

Snohomish County ADA Citizen Advisory Committee for Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: August 15, 2013

TIME: Commenced at 9:05 a.m. and adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

LOCATION: Main County Campus. Conference 4D00, 4th Floor West

ATTENDANCE: John Dineen, Corinna Fale, Oliver Sloboda, Mark Villwock, Brian Way, Harold Wirch, Jim Bloodgood, Ryan Peterson, Andy Lentz, Nadeem Mohammad, Doug McCormick, and Candice Soine.

GUEST: Ken Birkel

AGENDA: The meeting was conducted following the agenda that was emailed to each committee member in advance of the meeting. The agenda items included:

1) ADA Transition Planning

a. The County's ADA Compliance Self Evaluation

- The County is conducting an ADA mandated self-evaluation of its programs, services, and activities for compliance with the requirements of Title II of the ADA
- Scope – pedestrian facilities in the public ROW only.
- Purpose – to determine if the County is creating barriers to equal access to citizens with disabilities.
- The self-evaluation is being conducted to determine if the County's program - when viewed in its entirety – is meeting ADA requirements.
- Last self-evaluation was conducted in the early 1990's but the only record is a curb ramp inventory.
- Barriers identified during the self-evaluation could be non-physical as well as physical.
- Non physical barriers include practices, policies, procedures – even unwritten ones – that lead to unequal treatment of citizens with disabilities in the administration of the County's pedestrian facilities program.
- Physical barriers include:
 - ❖ Curb ramps
 - ❖ Sidewalks
 - ❖ Traffic signals systems

- ❖ Cross walks
 - ❖ Bus Stops
 - ❖ Rail Crossings
- The ADA also requires that the County prepare a Transition Plan to remove barriers identified during the self-evaluation process.
 - Not all non-compliant pedestrian facilities in the public right-of-way can be rebuilt at once. A transition plan is to establish a timeline and a plan for removing barriers.
 - ADA Transition Planning basis:
 - Physical barrier inventory
 - Self-Evaluation
 - Citizen input
 - Transition Plans are to include:
 - ❖ Set milestones
 - ❖ Schedules
 - ❖ Progress Dates
 - ❖ Priority given to:
 - Government buildings
 - Transit stops
 - Places of public accommodation
 - Business districts
 - Residential neighborhoods
 - ❖ Procedure for removal of barriers upon request

b. Maps and Inventory

- The curb ramp inventory is about 95 percent complete for the urban areas and the remaining inventory will be completed by next spring.
- A sidewalk inventory is currently being conducted and about 60 miles have been completed. The inventory includes running slopes, cross-slopes, obstructions, damaged panels, vertical deflections, and driveways. Technicians use a handheld Trimble GPS unit to collect data and locate inventory items.
- The initial sidewalk inventory indicates that about 75 percent of sidewalk cross-slopes are not ADA compliant. In years past construction crews were constructing sidewalk cross-slopes using a bubble (spirit) level.
- The level of accuracy in measurements has increased with the use of digital inclinometers and the County currently uses Smart Levels to measure slopes

c. Projects that Trigger ADA Upgrades (There are several entities involved in reconstructing curb ramps)

- Road Maintenance:
 - ❖ Overlay Program – 90 ramps per year
 - ❖ Citizen Requests – 5 / year
- Planning & Development Services:
 - ❖ Utility Franchises - ?? (more research needed)

- ❖ Private Developers - ?? (more research needed)
- ❖ Other Agencies - ?? (more research needed)
- Surface Water Management:
 - ❖ Division Projects – 16/yr
- Engineering Services:
 - ❖ Annual Construction Program (ACP) – 50-75/yr
- Depending on funding (at approx. \$4,000 per ramp) an additional 200 ramps per year could be included in a proactive plan using a prioritization and ranking method.

d. Curb Ramp Prioritization & Ranking (The ADAPROW Committee can really help in this area)

- A prioritization and ranking system could be used in a proactive plan to reconstruct non-compliant curb ramps in addition to the ramps that are reconstructed by the other entities listed previously.
- The prioritization and ranking system should include a way to account for not only the severity of the barrier but also the use of the facilities. The equation may look something like the following:

$$\text{Barrier Severity Score} + \text{Barrier Location Score} = \text{Ranking Score}$$

- The prioritization and ranking system should be:
 - ❖ Dynamic & repeatable
 - ❖ Simple & easy to understand
 - ❖ Able to account for severity & use
 - ❖ Compliant with the ADA which gives priority to certain facilities
- Barrier Severity Score:
 - ❖ More technical, more objective
 - ❖ Easy to calculate & implement
 - ❖ Binary and/or classified ranking
 - ❖ Critical barriers
 - ❖ Weighted or non-weighted.
- Barrier Location Score:
 - ❖ Facilities use more would rank higher
 - ❖ Less technical
 - ❖ More subjective
 - ❖ Harder to calculate & implement
 - ❖ Law dictates certain facilities receive priority
- How do we deal with tie-breakers?

