

SOURCE	CRITERION	COMMENT	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE	COBI Comment (Complete by Monday 7/12)
Ross	Quant #1 Resilience and Adaptation	Please eliminate this metric. This metric is essentially meaningless on Bainbridge and does nothing to prevent climate change or resultant sea-level rise. Given official sea-level rise forecasts, most locations will not be inundated within the project life cycle. Some locations susceptible to flooding may still be the best location for a facility. If the facility is along and existing roadway then the mitigation or relocation of the roadway should also include the facility.	Metric deleted.	Agreed
Ross	Quant #1 Resilience and Adaptation	Please replace this with "Reduce Carbon Emissions Per Capita from Transportation". Estimate this in tons per capita per year x life cycle of investment. This is your most important criteria for addressing climate change and will be critical for projects such as lobbying for a carbon tax.	This is beyond the scope of the project-level evaluation. Estimating carbon emissions reduction on a per-project basis will produce numbers so small as to be meaningless. This type of analysis is better done at the system level and would be more appropriate--although likely still beyond the scope of the project--when the recommended scenario has been identified. This may be an analysis the Climate Action Plan Committee could undertake.	Agree with Response
Ross	General	Eliminate the words "Investment" at the beginning of every Objective and "Project" at the beginning of every Criteria. If needed place in the row header only.	No change made. Language is intended to support STTF evaluation and may be useful for the time being.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #1 Climate Change	Make this Quantitative and rename to "Reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled Per Capita". Measure this in (and verified) vehicle miles reduced per year per capita as a positive number and, and increased miles travelled (for example due to creating one-way couplets) as a negative value. Use the annual ADT traffic count data to estimate the value.	This is beyond the scope of the project-level evaluation. Estimating VMT on a per-project basis will generally produce numbers so small as to be meaningless (with a high-capacity transit project as a potential exception). We can estimate the likely VMT reduction of the recommended scenario--or the near-term action plan--when we get there, assuming scope and budget allow. We have changed the scoring to reflect the VMT reduction potential of different types of projects (also addresses comment from Councilmember Carr).	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #1 Climate Change	Strike the words ", thereby increasing non-auto mode share" as this is irrelevant to this specific goal. Make this Quantitative and rename to "Reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled Per Capita". Measure this in (and verified) vehicle miles reduced per year per capita as a positive number and, and increased miles travelled (for example due to creating one-way couplets) as a negative value. Use the annual ADT traffic count data to estimate the value.	See response above. Removed "thereby increasing non-auto mode share" to simplify.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #2 Electrification:	Consider eliminating this as it is a strategy for achieving "Reduce Carbon Emissions Per Capita from Transportation". If it is kept, make it Quantitative as number replaced fossil fuel vehicles per year. Use a negative number for new purchases of fossil fuel vehicles (hybrid or not.) The latter will be important in shaping City vehicle purchases. per year x life cycle of investment.	No change made. This is an important criterion to some members of the STTF, and assessing the number of fossil fuel vehicles replaced each year isn't possible on a project-by-project basis.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #2 Environmental Protection	Rename to "Tree Protection": minimizes loss of community valued trees." Criteria: Avoids removal of healthy trees of 40 years of age or older. Negative value based on the number of trees removed times a multiplier of the age group of each tree (200 year old trees have an exponentially higher multiplier than 40 year old trees.) This is important because of the level of community resistance to removing trees.	Metric deleted. Specific suggestion is now captured in changes to Qual #3.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #3 Scenic and Rural Character	Score this as a quantitative negative number starting with a negative 10 if the project disturbs beyond the back of maintained ditch and another negative 1 for every foot the project disturbs beyond the existing maintained back of ditch.	Name of criterion and objective language updated to include minimizing impact to the island's tree canopy (per comment above). However, no changes have been made to the scoring. Projects are not yet defined to a level of detail to inform assumptions about the number of trees (and which trees) would be impacted or the potential disturbance caused by a project, so this remains qualitative and scored as yes/no.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #4 Scenic and Rural Character	Eliminate. Important but not relevant to this case.	No change made. This criterion has been a priority for STTF members.