

# **Snohomish County ADA Citizen Advisory Committee for Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way (ADAPROW Committee)**

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

**DATE:** November 13, 2014

**TIME:** Commenced at 9:00 a.m. and adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

**LOCATION:** Main County Campus. Conference Room 5A07, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Administration West Building

Meeting called to order at 9:00 am, by Ryan Peterson.

**ATTENDEES:** Doug McCormick, Mark Villwock, George Basioli, John Dineen, Harold Wirch, Oliver Sloboda, Brian Way, Candice Soine, Nadeem Mohammad, Ryan Peterson, Matt Feeley, Jon Linders

Excused Absences: Corinna Fale, Jim Bloodgood. Gina Hortillosa

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **(1) Follow-up on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter ADAPROW Committee Field Tour**

Committee members commented / recommended the following:

- Evaluating issues on-site was extremely helpful and it was better to experience ADA elements and features vs. only being able to view them in photos.
- For future walking tours it would be helpful if more than one tour guide was available to talk with participants and answer questions as the tour group is moving between way-points.
- Tour groups should be limited to no more than 10 participants. With more participants it becomes harder to hear and see what is going on.
- Even if the weather is poor future ADA training should include going to at least one pedestrian facility at an intersection near the County campus - unless it is pouring down rain.
- When the weather is bad and it is pouring down rain, a video tour of pedestrian facilities would still be beneficial.

- A blind-fold demonstration would be helpful for participants to experience what individuals with visual impairments encounter when navigating pedestrian facilities.
- It may be helpful if some of the tour guides were citizens with disabilities who volunteer to share their experiences with the tour group.

## **(2) Update on the 164<sup>th</sup> Street SE/SW Preservation Project**

- Ryan provided a summary update on the project and shared that the County reconstructed 68 curb ramps as part of the overlay project. Several of the ramps are in the Mill Creek City limits since the City joined with the County to get 164 ST SE overlaid.
- The curb ramp redesigns were some of the more challenging the County has attempted due to the steep terrain and roadway centerline slopes.
- Pedestrian curbs along the sides and backs of ramps and landings and the raised islands between ramps were used more extensively on the project. Engineers may have gotten the wrong idea that the curbs always serve as shorelines to guide citizens who use long canes to navigate the sidewalk. George demonstrated to Ryan that the pedestrian curbs are not necessarily useful and can be a tripping hazard. Not necessarily a bad idea, just not necessary. In some cases - if designed inappropriately – the pedestrian curbs can be tripping hazards.
- George also recommended that the Braille needs to be larger on signs. Cannot use textbook sized Braille on informational and guide signs in the public right-of-way. Hands and figures get numb when it is cold and the smaller Braille is nearly undetectable.
- Harold asked if it is possible to obtain additional ROW to comply with ADA because there were two ramps that were not reconstructed due to being partially located outside on private property? Ryan explained that the ADA does not require right-of-way to be purchased to upgrade curb ramps if the acquisition of right-of-way is not part of the scope of the project. In other words, if the County is does not intend to

purchase right-of-way for any other reason on a project the County would not be required to purchase right-of-way simply to upgrade ramps.

- A few members suggested maybe the County should contact property owners to get permission to use their property to correctly configure the ramps. Harold seemed to think many might be willing.
- Committee members suggested that the County host a field tour of the new pedestrian facilities on 164 ST SE/SW for the ADAPROW committee sometime in the late spring or early summer of 2015 when the weather improves.

### **(3) APS Pushbutton Volumes**

- A discussion of the upgrades on 164<sup>th</sup> Street SE / SW leads into the next agenda item which is about APS pushbutton volumes. George Basioli tested the new curb ramps and APS pushbuttons on 164<sup>th</sup> Street SE / SW with Ryan Peterson and the first thing that was noticed was that the volume on the APS pushbuttons was so low that the tones and audible messages could not be heard standing right next to the pushbuttons.
- Subsequently, Ryan requested the County's Signal Electricians to adjust the pushbutton volumes and within a few days the County received complaint from a citizen living near one of the signals that some pushbutton volumes were too loud and could be heard from four houses away – at night.
- Ryan gave Committee members a brief overview of the ADA requirements for pushbuttons and then asked the committee members to make policy and procedure recommendations for responding to citizen complaints about pushbutton volumes being too loud. The following comments and recommendations were made:
  - i. A signal technician should follow-up on every citizen complaint and the County should report back to the citizen on what was found and what will be done to correct the problem – if any.
  - ii. County engineers or technicians should offer to meet complainants in-person and on-site to discuss concerns if they so desire.

- iii. The County should follow-up with complainants after changes have been made to see if further adjustments are needed.
- iv. The use of baffles should be considered to direct sound away from residential neighborhoods.
- v. A routine inspection of APS pushbuttons should be made by signal technicians since they are already regularly inspecting the traffic signal equipment.
- vi. At least one quarterly check of the APS pushbutton volume should occur at night during off-peak hours to make sure the volume is not too loud.
- vii. The County should conduct public outreach and provide educational materials – maybe on the County website – to educate citizens about APS pushbuttons and their components.
- viii. The County should explore technology for testing the volume of pushbuttons at distances mandated in the ADA requirements so that volumes can be adjusted appropriately upon installation instead of guessing and then waiting for citizens to complain that the buttons volumes are too low or too loud.
- ix. The County should explore whether or not the pushbuttons log volume levels and, if so, that information could be useful in diagnosing a problem when there is a complaint.

#### **(4) Self-Evaluation Update**

- Matt Feeley provided a summary update of the curb ramp and sidewalk inventory:
  - i. The sidewalk inventory is 67.85% complete with an estimated date of completion – Spring 2015
  - ii. There are 2,000 curb ramps left to inventory with a estimated date of completion – January 2015
- The County is using the sidewalk and curb ramp inventory to build a pedestrian facility computer model network that can be used for:
  - i. Route planning

- ii. Prioritization and ranking
  - iii. Non-motorized network analysis and planning
- Committee members are encouraged to brainstorm ways that the data is being collected can be used. Some ideas include:
  - i. Mapping
  - ii. Website
  - iii. Publishing
  - iv. Partner with Community Transit
  - v. Disability & Senior Services providers

**(5) Transition Plan Update**

- How can the County craft a plan to fix 10,000 curb ramps and hundreds of miles of sidewalk? The Committee can continue to provide input to prioritization and ranking criteria and help the County embody important equal access values into its programming methods and practices.