

**MEETING TITLE:** Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee  
**DATE:** January 21, 9:00 AM to 11:00 AM  
**INVITEES:** Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee Members (see attached)  
**LOCATION:** Columbia River Crossing Project Office, Vancouver, WA

TIME	AGENDA ITEM
9:00	Introductions
9:05	Review of previous meeting summary and review of Action Items
9:15	Update on Marine Drive interchange options
10:30	Update on public involvement activities and Project Sponsor Council discussions
10:55	Next meeting topics
11:00	Adjourn

**MEETING:** Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC)  
**DATE:** December 10, 2008, 9:00 am – 11:00 am  
**LOCATION:** Columbia River Crossing (CRC), 700 Washington St., Suite 300, Vancouver WA  
**FROM:** David Parisi

**ATTENDEES:**

Bateman, Alissa	WSDOT
Boulanger, Todd	City of Vancouver Transportation Services
Bertelsen, April	PDOT Pedestrian Coordinator
Brown, Kyle	Steps to a Healthier Clark County
Corkill, Seanette	Arnada Neighborhood Association
Cronin, Kevin	Portland Development Commission, Senior Project Coordinator
Freeman, Natalie	Columbia River Crossing, design engineering
Gardner, Emily	Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Goorjian, Lisa	Vancouver-Clark Parks and Recreation
Greulich, Joe	Clark County Bicycle Advisory Committee
Hart, Jane	Metro Parks
Horowitz, Zachary	Columbia River Crossing, traffic engineering
McDonald, Allan	Columbia River Crossing, design engineering
Merrick, Rod	Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Parisi, David	Columbia River Crossing, traffic engineering, PBAC facilitator
Simms, Jim	Member of the public
Rehberg, Shayna	Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee
Valenta, Walter	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association, CRC Urban Design Advisory Group
Wetzel, Alice Ann	City of Portland Bureau of Planning
Williams, Michael	Columbia River Crossing, business manager
Wilton, Hillary	Metro Parks

## Review of October 22 meeting summary

No changes were suggested and the meeting summary was approved.

## Marine Drive stakeholders group update and general discussion

Shayna Rehberg sits on the Marine Drive Stakeholders group and represents the interest of of the CRC PBAC. She provided an update to PBAC on the latest happenings in the decision-making process for the Marine Drive options, and requested PBAC feedback to present at the next Marine Drive stakeholders meeting. The major decisions makers in the process are ODOT, PDOT and Metro/MERC.

Next meeting of the stakeholders group is Tuesday, December 16. MERC will be presenting their master plan for the Expo site. Shayna stated that it was her impression that the stakeholders felt rushed, and were interested in taking extra time to arrive at a good decision after exploring all the options and potential opportunities. This extra time needs to be balanced with the fact the design work for the CRC cannot proceed until the Marine Drive decision is made.

The CRC DEIS examined what is referred to as the “Standard” and “Southern 2” alignments. The original Southern alignment is now back on the table as an option. It is referred to as the “Southern 1” alignment, and contains two 45 MPH curves, one of which would require the project to acquire some buildings and

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

land. Any decision about Marine Drive will come before the Portland City Council so that the public will have an opportunity to comment.

The four different alignments were reviewed, with an explanation of the pros and cons of each, based on information in the Marine Drive criteria matrix. It was noted that the Marine Drive interchange maybe the most important freight interchange in Portland. The pedestrian and bicycle planned facilities would be quite similar under each of the four options. Shayna asked PBAC if they thought her role on the stakeholders group should be to focus on the primary, off-street pedestrian and bicycle improvements at Marine Drive or if should she comments on improvements along Marine Drive itself. There was some discussion of this, but it was generally agreed that the off-street facilities are the most important, but their presence should not preclude improvements elsewhere on Marine Drive, especially given the future needs based on bus stop locations and Oregon state law requiring sidewalks on new or reconstructed roadways.

There was some discussion about the connectivity of the 40-mile loop trail in the area, as well as what the various options would look like from the ground. For example, the “Central” alignment would be partly elevated as it travels through the existing Expo Center parking lot. Lisa Goorjian suggested that the Marine Drive maps should show the location of proposed traffic signals.

Natalie Freeman explained the pedestrian and bicycle improvements for the proposed “gull-wing” intersection providing access to and from MLK Jr. Blvd. to Vancouver Way. Northbound bicyclists would travel down a path on the off-ramp, then underneath the off-ramp and through a tunnel, then complete a 180-degree turn to rejoin the northbound on-ramp. This configuration would allow bicyclists to be separated from the heavy traffic and truck volumes along MLK Jr. Blvd. Seanette commented that since the majority of bicyclists in the area are arriving at the Marine Drive interchange via Delta Park, maybe improvements should be concentrated at that location. It was suggested that Gregg Everhart at Portland Parks & Recreation should become involved in the discussion. Walter suggested a two-way bikeway on the west side of MLK Jr. Blvd. as an alternative to the tunnel at the “gull-wing” intersection.

Walter Valenta made a number of comments concerning his personal opinion about the Marine Drive options. He stressed the potential for opportunity to develop some additional land under the “Southern” or “Central” options. He felt that these options would be able to provide “signature pieces” highlighting the area as a gateway to Portland. He noted that there are a “lot of moving parts” in the discussion about the Marine Drive options, and that any decision will have urban planning implications. He said that in his opinion, the Southern options had a low chance of success of being adopted.