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #3 Crash Reduction	Objective should be to "Mitigate known safety risk or hazard". Eliminate 1/4 mile radius or distance criteria. Crashes are typically related to very site-specific risks and it is important to understand the details of the crashes to address those risks. Projects to address those risks must be very context sensitive (a "facility" is often not the solution). Those crashes that are explained by more typical Level-of-Service parameters should be addressed under a Level-of-Service (not Level-of-Stress) criterion	No change made. The combination of safety-focused criteria address this point. Focusing on known crash locations is important, and every project near a crash location presents an opportunity for improvement.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #4 Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety	Revise to "will bring corridor up to adopted Pedestrian and/or Bicycle Level of Service". Do not use "Level of Stress" as it is not legitimate or objective and can not be cross-used for Concurrence or Non-Moto Impact Fees and can not be effective used to test the efficacy of a proposed project. Score based on the project length times the degree of improvement of level of Service. More how to tune and efficiently and easily measure BLOS and PLOS later. LOS will also cover heavy-vehicle/truck/bus impacts.	No change made. Level of stress is both legitimate and objective; furthermore, the methodology has been tailored to the Bainbridge Island context. The City doesn't have an MLOS standard (or bicycle or pedestrian LOS)--although that will be recommendation of the plan--therefore this isn't realistically within the current scope.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #5 Access to School:	Eliminate. Redundant to Quant #11. Could be changed to mode shift of fossil fueled vehicle drop-offs.	No change made. The extra focus on schools is intentional and is in keeping with guidance from the STTF.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #6 Access to Senior Housing	Eliminate. Important but irrelevant to this case.	No change made. Improving access for older adults has been a priority of the STTF.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #5 Dedicated Space	Eliminate. Redundant to Quant #4 once LOS is corrected. Besides, this is not about creating a dedicated space but rather making the mode viable.	Metric deleted. Disagree with the logic stated here--it is not redundant and creating dedicated space has many benefits--but any project can be designed with separation.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #7 Equity	Eliminate. Important but irrelevant to this case. Also, census tract granularity makes this unworkable.	No change made. It is not irrelevant to the project's goals; in fact, equity is central. Census data is the data we have available, and while it isn't perfect, it does point to concentrations of key populations.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #8 Affordability	Eliminate. Important but irrelevant to this case. Also, census tract granularity makes this unworkable. Note the tax burden on Bainbridge is effectively ending affordability; the project list does not help this.	No change made. It is not irrelevant to the project's goals; in fact, equity is central. Census data is the data we have available, and while it isn't perfect, it does point to concentrations of key populations.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #6 Accessibility	Eliminate. Important but irrelevant to this case. Also, census tract granularity makes this unworkable.	No change made. Criteria is qualitative and doesn't rely on Census data.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #7 Gender Mode Split	Revise to "Address Cultural Barriers Including Systemic Racism and Sexism". The Objective should be revised to: "Address existing disparity in a way that will cause people to mode switch from fossil fuel transportation to non-motorized or renewable powered." Measure with general public questionnaire.	Name of criterion and objective language updated to reflect potential for the project to address a systemic inequity. Focus remains on anticipation of low-stress facilities for scoring. Because this is qualitative, the project team and the STTF will conduct the scoring; a general public questionnaire is not within the scope of the project.	Agree with Response
Ross	General	Change Section Name to "Fast and Convenient". If we are serious about significant numbers of mode switch on Bainbridge then the preferred mode must be nearly as fast or faster than the existing mode and reasonably convenient. Otherwise it will not be successful.	No change made. The goals of the plan were adopted by Council in November 2020.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #9 Transit Access	Generalize to "Improving Trip Pooling". This includes on-site deliveries with one truck delivering say a hundred orders rather than those hundred customers traveling to Silverdale; this will also help Bainbridge's tax revenue. Eliminate the 1/4 and 1/2 mile, almost everywhere is the "last mile" so it is not valuable.	No change made. We have strategies (programs and policies) to encourage trip pooling, but it is not a criterion that will help with project scoring. The distances have been maintained to help differentiate between projects. Without them, the entire island gets a point, which is not useful for project-level evaluation.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #10 Sustainable Growth	Redundant to Quant #11. Revise to support TDRs into Winslow within easy and quick walking distance to the ferry.	No change made. It is intentional that we are giving Centers extra points.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #12 Phase 1 AAA Network	Eliminate. This wrongly presumes the solution is the AAA network and games the criteria process.	