

**Lemon Creek Area Plan
Steering Committee
Meeting Agenda
Gruening Park Rec Room
February 23, 2017, 6:00 pm**

I. ROLL CALL, 6:00PM

Steering Committee Members Present: Stephen Johnson, Chair; Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission Liaison; Susan Erben; Sandra Coon; Dave Hanna; Patrick Quigley; Michael Short

Steering Committee Members Absent: Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair; Tom Chard; Daniel Collison; Wayne Coogan; Mark Pusich

Community Development Staff Present: Jill Maclean, Senior Planner; Allison Eddins, Planner I; Marjorie Hamburger, Administrative Assistant

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. December 15, 2016
- b. January 12, 2017
- c. January 26, 2017

MOTION: by Stephen Johnson to approve all three draft minutes.

The motion passed with unanimous consent.

III. REVIEW OF PUBLIC DESIGN WORKSHOP

Jill Maclean gave an overview of the public design workshop that took place on Saturday, February 4, at Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School. A table summarizing output from the four table groups at the workshop was presented to committee members. Jill noted that some of the outcomes from the design workshop are reflected in the transportation chapter.

Paul Voelckers suggested that the committee will need to decide on prioritizing the design features and other suggestions that came out of the workshop process. He noted that the drawings developed by each table group establish a ballpark range of goals for the city to work towards.

Susan Erban asked about the notes that city planners took at each table. Paul Voelckers said this information is more or less captured in the summaries. Paul Voelckers answered questions about how the information from the workshop will inform the steering committee's work moving forward.

Susan Erban asked if there can be another charrette about housing later, since this was not addressed as part of the 2/4/17 workshop. Jill suggested this be discussed next month when housing is the topic.

Stephen Johnson said he doesn't consider walking and bike paths as transportation routes. Susan Erban said federal funding can be impacted by things like the provision of a bike path.

Jill Maclean noted that the documents from the charrette should be used as reference for other parts of the plan. Paul Voelckers said the output from the workshop is a diagram in its own right and is on its own timeline. He discussed adding the documents as addendums to the final plan. Eventually, the whole thing, the plan and any addendums, will be presented to the Planning Commission.

Sandra Coon asked if there were recommendations for bus shelters. Jill Maclean said that question is skipping ahead. Dave Hanna said that at this point the committee might have trouble reaching consensus about items on the list from the charrette. Paul Voelckers said the charrette documents should be a graphic product that represents a study, but the committee at some point will need to endorse them. Some items might be set aside because they are “beyond the pay grade” of the committee members. But others should be debated and decided upon.

Susan Erban said the graphics are a good representation of what the public told the steering committee and that this is an obligation to report on that. However, she wondered if there could be two graphics, with the second representing what the committee decides to prioritize. Paul Voelckers said that instead of two parallel graphics, notate the first and include committee comments in the appendices. But, he advised, it is the steering committee’s duty to listen to public comment but then decide what to do with it. You have to be in bed with it a little bit, he said.

Jill Maclean suggested that members take the resulting documents, review them and reflect, and put discussion about them on a future agenda.

Stephen Johnson postulated that the committee has an obligation to make priorities based on what is fiscally possible. Paul Voelckers responded that he feels the committee does not need to get bogged down regarding that issue. It is a 20- year plan, and the assembly has responsibility for funding, eventually

IV. DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE CHAPTER, GOALS AND ACTIONS

Jill Maclean summarized the chapter framework that was before the members.

It was noted that the Renninger Roundabout is in the works with DOT.

Dave Hanna recalled that the committee wanted to take out C on the list found on page 3 as it has nothing to do with Lemon Creek Plan. **It was decided to remove this item.**

Stephen Johnson wants language to address the intersection at Fred Meyer’s which has been a problem for years. Even if the Department of Transportation (DOT) already has plans to address this, he thinks this should be stressed as a priority in the plan. Should this be addressed in the background narrative or stated as a goal? Susan Erban said it should be a goal to fix the intersection or extend Glacier Highway to Mc Nugget.

