



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY  
WASHINGTON

## NOTES COMMUNITY PLANNING

### Salmon Creek Sub-Area Plan

Technical Advisory Committee

Wednesday, March 24, 2010

2:30 PM – 4:00 PM

Legacy Salmon Creek Medical Center – 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room

The meeting began at 2:35pm.

Attendees included Colete Anderson (Clark County), Beth Holmes (3Creeks), David Heal (Health), Steve Bacon (CRWWD), Ken Burgstahler (WSDOT), Lisa Goorjian (Parks), Samantha Guse (NoSCNBA), Brendon Haggerty (Health), Dennis Johnson (FNBA & Bicycle Advisory Committee), Jacqueline Kamp (Clark County), Mike Mabrey (Clark County), Laurie Lebowsky (Clark County) Avril Massey (NoSCNBA), Bridget Schwarz (FNBA), Dave Taylor (3Creeks & City of Ridgefield), Jim Spinelli (Legacy), Jennifer Halleck (Vancouver School District), David Gray (Battle Ground School District) and Lynn Valenter (WSU-V).

Excused: Oliver Orjiako (Clark County), Bryan Snodgrass (City of Vancouver), Barbara Anderson (NoSCNBA), Scott Gullickson (SC Business), and Mike Bomar (BIA).

#### Transportation continued from March 10.

Following introductions the TAC reviewed circulation “what if” scenarios in the sub-area.

Mike Mabrey passed around a document illustrating circulation scenarios that explained the traffic impact, cost and benefit considerations of each possible scenario. He explained that this comes from the regional transportation model.

The first scenario has NE 139<sup>th</sup> Street extended east to Salmon Creek Avenue. Mike explained that the environmental constraint isn't too bad but it would still be expensive. It would require new signals a quarter mile apart. The new road would replicate the function of the old road.

The second scenario has NE 144<sup>th</sup> Street becoming a 3 lane collector street. Mike explained that this was not an attractive route. It diverts some traffic, but given the cost and proximity of the existing buildings to the roadway and the existing width of the street, it would not be a good candidate.

The third scenario has NE 150<sup>th</sup> Street extended west to NE 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue as a 3 lane collector street. The grade is very steep and the houses are very close to the street. Mike stated that he doesn't see this as a collector and probably would never be anything wider than a two-way, local collector. There are a lot of driveways on the south side which is not desirable in collector-level streets. Mike explained that the group could still recommend the road for connectivity purposes to get from point A to point B and that it is a matter of preference. The group will need to think about what they would like to see. There will be an opportunity to talk about it during the visioning exercise.

The fourth scenario has NE 164<sup>th</sup> Street extended across I-5 with no 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing over Whipple Creek. Mike explained that the county is looking at other ways to provide access to the Amphitheater because of the expense to cross Whipple Creek. There is a proposal to cross over I-5 utilizing the old Pacific Highway right-of-way. This would add significant traffic to NE 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue but would not exceed its capacity.

Lisa stated that Parks would be very interested in providing better connectivity to the Fairgrounds/ Whipple Creek Regional Park. They would also like to accommodate bike and pedestrian traffic. Samantha stated that the North Salmon Creek Neighborhood Association would like to see this connectivity for the residents of the area.

Samantha stated that the No. Salmon Creek Neighborhood association would support the I-5 overpass. The neighborhood has significant transportation problems currently and would not like to add north/south traffic from amphitheater/fairgrounds to an already difficult situation.

Bridget stated that the Fairgrounds Neighborhood association would support the Whipple Creek option rather than the I-5 overpass based on improving the light industrial properties along 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Also, amphitheater/fairgrounds users will be looking for the closest I-5 interchange and to travel across I-5 twice in order to access I-5 at 139<sup>th</sup> Street would be a disincentive. If the overpass is constructed, she feels that most amphitheater/fairground users would still travel north to I-5.

There was a discussion about 139<sup>th</sup> Street. Mike explained that based on the numbers it should be four to five lanes up to 29<sup>th</sup>. Other than that portion of the road, three lanes should suffice.

The fifth scenario looked at a full access driveway to Washington State University from NE 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mike explained that if buses could go up 29<sup>th</sup> they could serve a lot more of the neighborhood and be more efficient picking up additional passengers than the present route of going up Salmon Creek Avenue to the University. The scenario would shift a lot of traffic away from Salmon Creek Avenue to 29<sup>th</sup> Street and the numbers show that would not exceed the road's capacity.

Brendan asked whether it would increase and help C-TRAN's rider-ship, which would then in theory lighten the traffic in the area. Mike agreed with that assumption.

Bridget stated that she believes that there would be opposition from the neighborhood about access to the campus on 29<sup>th</sup> Street because of what the University had promised the neighborhood when they developed there.

Bridget further stated that she doesn't think that 164<sup>th</sup> Street extended would be efficient. On one hand, it is a lower cost solution, but on the other hand the completion of NE 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue opens up more employment land for development.

Mike offered to run other scenarios that the group might want to see. Anyone who has an idea can call or email him.