Walter suggested that the PBAC make a recommendation to the Marine Drive stakeholders group in favor of one alignment. April and Rod supported this idea. Jane Hart asked who owns the property that would be up for redevelopment. The answer was that most of the property is in public ownership already (primarily, if not all of the property is owned by ODOT). Rod Merrick expressed his concerns about moving through the new interchange area. Todd Boulanger noted that there is work to be done to ensure connectivity between Expo Road and the Expo Center LRT station, which is a difficult connection today. Rod asked that the interchange be designed as tightly as possible to minimize the amount of space it takes up. There was some thought that the approximately six acres that could be opened up for development is a lot of space, especially in the context of an average size of an urban park is three acres. Alice Ann noted that stormwater concerns have yet to be addressed in the interchange proposals.

## **Bridgeton Trail presentation**

Kevin Cronin, a project coordinator with the Portland Development Commission, gave a presentation about their work on the Bridgeton Promenade project. He said that the project has been in development for at least 10 years.

Kevin discussed a trail study that was completed in July 2007. The Bridgeton Promenade would complete one of the gaps in the 40-mile loop trail that was identified by Metro. Funding will come partly from a Metro bond measure that was passed in 2006. The project has three main phases: 1) completion of the main east-west trail between the Bridgeton neighborhood and ending in the vicinity of the CRC project, 2) completion of one or more north-south access point connecting the main trail with Anchor Way and other locations, and 3) completion of a “lower trail” that would parallel the main trail but be located closer to the river’s edge.

Kevin walked PBAC through his presentation, explaining the project's goals, site location, issues with the levee (the Army Corps of Engineers, to date, has not weighed in on the project). Kevin discussed the acquisition, through the development process, of several north-south easements located adjacent to new development along the river.

## Discussion

Walter suggested that the property he owns, Pier 99, is the plug between the trail connection and the CRC project area. David Parisi noted that the CRC has previously discussed the trail project with Kate Deane at PDC. David also noted that it is currently undecided who will be ultimately responsible for paying for the various connections. Lisa Goorjian suggested that the CRC project limits be shown on all maps.

## Input on pedestrian and bicycle facilities and connections in Hayden Island interchange area

Natalie Freeman reviewed the proposed changes for Hayden Island on the west side of I-5. She showed two options for access from the multiuse trail down to the proposed park on the west side of I-5, north of Hayden Island drive. One option would be to loop down twice. This would provide connections to the sidewalks on the north side of the roadway and to the park as well. A second option would elongate the loops so that they would travel partway underneath I-5. The additional length would allow the path to provide multiple connections to the potential future park and the sidewalk on the north side of Hayden Island Drive. Seanette said she preferred the elongated option, commenting that it is more comfortable for bicyclists to break up the multiple tight turns. PBAC confirmed that they would like to see a ramp at this location.

Natalie then discussed the pedestrian and bicycle facilities at and near the proposed site of the LRT station. She stressed that the vast majority of the design would come as part of the station area planning process, which is beginning shortly. PBAC will be counted on to provide input into this process. Under this scenario, regardless of whether there are two platforms or a single one, the transit users and the multiuse path users will remain separated.

The stairs and elevators providing access to and from the LRT platform(s) and Tomahawk Island Drive will provide transit users the ability to access the platform without crossing the multiuse path. In the case of the stairs, transit users will cross underneath the multiuse path, then take the stairs up to the platform. There are two changes that could possibly affect this arrangement: the development of a building that would be adjacent to the LRT station (possibly as part of the Jantzen Beach SuperCenter redevelopment) that would house the elevators and stair connections and the selection of the Stacked Transit Highway Bridge as the bridge design option.

Natalie then opened up the discussion of the pedestrian and bicycle facilities on the east side of I-5. She first showed the potential for the Marine Drive to Hayden Island pedestrian-only connection to be made via a path alongside I-5 (Option 1). The path would begin west of the roundabout at Marine Drive and connect to the sidewalk on Jantzen Drive via an eight-foot wide switchback path that would partially be shaded by the collector-distributor (C-D) roadway ramps for I-5. Natalie showed a rough view of what the path would look like in 3-D and the PBAC found that very helpful. From Bridgeton, this route would take about 16 minutes walking time to reach Safeway. Todd suggested adding travel times to the maps in the future. Lisa stressed the need for good signage and a staging area where the path touches down to grade.

Another option would be for the pedestrian-only path to be located on the C-D road from Marine Drive to Hayden Island. This path would be higher above the ground than a path along I-5. After crossing over the northbound on-ramp to I-5 from Hayden Island, Natalie discussed two options for connecting down to Tomahawk Island Drive. One option (Option 2a) would be similar to a switchback but would be slightly more elongated and provide views to the east of Mt. Hood. The other option (Option 2b) would see the path loop underneath itself as it descended to Tomahawk Island Drive. This option would also provide lookouts to the east. Both options would increase walking time from Bridgeton to Safeway to about 19 minutes. Lisa thought that it might be worthwhile for all ramps on Hayden Island to share some design elements. Alice Ann noted that walking along the I-5 mainline would be a tough environment to be in

because pedestrians would be sandwiched between the mainline and the ramp to the east. She also suggested that a new option, 2c, be shown at the next meeting, which would be a combination of the switchback element from Option 1 placed where the Pier 99 building is today, and Option 2b, which would eliminate part of the pathway along the C-D road. Natalie also asked the members to weigh in on a faster connection which would touch down in a spiral at the existing Hooters site. There was not much support for this option despite the shorter travel time of approximately 11 minutes. A quick straw poll showed good support for Option 2b, though all it was decided to leave all options on the table at this time.

### **Next meeting**

Wed., January 21, 2008  
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.  
Columbia River Crossing project office  
700 Washington St., Suite 300, Vancouver WA

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY