it would be public parking, not dedicated business parking. If the Kitsap lake loop trail becomes complete, it's possible that this parking would be used for recreational purposes.

Tom (City) requested providing a parking loss and gain for each alternative.

Christine (resident) raised a concern for people on the south side of Kitsap way having difficulty getting access to northbound travel particularly with the hard median options.

David (County) suggested dividing the trails between bike lanes and pedestrian areas, potentially using different pavement types. This is currently being used for a project in the county.

Tom (City) expressed the concern that the City would need to investigate sweeping and snowplow considerations with the parking aisles.

Discussion on Intersection Alternatives

John (consultant) discussed each of the intersection alternatives. He noted that these alternatives could be somewhat interchangeable and a combination of roundabouts and signals could be used.

Marco (Kitsap schools) discuss the idea of allowing Chico to North Lake movements. Particularly with the roundabout option.

A number of committee members did not like the Chico/North Lake signal alternative. They felt that a signal would not change the speeding issues and that it might create negative queuing issues.

Shane (City) asked if we could get traffic operation data (level of service and queue lengths) for each approach to help assist in the Steering Committee evaluation.

Tom (City) asked the question if we needed additional right of way for a roundabout at Austin Drive. John indicated that we believe that we could get a roundabout in without needing to get into NAD property.

Katie (City) emphasized that the discussion's purpose is to ensure that the alternatives capture the improvements that the study should evaluate, and asked the group if there were other projects that should be considered with these alternatives. As an example she suggested an alternative where Lyle Ave would be right in/right out. Marco (school district) felt that Lyle is an important access for Kitsap elementary school and needed left turns.

David (County) wondered if a 1-lane roundabout would be sufficient at the SR 3 ramps. John (consultant) indicated that to meet operations a 2-lane roundabout would be needed to meet forecasted volumes.

Ed (Kitsap Transit) expressed concern about transit operating in a multilane roundabout. Especially as drivers at the SR 3 tend to be more aggressive and less cooperative. He also said the Kitsap Transit could benefit from a queue jump at SR 3.

Next Meeting

Project team will update the evaluation criteria and provide data so that the steering committee can complete a pros/cons analysis of the alternatives. The alternatives and analysis will be presented to the public at the second open house.