### **Bike and Pedestrian Plan**

Laurie Lebowsky, the Project Manager for the Bike and Pedestrian plan gave an overview of the plan to the group. Laurie presented statistics that compared and contrasted the cost of road improvements, bicycle infrastructure and health care costs. Some statistics included:

- City of Portland has invested \$60 million in bicycle infrastructure
- It costs \$50 million for 2 miles of freeway interchange construction
- Health Impacts – in 2009, the Center for Disease Control stated that the direct medical cost for obesity was \$147 billion. That cost exceeds the cost for fighting cancer by \$50 billion.

Laurie explained that the Board of County Commissioners appointed a Bicycle Advisory Committee whose goal was to develop a Bicycle Plan. Through researching the project, staff found that the county had done a bicycle plan in 1972 and 1996 and that staff didn't even know they existed. It was then determined that the county would do a joint Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. Several of the TAC members are also on the Bike and Pedestrian Plan committee. The plan will include policies, vision and an inventory of bike lanes.

Laurie explained that the sidewalk inventory has been done for the Salmon Creek sub-area and that she will come back before the group with a map and recommendations. Laurie also explained that a

Health Impact Assessment will be done on the Bike & Ped plan which is unique because it will talk about the health benefits on adopting the plan. The plan will be presented to the Planning Commission to be adopted as policy by 2014. They hope to adopt the plan by December 2010.

Laurie passed out the bicycle inventory map for the sub-area and explained the legend key.

- A full bike lane is a 4 foot stamped bike lane
- Difficult is a 2 foot or narrower land with a bike stencil
- Shared is a 4 foot lane but has no stencil
- Difficult Shared is a 2 foot land with no stencil
- No Bicycle lane is a road with no shoulder

The next Bike & Ped meeting is April 12<sup>th</sup> from 4:30-6:30 p.m. at the Public Service Center in downtown Vancouver.

Ken wondered whether the 134<sup>th</sup> Interchange project would cause an impact on bike & ped access. He isn't sure if it will hinder or help access. The 139<sup>th</sup> Street bridge should help access.

Lisa asked about the sidewalk inventory for the sub-area. Laurie explained that it has been done and that the consultant has it and is working on a list of proposed sidewalk projects. Laurie will bring the map and project list to the visioning meeting.

Lisa suggested that we show the trails on the map so that we don't duplicate infrastructure.

There was discussion that the bike and pedestrian facilities should be beefed up at the new park-n-ride.

Laurie reviewed with the group the Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Evaluation Criteria.

Mike suggested bike striping along 159<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>. He also suggested it on 179<sup>th</sup> between 15<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>.

There was discussion about the bridge over Whipple Creek on Union Rd/NE 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It is currently not safely accessible and with the 164<sup>th</sup> crossing, it should be looked at. It connects 15<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>.

David stated that we need to try and get these connections because of not only the physical activity by biking, but to provide access to get around by foot. Plus if more people use alternate modes, it makes the county healthier overall.

It was also suggested that Laurie look at the connection through the WSU campus south from NE 159<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup>.

## **Schools**

Representatives from the Vancouver School District and Battle Ground School District reviewed with the group the issues that face school districts.

David Gray from Battle Ground stated that they are looking at growth where urban holding was recently lifted. They have property near WSU and would like to partner with the county and Parks to develop. David explained that Pleasant Valley is at capacity and has limited or no ability to enhance. Also the Glenwood-Laurin campus is at capacity. David told the group that they are limited by not having sewer connections. The current focus has been on Orchards because of the development occurring. The Tukes campus has room but they would have to shift boundaries to move kids north.

Jennifer Halleck from the Vancouver School District explained that the boundary lines for the school districts were drawn a long time ago and probably were drawn around farming properties. The VSD works with demographers and building permits and look at proposed developments to determine how many kids may be coming their way. However, it all depends. The state will not let school districts build for future students until the existing schools are at or past capacity.

The TAC asked how school district boundaries are changed. Jennifer and David explained that it is very tough. Vancouver did it recently because of overcrowding. It has to be done by a vote by those in each School District and there is an appeal process. Many people do not want it because of the tax cost is different between districts.

David shared with the TAC that Battle Ground School District was currently looking at a 20 acre site at 119<sup>th</sup> and 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. He also explained that the type of housing developed affects the forecast for students. He stated that sidewalks are extremely important and that the BG students have hardly any sidewalks to walk to school on. In some areas they have to stop the bus at every driveway because there aren't any sidewalks.

Jennifer stated that it is important to orient the community so that kids can walk to school. She shared with the group the issue with Skyview and that there is no safe path from the residential area adjacent to the campus, so those kids have to take the bus.

In all, the message was that it is important for the neighborhood to be connected to the schools. They are community resources and a community investment. Jennifer and David further talked about the Washington Walking School Bus project. The list below is what the school district would like the TAC to consider during their planning process:

- Pedestrian access;
- opportunities to share property with parks;
- take into account where buses need to travel; and
- to keep the school districts involved in the planning process.

Action Items:

1. The TAC requested the following topics to be added to future meetings:
  - Form-Based Code – roundtable discussion on design standards. Do they apply here?
2. Review the Parks shapefile, there appears to be a missing park.

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 7 at 2:30pm (Public Service Center – downtown Vancouver – 6<sup>th</sup> Floor)**

Topics: Visioning exercise – Mobility (bike, trail, auto)

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.