

WATERFRONT CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE
"WAC"
MEETING SUMMARY
JANUARY 24, 2007 - 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Port Representatives (Support)

Rich Gunderson
Sheldon Tyler
Byron Hanke
Mary Murphy

Riverwalk LLC (Support)

Mark Benson
John McKibbin

Committee Members

Arnold Cogan, Facilitator
Larry Blaufus
Jennie Brown
Russ Chambers
Paul Fearn

Charmaine Harvey
Sandy Krahn
Casey O'Dell
Pat Sheaffer
Gary Simmons

Roberta Tidland
Barbe West
Absent
Ashley Eckman
John Svilarich

Arnold Cogan, Facilitator, opened the meeting at 5:00 p.m., and welcomed the large audience.

Review

The Meeting Summary from December 13, 2006 was approved, with one exception: Gary Simmons comments on Page 3 will be clarified and a final version of the Summary will be distributed.

The Meeting Summary from January 10, 2007 was approved, with the correction of the spelling of Kelley Puntney's name. The corrected Summary will be distributed.

Prior to tonight's meeting, Riverwalk LLC distributed copies of three reports to Committee members as an additional resource for consideration. They are:

The 1986 Port of Camas/Washougal Masterplan

The 1990 Background Planning Study for the Port of Camas/Washougal
Draft Comprehensive Plan of Harbor Improvements & Industrial

Development for the Port of Camas/Washougal

The Committee members acknowledged receipt of these reports.

Next, Arnold went over the Revised Ground Rules, focusing on #12 which outlines parameters for the public comment period. The consensus was to:

- Allow 3 minutes per speaker, with more time allowed at Facilitator's discretion;
- Be flexible. Allow everyone who wishes to speak an opportunity to do so. If they are interested enough to attend a meeting, then their request to speak should be respected

- Make it known that public comments will be limited to 3 minutes with an announcement at the beginning of the meeting, signage, and adding that information to the sign-in sheet.

Washington Dept. of Transportation

Kevin Miller and Bart Gernhart of the Washington Dept. of Transportation spoke about plans for the SR-14 corridor:

This project will widen SR-14 from two lanes to four lanes from 6th Avenue to Union Street (SR 500). The addition of median barriers will safely divide east bound traffic to west bound traffic as it does to the west on SR 14. Also included in the project will be the construction of new bridges over the East and West Camas Sloughs as well as a new interchange at Union Street. This project will improve safety in the corridor, increase capacity and reduce travel time on SR 14 to accommodate residential, commercial and industrial growth.

WDOT has formed a Technical Committee and an Oversight Committee, with representatives from the Port of Camas/Washougal, the cities of Camas and Washougal, RTC, and Clark County. Three open houses have been held, in addition to stakeholder meetings, and more open houses are planned for the future.

An aerial map was utilized to show the ‘footprint’ of the improvements along SR-14:

- Construction is planned to begin in 2010.
- Highway will have 4 lanes continuing from the current location, through Union Street.
- A parallel structure will be added to the bridge across Lady Island, for the additional 2 lanes.
- The traffic signal will be removed at the Union Street intersection and the highway will be raised to go over Union, with east and west bound on and off ramps
- The highway will gradually be reduced to 2 lanes after Union.
- The interchange at Union Street will grow to accommodate traffic needs.
- There is a need for additional frontage roads; they’re exploring alternate routes.
- Frontage roads could be changed to accommodate RiverWalk.
- RiverWalk will need its own internal roadway system.
- Second Street access would be closed.
- Want to maintain connectivity to 6th Street, so it would have right in/right out.
- Ultimately, there may be no intersection at 6th Street, if safety requires closure.
- There are plans for the 15th and 32nd street intersections, but that will be much later.
- Washougal is going forward with their own ideas to bring people to their downtown development.

While WDOT's primary focus is safety, not access to RiverWalk, they want to work with the Port, the developer and the City. They feel access at Union Street will be "enough" and compared it to Columbia Blvd. being the sole access to the highly successful Beaches area on the Columbia River waterfront in Vancouver.

John McKibbin, of Riverwalk LLC, stated that WDOT's job is to move traffic. He said that WDOT's proposal for a single access to the development "is not good news." In addition, he has concerns about WDOT's plans for eliminating the 6th Street intersection, with the added traffic RiverWalk development may create. Other alternatives, including roundabouts on the highway, are being looked into by Riverwalk LLC. They will work with WDOT.

Waterfront Features / Elements of Interest to WAC

Mark Benson, of Riverwalk LLC, handed out a matrix showing Comparative Features of Waterfront Communities to WAC, which listed the features of the waterfront developments shown in the January 10, 2007 PowerPoint presentation.