No change made. This simply prioritizes segments of the bicycle network for earlier implementation based on work by the STTF. Most of the previously planned bicycle network (including the Core 40) is captured within the proposed AAA network.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #8 Link-Node Ratio	Consider elimination. Important but redundant to "Reduce Vehicle Miles Per Capita". There are a lot of opportunities for these but a lot of resistance on Bainbridge (Erickson-Hildebrandt, Fort St... etc)	No change made. This is not redundant to reducing VMT, but it can help to advance that goal.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #9 & #10	Weight low	No change made. We are not weighting yet.	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #13 Leverage Planned Investments	Revise to "Project is within project site of another capital project and can be efficiently included the scope". Eliminate "within 1/4 mile", it is actually worse to have conflicting projects.	Updated description to reflect potential value of proximate projects. No change made to distance, as the intent is to capture projects near one another to seek opportunities for "efficiently including in scope."	Agree with Response
Ross	Quant #14 State of Good Repair	Eliminate. Important but redundant to other sections such as known hazards / risks and pavement condition is also covered under Level-of-Service.	No change made. We are not using level of service and this is not redundant. Pavement condition captures known maintenance needs and is the best data available to assess a project's ability to improve existing conditions. Maintenance concerns have been raised consistently by the STTF, the Council, and members of the community.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #11 Feasibility	This should be "Cost/Benefit Ratio and Feasibility" and measured in actual cost benefit as a Quantified value with a step function to infeasible projects having an infinite negative score. One of the biggest concerns with the proposed program list is that it appears infeasible within the foreseeable future let alone the 2045 time frame that is already very late to address climate change.	Updated criterion to focus on feasibility only. Added new qualitative criterion to address cost effectiveness. Conducting a full CBA is outside the scope of this project, therefore a qualitative assessment of cost effectiveness is appropriate. Once projects are scored, we will create a recommended scenario that balances higher cost and lower cost investments with potential return-on-investment of the full set of recommendations.	Agree with Response
Ross	Qual #12 Interagency Partnership	Remove and Replace with "Within City Right-of-Way or City Property" with a no-go negative value if it is not. Work within the State's SR305 corridor or on the dock is important but bicycle, pedestrian and transit traffic in those locations is the State's traffic and the State's cost and resourcing responsibility. We can and should lobby the State, but the City does not have the money, resources or responsibility to take on the State's role.	No change made. Right-of-way can be covered as a consideration within feasibility; Qual #11 has been updated to address this. Partnerships are very different than ROW or property ownership and will be critical for delivering the plan.	Agree with Response
Susan	Climate Action	By far, the most important objective for meeting our climate action goals is reducing VMT and mode shifting. Therefore, the most important suggestion is to weight this in relations to its importance to our overarching goal: The score given should be on a scale of 1-10.	Weighting of criteria will be done after initial scoring and normalizing.	Agree with Response
Susan	Access to School	This only accounts for walking and doesn't account for biking. We should get our single largest mode shift from children biking to school, (large demographic, twice a day commute, intrinsic motivation to bike) so this one is really important to weight correctly. We know most people will bike 2 miles, but since older children will be averaged with younger ones, we could make the a conservative bike shed as 1 mile for school children. Change objective to: "Investment is in proximity to a school" and add criteria of "Project is within 1 mile bike shed of a school."	No change made. It is true that people will bike further than they will walk, but extending the shed for evaluation purposes means the entire island gets a point. That renders the criterion meaningless for project-level evaluation.	Agree with Response
Susan	Resilience & Adaptation	This objective should be taken out of project prioritization and instead be addressed in the implementation phase with specific standards to deal with flood plains and sea level rise.	Metric deleted.	Agree with Response

Susan	Environmental Protection	This objective should be taken out of project prioritization and instead be addressed in the implementation phase with specific standards and designs for dealing with wetlands.	Metric deleted.	Agree with Response
Susan	Equity	Objective Criteria doesn't make very much sense on Bainbridge Island, (if I correctly understand the way it's being objectified). Looking at the NN BI conditions map, it looks like the data is significantly collapsed. The comparative areas are so large that the smaller variations within them have gotten lost. Bainbridge Island isn't like a larger city where there are large neighborhoods where a high percentage of minority people, low-income people or high concentrations of younger or older people live; the scale is much finer here. Therefore, the large geographic segmentations shown on the map become meaningless and it muddles the scoring. Remove from project prioritization scoring and instead address this goal in our policies and programs. (do programs have a prioritization methodology?) Programs include subsidies for lower income households, nearness of program to senior housing, All ages and Abilities design, ect	No change made. Census data is the data we have available, and while it isn't perfect, it does point to concentrations of key populations.	Agree with Response
