

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

APPENDIX A

Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

History of Plan Development

JANUARY 2003

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
280 MADISON AVENUE NORTH
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110-1812
PHONE: (206) 842-2552 FAX: (206) 780-0955
DCD@CI.BAINBRIDGE-ISL.WA.US
www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us

THE PUBLIC PROCESS

Non-motorized planning on Bainbridge Island has been an on-going process dating back for more than 20 years. While many of these plans have never been fully implemented, they demonstrate the community's ideas and vision of a desired non-motorized network.

Kitsap County Bike Plan

In 1980, Kitsap County identified a system of bicycle routes for Bainbridge Island. While the plan proposed a system of routes for bicycle travel, it did not propose major facility improvements – only identifying spot improvements along the system. Routes identified in the plan included:

- *SR 305 Corridor Route – Bicycle shoulder improvements along SR 305 in both directions from the ferry terminal to Agate Pass Bridge.*
- *South Bainbridge Route – (a) High School Road-Madison Avenue-Winslow Way-Grow Avenue-Wyatt Way, (b) the entirety of Eagle Harbor Road, and (c) Bucklin Hill Road-Lynwood Center Road-Pleasant Beach Road-Oddfellows Road-Blakely Avenue-Blakely Hill Road-Taylor Road.*
- *North Bainbridge Route – (a) Hidden Cove Road-Lafayette Avenue-Sunrise Drive-Manitou Beach Drive-Moran Road-Lofgren Road-Ferncliff Avenue, and (b) Hidden Cove Road-Manzanita Road-Bergman Road-Miller Road- Fletcher Bay Road.*

1992 Bicycle Plan

The 1992 Bicycle Plan, prepared by the Transportation Advisory Committee, identified the short-term and long-term possibilities for developing a bicycle system on Bainbridge Island. The Plan, which was never formally adopted, established a vision of a community bicycle system. The Plan gathered base information about Island roadways, inventoried existing corridors and routes, and identified a number of short-term and long-term improvements. It emphasized the striping of bicycle lanes and roadway shoulder improvements to provide a network of bicycle facilities. The main elements of this plan included:

- *SR 305 corridor or the Mandus-Olson Road corridor.*

“We are tired of being captive, having overdesigned our cities for our cars and underdesigned them for people.”

*-Dan Burden
6-13-2000*

- *Phelps Road/Miller Road/Fletcher Bay Road corridor.*
- *Madison Avenue Blakely Avenue/ Wyatt Way (Head of Bay).*
- *Lynwood Center/Bucklin Hill Road.*

These main routes would be served through a system of feeder and connector roads including:

- *Eagle Harbor Drive.*
- *Sportsman Club Road.*
- *High School Road.*
- *Separated bicycle path from Blakely Harbor to Blakely Avenue.*
- *Sportsman Club Road.*
- *NE Day Road.*

Pedestrian Roadshow

In July 2000, the Washington State Department of Transportation brought the Pedestrian Roadshow to Bainbridge Island. This event followed the visit of pedestrian expert Dan Burden who gave a stirring presentation on what it takes to develop a walkable community. The Roadshow's focus identified the community's issues and concerns for improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility and access within Bainbridge Island. Top community concerns included:

- *Funding of bicycle and pedestrian facilities/right-of-way.*
- *Pedestrian and bicycle safety.*
- *Sidewalk improvements in Winslow.*
- *Driver behavior and speed.*
- *Standards for sidewalks, trails, and bicycle pathways.*
- *Maintenance.*
- *Vision and implementation.*

Community Involvement

In late September of 2000, a Non-Motorized Transportation Plan Steering Committee was formed with representatives from the City's Planning and Public Works Departments, City Council, Planning Commission, the Parks District and the School District who are all participants in the plan. This committee was responsible

for planning public meetings, giving direction to the consultant, and final review of proposed goals and policies and development of draft system maps.