Arnold asked the Committee members to look at the matrix and to also think about what other features they would like to see on our waterfront. The following list was created:

- Connectivity: pedestrians, bicycles, autos.
- Fun, safe and comfortable place to come to – recreational opportunities on water and land.
- Indoor & outdoor activities to draw people in year-round – athletic club, ice skating rink, swimming pool, movie theatre, etc.
- Marina is important element – a destination spot for many.
- Maximize natural surroundings, e.g., trails, amphitheatre, open park, year-round trails.
- Concerts and events to bring people together to participate in the arts.
- Utilization of open space on land and on the water.
- Avoid big box stores and strip malls. No fast food, i.e., MacDonald's.
- Place for conferences and banquets.
- Unique restaurants and shops that have access to or have a view of the water. Outdoor dining.
- Put trails on water side of development.
- Supporting services for Marina, including dry storage, picnic services. Launch ramp(s).
- Services accessible from and on water.
- Hotel with convention / conference center.
- Residential should be low-rise; perhaps townhomes with retail below. Residential will make the area safer; be a draw for retail.

- Public access to river.
- Excellent design – build tasteful facilities.
- Retail should be aesthetically pleasing – glass, beautiful, able to see through to water.
- Maintain view corridors.
- Integrate history of area into the design.
- Preserve the National Historic site.
- Create unique attraction that brings people to the development. A ‘brand name’ restaurant may draw people.
- Fishing-related services.
- Excellent lighting, signage, and landscaping should be a part of the design.
- Create a signature development with a common thread throughout that ties it all together, and reflects local flavor.
- River transportation services.
- Long-range: transportation to connect to downtown Washougal and surrounding areas.
- Project needs to be oriented to jobs.

There was consensus that this list should be refined and prioritized, perhaps with examples, and Arnold stated that he would bring tools to the next meeting to address this issue.

Public Comment

Susan Stauffer stated her frustration with not getting meeting materials ahead of time. She also asked the Committee to keep in mind that this is a “very heavily used Marina.”

Bill Ward commended the Committee on their vision, and asked them to keep looking at the survey results from the Riverwalk LLC website.

Roger Daniels stated that the Port was first created for a Marina. There needs to be marina-related services, repair services and boat retrieval. The Port of Camas/Washougal’s Marina is the “premiere marina” for Clark County. He later commented that this does not have to be an entire public / private development; someone else could buy Hambleton and work with RiverWalk. He said, “Think about partnering with another private developer.”

Richard Hamby reminded the Committee that the focus of WAC was supposed to be “waterfront” advisory, not “Riverwalk” advisory. WAC needs to consider whether RiverWalk is what the public wants. He said we don’t want to dilute our sense of community; think long-term; not just consider public gain. Ask ‘is RiverWalk a good idea?’.

Alisha Downs agreed with other public comments. Reminded the Committee to keep the existing businesses in mind.

Issues for Future Agendas

- Timing / Approach for public input
- Property negotiations
- Tax Revenues
- Location / timing of WAC meetings
- Rezoning Issues

General Discussion on Future Agenda Items

- Timing and approach for public input.
 - Ideas: a large meeting to receive public comments; a town hall; an open house.
 - Should it be interactive? Work toward time to gather public input by refining and prioritizing the list of desired features, in order to present clear options. List each feature with a descriptor; give examples. Prioritize, then ask: ‘What works on smaller area; what on larger?’
- Property negotiations:
 - Casey O’Dell stated that he’s ready to see some concepts; encouraged the Port not to use condemnation to acquire property, unless the property owner is willing to pursue that course of action.
 - Russ Chambers stated that he needs to know how much open space the Committee has to work with for residential and commercial development.
 - John McKibbin, of Riverwalk, LLC, concurred that it’s difficult to work on placement of open spaces, trail, public access, etc. when footprint is unclear.
 - Byron Hanke asked the Committee to consider several options: with and without land currently owned by private parties. Explained that it’s not within the Committee’s purview to be involved in property negotiations; the Port will keep the Committee informed.
 - Roberta Tidland stated that she joined the Committee to save the National Historic site. Cautioned the Port to tread lightly; can’t take away people’s property and force them to comply.
 - Mark Benson stated that there were grant monies available for property acquisition.
- Tax revenues:
 - Sheldon Tyler is meeting with Clark County Auditor to collect data; will keep the Committee informed.
- Location and timing of future meetings
 - Meetings will remain at the Port unless Arnold feels a more spacious location is needed. In that event, sufficient notice will be given to WAC, the newspapers, and will also be posted on the Port’s Website.

- Rezoning issues
 - Arnold commented that WAC may wish to receive information on this issue for review and discussion at a future meeting.

Meeting Schedule:

The following meeting dates were agreed upon for the next two months:

February 14, 2007 - 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

February 28, 2007 - 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

March 14, 2007 - 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

March 28, 2007 - 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

The February 14th meeting agenda will contain the following items:

- Update on tax consequences, rezoning and property acquisition
- Prioritize list of desired development features
- Come to a consensus on priorities
- Discuss open house for public input on features
- Distribution of materials

Adjournment:

Arnold Cogan adjourned the meeting shortly after 7:00 p.m.