Susan	Affordability	Objective Criteria doesn't make very much sense on Bainbridge Island, if I understand the way it's being objectified. Looking at the NN BI conditions map, it looks like the data is significantly collapsed. The comparative areas are so large that the smaller variations within them have gotten lost. Bainbridge Island isn't like a city where there are large neighborhoods with a high percentage of low-income people; the scale is much finer here. Therefore, the large geographic segmentations have become meaningless and it muddles the scoring. Remove from project prioritization scoring and instead address this goal in our policies and programs. Programs include subsidies (eg for e-bikes and transit) for lower income household, ect	No change made. Census data is the data we have available, and while it isn't perfect, it does point to concentrations of key populations.	Agree with Response
David	General	Using a 0-1-3-9 rating is another way of forcing rating separation. My experience in creating these type of evaluation tools normally also creates a sheet of operational rating definitions corresponding to 0-1-3-9--and can be different for each filter.	No change made at this time. We will explore this approach after we score and normalize across the criteria.	Agree with Response
Demi	Reduces VMT	One of them is the most important criterion of them all ("Reduces VMT and/or SOV trips") -- that's what this effort is all about. But it has the same weight as other FAR less important criteria in this and other sections. This criterion should be given significantly more weight.	Weighting of criteria will be done after initial scoring and normalizing.	Agree with Response
Demi	Resilience & Adaptation	The "resiliency" criterion (not located in an area likely to be affected by sea level rise) is important but likely to be relevant to very few projects.	Metric deleted.	Agree with Response
Demi	Electrification	The "electrification" criterion relates to a worthy goal, but it is nearly impossible for evaluators to apply -- which projects are likely to enable the use of electric mobility options more than others? Class 1 and 2 electric bikes should be treated as regular bikes for all purposes, so this probably is not a meaningful evaluation criterion for infrastructure projects on Bainbridge.	No change made. This is a qualitative criterion that will be particularly useful for evaluating programs and policies.	Agree with Response. Electrification criteria applies not only to bicycling projects or programs.
Demi	Scenic & Rural Character	All projects should be built in such a way that they enhance the island environment and add vegetation over time. Two of the "green and scenic character" criteria are nearly identical, which in effect doubles the weight of this criterion -- one of them should be eliminated or significantly revised.	Qual #3 has been revised to incorporate canopy protection. Scores will be normalized after the initial evaluation (and before weighting), do the "doubling" effect will be addressed. These criteria have been important to STTF members; therefore, only minor changes have been made at this time.	Agree with Response
Demi	Environmental Protection	The third criterion (completely removed from critical areas) seems problematic for several reasons. Any project built near a critical area will be subject to significant scrutiny, limitation and mitigation measures as a part of the permitting process. But areas like the head of Eagle Harbor are absolutely critical as transportation corridors, and de-prioritizing them because they are near wetlands could produce the wrong result. Please consider deleting this criterion.	Metric deleted.	Agree with Response
Demi	Safety & Comfort	And this section is lacking the most important consideration, by far -- whether the project is likely to improve safety for large numbers of users due to its location in a high-use corridor. <b>Safety improvements in high-use corridors should be prioritized above virtually any other consideration.</b> It may be that high-stress corridors are also high-use corridors, since high levels of traffic lead to higher stress, but consider whether this important criterion should be clarified and given additional weight.	High-stress corridors and the opportunity to improve them does capture the potential to improve safety for many people. Increased scoring to 3 pts within 500 ft and 2 pts within 1/4 mile to reflect importance of this criterion.	Agree with Response
Demi	Crash Reduction	Use of crash reports as a criterion (Safety criterion #1) is difficult in a place like Bainbridge (unlike major urban areas), since crash reporting is spotty, limited and incomplete.	No change made. While the data are imperfect, they are what is currently available.	Agree with Response
Demi	Dedicated Space	The criterion regarding "dedicated space" is flawed, since all bike and pedestrian infrastructure going forward should include some separation from traffic, except on low-volume, low-speed roads, where it is unnecessary. We should no longer invest in sub-standard infrastructure that lacks separation from car traffic -- all projects should include at least significant visual separation and physical separation wherever possible. In addition, having this criterion in addition to the "included in AAA network Phase 1" and the "Project provides low-stress facility to meet the needs of interested but concerned riders" criteria in effect gives excess preference to off-road facilities. This issue must be addressed in order to provide appropriate balance to the criteria.	Metric deleted. Intent is covered in other criteria, and facility design should not be considered in this phase of evaluation.	Agree with Response