On November 2, 2000, a Public Meeting was held to “kick off” the development of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. Approximately 150 members of the community gathered around tables and marked up maps with comments about which routes they would like to see developed, where there were dangerous conditions, and any other information they could provide. After the meeting, maps were distributed to volunteers to inventory what they knew about the Island facilities, i.e., paved shoulders, informal trails, and where they would like to see connections.

A 12-member citizen committee was also formed to develop goals and policies for the Plan. This committee held seven meetings and produced a document with goals and policies that address mobility and connectivity, design and construction, safety and maintenance, education and implementation.

Based on the input from the public meeting and from the citizen inventories, an existing conditions map was developed that included portions of an existing bicycle plan plus additional facilities that were desired by the community. The Steering Committee reviewed these maps and the goals and policies. The committee also developed a “Non-Motorized Use Map” which classified each segment of roadway by type of use. This was an important interim step in developing the System maps.

Using the Non-Motorized Use map, staff developed a proposed system map which shows a specific facility type for each side of each segment of road in addition to off-road trails. Proposed facility designs were then developed.

These were then presented at a second public meeting, which was attended by about 120 persons. Participants were invited to write their comments right on the maps. Comment sheets were also provided. They were also asked to prioritize major categories of facilities, i.e., school access, commuter corridors, etc. Based on the input, the proposed system maps were revised and segments measured in order to determine capital costs of the system and to complete the proposed draft plan.

After approval by the Planning Commission, this plan went through another extensive review process with the City Council's Land Use Committee (LUC). The LUC meetings were attended by interested property owners whose lots are adjacent to proposed facilities, members of the bicycle advocacy group Squeaky Wheels and other community members. Goals and Policies were added to incorporate neighborhood character and design standards were changed to reflect a desire for less pavement. The Land Use Committee's review culminated in an Open House and

Public Hearing. More than 135 people came out to review and comment on the Council's proposed revisions.

Community Priorities

As part of the May 2001 workshop attended by 120 citizens, a community survey was conducted to establish the manner by which the non-motorized system should be developed. Six strategies were proposed, each focusing on developing one aspect of the system:

1. *Start with Winslow* – Builds facilities in Winslow area where most of our population and non-motorized users live.
2. *Start with Schools* – Provides facilities to children in the vicinity of school areas. May also help commute corridors and general non-motorized mobility.
3. *Start with Commuter Corridors* – Encourages more commuters to travel farther distances.
4. *Focus on Connections* – Identifies where there are non-motorized uses and emphasizes the connections between existing segments.
5. *Start Big* – Puts effort into a large project such as the north-south Mandus Olson corridor.
6. *Start with Neighborhood Service Centers* – Encourages (safe) walking and improves Neighborhood Service Centers opportunities.

Community members attending the workshop were asked to place in rank order (from 1 to 6) each of the six strategies, based on their perceptions of need and community importance. Results of the survey found that school needs were prioritized the highest, followed by commute corridors, Winslow, and connections.

Based on the May 2001 community prioritization exercise, each of the identified system segments were categorized and ordered to reflect the community needs and desires. The top segments were reviewed for meeting system goals and policies and forwarded ~~to~~for inclusion into the six-year plan (Table 5-1).

Table A-1. Community Priority Projects For Six-Year Plan

Facility Description/ Minimum Standard	High Priority Projects*
	* These projects are not listed in order of preference
<u>ISLAND AREAS</u>	
10' Separated two-way pathway	▪ Puget Power Utility Corridor from SR 305 to Dolphin Drive.

Facility Description/ Minimum Standard	High Priority Projects*
5' bicycle lane + 3' paved or gravel pedestrian path	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ N. Madison Avenue from Valley Road to Manitou Beach Drive. ▪ Fletcher Bay Road from New Brooklyn Road to High School Road. ▪ Bucklin Hill Road from Blakely Avenue to Fletcher Bay Road.
School Facility – 5' bicycle lane and 4' curbed pedestrian pathway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ N. Madison Avenue from S. of Torvanger Road to Valley Road. ▪ Day Road from SR 305 to Sunrise Drive. ▪ Wyatt Way from Eagle Harbor Drive to Finch Road. ▪ Eagle Harbor Drive from Wyatt Way to Bucklin Hill Road. ▪ Bucklin Hill Road from Eagle Harbor Drive to Blakely Avenue. ▪ Blakely Avenue from Bucklin Hill Road to Blakely Harbor Park. ▪ Baker Hill Road from Lynwood Center Road to Blakely Avenue.
3'-5' paved shoulder + 2'-3' gravel pedestrian path	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fletcher Bay Road from High School Road to Lynwood Center Road. ▪ Blakely Avenue from W. Blakely Avenue to Blakely Park.