2) Design Resources for Engineers and Designers

Designers and Engineers want to know these four things when it comes to ADA compliance:

(1) What is expected?

- (2) What are the standards?
- (3) How will compliance with the standards be measured?
- (4) What happens if compliance is not achieved or what is expected if compliance cannot be achieved?

The County is attempting to put together design guidance to answer the above questions to include the following documents. The ADAPROW Committee will be asked to review and provide feedback/suggestions on the following documents when drafts are completed:

- a. **ADA Decision Matrix** – The matrix is to help County engineers, utility franchises, and private developers know what is expected of them and what standards they are to meet. Specifically the ADA Decision Matrix will help with design decisions where the ADA is silent or vague, or where County policy goes above and beyond the ADA requirements. The decision matrix attempts to provide consistent guidance for the questions most frequently asked of County staff.
- b. **Measuring Guidelines** – The intent of the measuring guidelines is to help engineers and contractors know how facilities they design and build will be measured for compliances with the standards.
- c. **Construction Tolerances** – The question of construction tolerances will be addressed within the measuring guidelines document.
- d. **Maximum Extent Feasible (MEF) Design Review Policy and Procedure** – The MEF Design Review Policy and Procedures are to help engineers and contractors know what is expected when compliance cannot be achieved. A design review procedure is being developed whereby the engineers must submit documentation to the County Traffic Engineer who must review and approve designs for all non-compliant facilities before they will be allowed to be incorporated into the County's system. Non-compliant facilities that are constructed without review/approval of the County Traffic Engineer will be required to be torn out and replaced with compliant facilities at no cost to the County.

3) **Public Outreach**

- a. **Web Survey** – The initial review of the web survey by the ADAPROW Committee resulted in the recommendation that figures, illustrations, or explanations accompany the survey questions so that non-technical audiences or those unfamiliar with the requirements and terminology of the ADA would be able to understand the survey. The County does not currently have the technology to meet the Committee's request. The unanimous feedback from the ADAPROW Committee was to not send out the web survey at this time. County staff will continue to explore other options.
- b. **Public Meetings** – A public meeting schedule will be set up within the next few weeks and the ADAPROW Committee will be notified as soon as the dates, times, and meeting locations are known. The main purpose of the public meetings will be to solicit feedback on the County's ADA self-evaluation and transition plan.

ADAPROW Committee Follow-Up

- The County will set up the prioritization and ranking framework & send to the ADAPROW Committee for critique & input.
- Assignments were given to specific committee members to check into the availability and use of data that is collected/managed by their employers that may be useful in the prioritization and ranking method.
- Committee members are encouraged to research other agency ranking & prioritization methods.
- The County will send out drafts of the ADA Decision Matrix, Measuring Guidelines, and MEF Design Review Policy for the ADAPROW Committee's review/feedback.
- ADAPROW Committee members received a copy of WSDOT's 2012 Field Guide for Accessible Public Rights of Way. Committee members are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the ADA requirements outlined in the Field Guide as a means to better understand the barrier severity portion of the ranking and prioritization method.
- The committee may want to organize and conduct a field survey or field review of pedestrian facilities in the County.

WHITE BOARD

BARRIER SEVERITY VARIABLES

BARRIER LOCATION VARIABLES

- (1) Locations of Citizens with Disabilities (Proximity)
 - Everett Transit??
 - ARC data – Corrina ??
 - DART addresses - Oliver ??
 - DART ridership patterns – Oliver??
 - Harold recommends contacting
 - National Fed. Of Blind – Bothell
 - D.S. Blind – Seattle
 - Seattle Lighthouse
- (2) Bus Stops (Proximity)
 - Community Transit Ridership (boarding/alighting) data
- (3) Health Clinics/Facilities (Proximity)
 - Jim recommends looking into the Snohomish Co. Emergency Plan.
- (4) Census Data for Age (Density)
 - Housing Authority of Snohomish County
 - Population Densities.
- (5) Public Attractions (Proximity)
- (6) Schools (Proximity)
- (7) Safe Walking Routes (Routes)
- (8) Adult Daycare Centers (Proximity)