Demi	Phase 1 AAA Network	It's also worth noting that the "included in AAA network phase 1" is premised on the assumption that the AAA network is entirely valid and optimal, which may not be a fair assumption.	No change made. This simply prioritizes segments of the bicycle network for earlier implementation based on work by the STTF. Most of the previously planned bicycle network (including the Core 40) is captured within the proposed AAA network.	Agree with Response
Demi	Equity	While equity must be a core consideration for any city transportation plan, the criteria should be tailored to the community. Bainbridge Island is a semi-rural residential community with high median income, a very low poverty rate, and no significant concentrations of low-income housing. Project criteria focused on serving "equity census tracts" make little sense in this context. (Affordable housing and related initiatives to serve low-income residents are critical in order to enable greater diversity on Bainbridge, but that is a separate matter.)	No change made. Census data is the data we have available, and while it isn't perfect, it does point to concentrations of key populations.	Agree with Response
Demi	Gender Mode Split	On the other hand, gender equity (ensuring that the network functions well for users with relatively high concern for safety) is a significant issue on Bainbridge and should be given meaningful weight.	Criterion language has been revised slightly to address other comments, but scoring has not changed. Weighting will be undertaken in the next phase of the process.	Agree with Response
Demi	Connected & Convenient	Several of the criteria value locations very close (1/2 mile or 1/4 mile from a public transportation hub or specific destination) -- this should be carefully considered, since it might produce anomalous results. These criteria favor projects within the walkshed of specific locations, but projects that enhance connectivity by bike are far more likely to enable replacement of car trips.	No change made. Distances are based on industry standards and best practices and have been tailored for Bainbridge Island's context. Increasing the distances results in the whole island receiving a point, which isn't useful for project-specific scoring and differentiation. Connectivity is captured in the AAA Network criterion and in Ease of Access.	Agree with Response
Demi	Ease of Access	Closing gaps in the bike network should be a top criterion for project selection, and most of the current criteria in this section do not seem focused on that. The very last criterion ("Project connects to trail or bike network, improves access to transit, or removes barriers to sustainable modes") is critically important, but it is actually given LESS weight than other less critical criteria -- it should be weighted much more highly.	Scoring revised to give 3 pts for projects that make connections or close gaps.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Climate Action	We continue to hear that this is our primary goal -- the "north star," and that all other goals must follow. It is disappointing that we have NO quantitative evaluation criteria for this goal that address the primary objective or supporting objectives.	Given data availability and the scope of the project, this goal is best addressed through qualitative criteria, especially at the project level. We have revised the VMT reduction criterion within this goal to better capture the potential value of different project types--changing the scoring for projects--and we will continue to look for ways to measure VMT reduction and GHG reduction of the recommended scenario as a whole. Additionally, we will weight the climate criteria once the initial scoring and normalization is done.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Resilience & Adaptation	The only quantitative goal is distance/exclusion from floodplains and potential areas of sea level rise. Also curious what "buffer area" is. Shoreline buffer? This evaluation criterion does zero to meet the objectives for this goal -- what must be done. It is not a bad evaluation criterion, it just doesn't belong here because it does not help us evaluate solutions to meet the stated objectives. This is more of a climate-resilient/adaptation implementation evaluation criterion. <b>It does not address mode shift in any way, which is the primary objective.</b> The location of infrastructure has nothing to do with it. If this criterion is given 2 points, it will mischaracterize the effectiveness of solutions to result in mode shift, EVs, or sustainable travel choices.	Metric deleted.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	VMT Reduction	Project reduces VMT or SOV: How can this possibly be a qualitative criterion? Assigning a qualitative high/medium can be nothing but a best guess. This is the linchpin in this planning effort. What will make me travel less or differently is totally different than what will make someone else travel less or differently. If we build it, will they come? Can this be a binary quantitative criterion? Like a transit project would reduce SOV -- 1 point.	Scoring revised to differentiate between project types and their potential to reduce VMT.	Agree with Response. Scoring revised to differentiate potential VMT reduction by mode.