WINSLOW

10' sidewalk + bike lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Madison Avenue from Wyatt Way to Winslow Way. ▪ Olympic Drive from Winslow Way to End.
7' sidewalk + bike lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hildebrand Lane from High School Road to Wallace Way.
5' sidewalk + bike lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grow Avenue from Wyatt Way to Winslow Way. ▪ Wyatt Way from Finch Road to Gowen Place.
10' sidewalks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Winslow Way from Ericksen Avenue to Olympic Drive (SR305).

Preliminary System Development

Working with consultants, the preliminary development of the proposed Non-Motorized System included input and review by the Steering Committee, review by the citizen's Goals and Policies subcommittee, and was presented to the public for review. A detailed process was followed to develop the proposed Non-Motorized System. The process included three primary steps:

- *Classification of the transportation network to identify the non-motorized use of the system.*

- *Development and application of evaluation criteria.*
- *Assignment of non-motorized standards to roadway segments.*

Step 1 - Classification of the Transportation Network

The Non-Motorized Steering Committee assigned one of four non-motorized classes to each segment of the roadway system, in order to identify the primary non-motorized purpose and use of each. Table A-2 identifies and describes each non-motorized class. Roadways with very low traffic volumes or few non-motorized trips were not included in the classification. Map C and Appendix C display the final Non-Motorized Classification for all elements of the non-motorized network.

Table A-2. Non-Motorized Classes and Description

Non-Motorized Class	Description
NM-1 High Use	NM –1 represents high use corridors near public schools, in the Winslow area and Neighborhood Service Centers. This classification recognizes the importance of these routes for moving non-motorized users to non-motorized attractions. These corridors are primary routes with high volumes of motorized and non-motorized users.
NM-2 Commute	NM-2 represents primary bicycle commute corridors that connect to important employment and transportation centers. NM-2 corridors are primarily used during commute hours by more experienced users of the system.
NM-3 Connections	NM –3 routes represent important connections to higher classification non-motorized routes and provide access to parks and other recreational opportunities. The class assumes users of a variety of levels of experience and skills.
NM-4 Other NM	This class covers designated non-motorized system routes that provide access to neighborhood areas and secondary connections to higher classification facilities. These routes typically have lower volumes of motorized and non-motorized uses.

Step 2 - Development and Application of Evaluation Criteria

The Non-Motorized Steering committee identified the issues and needs of each segment of the system. The criteria, as indicated in Table A-3, considered facility users, topography, traffic volumes and speeds, safety, location, and connectivity in the identification of the non-motorized transportation system network. The Steering Committee used these criteria to identify the locations where a higher standard of

non-motorized facility might be required. This process considered both current and future needs of non-motorized users. A summary table of the assigned criteria appears in Appendix B.

Table A-3. System Development Criteria

Criteria	Measure
Facility Use and User Type	Non-Motorized (NM-#) class
Topography	Roadway grade
Traffic	Traffic volumes
Safety	Perceived and measured safety
Location	Proximity to non-motorized attractions
Connectivity	Proximity to key non-motorized classified roadways and general system connectivity needs

Step 3 - Assignment of Non-Motorized Standards

Finally, the Steering Committee assigned non-motorized design standards to the system network. Using the information developed from the existing conditions analysis, non-motorized classification, and the system development criteria, a non-motorized design standard was assigned to each roadway segment of the proposed network. On some roadways, different design standards were applied to each side of the roadway, reflecting different topography or use. This process resulted in a Proposed System Plan.