CM Carr	Environmental Protection	Distance from wetland or critical habitat area. [I don't know what "critical habitat area" means.] I think I saw this covered/asked somewhere else, but I do not think this is positive in all cases. Particularly because it depends on the type of facility. Like Paula was saying, commuters like efficiency and, due to construction requirements/limitations, a facility through a wetland or other critical area would not be highly desirable. Also, mitigation sequencing is required to first avoid impacts, then compensate for unavoidable impacts. So, in the end, there should be no impact/loss of function and value. On the other hand, if this criterion is about trees and tree canopy, that makes sense to me because a) an objective for this goal is to preserve tree canopy and b) that is one of the biggest "battles" of recent trail/facility development – tree loss. The facilities were not in critical areas, it was all about the trees. The distance from a wetland or critical habitat area really doesn't matter. Besides, wetland buffers are only a maximum of 200 feet – why do facilities need to be 1/4 mile away to score high?	Metric deleted (Quant #2). Tree canopy protection has been added to Qual #3.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Safety & Comfort	There needs to be additional criteria in this goal to address people walking and rolling now on existing facilities! The safety and comfort of people walking and rolling NOW needs to be addressed in this plan. It is totally focused on new/future facilities. We need to maintain/improve what already exists. We are neglecting our existing network and our existing sustainable movers.	Added new quantitative criterion (Quant #15) to address existing facilities. Projects that overlap with an existing walking or biking facility--and present an opportunity to improve that facility--will now receive an extra point.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Senior Housing	This doesn't seem relevant on the island since most (all?) of the senior housing is in Winslow. I don't think the one-off senior housing facilities should rank higher, unless they are as employment centers. Seniors are not likely going to be going anywhere from the type of senior housing facilities we have. I doubt family members would visit by sustainable modes. Maybe employees would.	No change made. Improving access for older adults has been a priority of the STTF.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Equity & Affordability	My guess is that these criteria are not valuable due to the combination of age and income. Old people are scattered everywhere, so are young people. If they are concentrated, it is in Winslow. If it is grouped in one area of the island, it is a coincidence and won't last past the life of any infrastructure put there because of it (e.g. Crystal Springs/Point White). The concentrations of old people and low-income people probably occur in Winslow.	No change made. Census data is the data we have available, and while it isn't perfect, it does point to concentrations of key populations.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Gender Mode Split	Gender mode split/interested but concerned: I think this process has been overwhelmingly influenced by interested but concerned women. I do not think that Bainbridge Island shares the same characteristics as the research/data used to support the bias toward these user groups. We most likely – more than most likely – do not match up with the 60% figure of interested but concerned and we have way more confident riders than 1-2%. Families who want to ride their bikes aren't doing mode shift -- they are going out for a ride on a weekend. Is that who we are building a network for? The increase in the amount of female bicycle commuters was huge before the pandemic (on the ferry). I used to be one of maybe 3 women (when I started 20 years ago). Now men and women are nearly equal. Do we have gender for the ferry bike counts? Women were already starting to ride more without massive expenditures in separated pathways. We cannot use national data for Bainbridge Island. We need to use Bainbridge Island data for Bainbridge Island.	Criterion language has been revised slightly to address other comments, but scoring has not changed.	Agree with Response. The objective is broader than women bicycle commuters.
CM Carr	Link-Node Ratio	Project creates new crossings? Aren't crossings where accidents happen? I don't get how this is positive. I don't think the island is going to increase street connectivity or intersection density -- is that the island you think the Comprehensive Plan envisions? This criterion needs to be deleted.	No change made. This criteria isn't rewarding the creation of crossing conflicts, it's intended to highlight where there are crossings (that likely already exist in some capacity) with the intent of making them safer. Additionally, the criteria is intended to reward projects that link together-- part of the overall goal of the network strategy.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Modal Density	Modal density for non-motorized. For me, this is the whole point of this plan. It needs to have more points for yes or be weighted very high.	Scoring has been revised to reflect the importance of this criterion. Weighting will be done in the next phase of evaluation.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Quant #14 State of Good Repair	Project is located on a facility rated fair or poor. How is "facility" defined? Is this a non-motorized facility? Or a street? What does "fair" or "poor" mean? Is this related to our annual road maintenance program? I don't understand this criterion but it could be useful to get at our existing network -- improving what we have now.	No change made. This criteria is based upon pavement condition index (PCI) scores for the project location. The idea is to concentrate investments in places where there are multiple infrastructure needs that should be addressed.	Agree with Response
CM Carr	Feasibility	Can we have a criterion that asks about the project's estimated cost within a range of the average? Or some way to evaluate if it's a super expensive project (like a boardwalk across the head of the bay) or a super inexpensive project (like green paint/stripping improvements)? Overall, the evaluation for this goal are weak and need improvement to help us evaluate cost implications of the plan/near-term actions. "Cost effective" and "feasible" are too vague.	Updated criterion to focus on feasibility only. Added new qualitative criterion to address cost effectiveness. Once projects are scored, we will create a recommended scenario that balances higher cost and lower cost investments with potential return-on-investment of the full set of recommendations.	Agree with Response