MOTION: *by Dave Hanna to note as a goal and in the chapter narrative that the steering committee would like to see Glacier Highway extended out to the Mc Nugget intersection in the interest of public safety. Michael Short seconded the motion.*

The motion passed with unanimous consent.

Sandra Coon wanted to discuss bus pullouts and shelters. She feels the area needs better shelters due to the weather and the proximity to road. A lot of people in the Lemon Creek area use the bus. The neighborhood has a lot of low cost housing and people without cars who rely on bus service.

Paul Voelckers said that DOT has plans to improve the shelters. He thinks the committee might want to have a DOT representative come and talk to the committee about their intentions.

Sandra Coon would like to see bus service extended to Costco and Home Depot. The bus doesn’t go all the way there, she noted, but many people need to do so. Susan Erban said she thinks this should be mentioned in the text and put as a goal.

Jill Maclean suggested this can be part of Goal 3.

Sandra Coon suggested that the committee put it in an action item and also comment on the 2014 Transit Development Plan which was not implemented fully. She would like that the 2014 Plan's recommendation to expand the bus routes in Lemon Creek be re-examined and would like this to be a priority.

Add new action item for goal 3: There should be a bus shelter at every bus stop.

Susan Erban wanted more text in the chapter discussing the second access into the Lemon Flats Commercial District. She felt that as it stands, the text suggests the committee is in favor of a second access route. Jill Maclean said this needs a lot more analysis and review. The CIP money mentioned on page 4 is for study only. The City has not spent any money on land acquisitions regarding second access route. The 2007 memo is open regarding looking at options.

As discussion ensued, it was clear that the committee is not in consensus about a second access route. Paul Voelckers suggested not being limited by the 2007 conclusion but suggests a more contemporary study is needed. He said the committee does not need to decide on the best alternative and does not need to offer their recommendation but can simply state that study is needed.

Patrick Quigley said that depending on what road is recommended, it should be a real road, not just a gravel one. Others in attendance nodded their agreement. Patrick Quigley asked if it is reasonable to state in the area plan that whatever happens it ought to be a real road, not a pioneer road (definition: a primitive, temporary road built to provide means for moving equipment and workers.) He is concerned about the damage to the area.

Stephen Johnson suggested adding to goal 4 about analyzing the second access. Instead of keeping it in goal 1, others asked? Since there is no consensus, the committee wants to be sure not to sound like they are in support of the 2007 memo. Dave Hanna suggested rolling goal 4 into goal 1 and revamping the action item to call for a study. Paul Voelckers thought that access is a broader topic than just industrial access, for example it also includes emergency vehicles. Sandra Coon hoped people will consider any access in light of the potential to cut off residences in case of a road closure/blockage.

Goal 1 action – work on language to propose further environmental and engineering analysis of a second access arterial road. Susan Erban is concerned that the language be crafted in a way to be open to all options, not just a second access road.

Regarding goal 2, Susan Erban said she thinks it should be specifically about the path along Egan. Jill Maclean responded that the committee might not want to limit themselves to a specific location at this time and let the appendix show pathways. If Appendix X shows the Egan route, then it is covered. Appendix X is the documents from the design workshop (charrette) and the Area Wide Transportation Plan (AWTP) routes.

MOTION: *by Sandra Coon to accept goal 2 with the addition of the reference to Appendix X. Dave Hanna seconded.*

The motion passed with unanimous consent.

Discussion commenced regarding adding two new items to goal 3: bus service to Costco and working with DOT to ensure that there are shelters at all bus stops.

Paul Voelckers said DOT hasn't finalized their plan for the area. It would be good for the committee to pay attention and advocate for those items that are of great concern, he said. There was discussion about having a DOT representative come and meet with the committee; however there is already a public meeting being planned by Mr. Miller of DOT. The steering committee needs to follow up with him to learn of the time/date and members should plan to attend, along with the general public.

It was suggested to change the third action item under goal 3 to read “. . . improvement along Glacier Highway” and not cite just one particular spot over another.

DOT has proposed installing a roundabout at the Renninger intersection. Committee members discussed pros and cons of advocating for one at Anka Street, as well.

Susan Erban commented on action item 1 in this section. She was concerned about including the word ‘wetlands’ because she wants to also advocate for maintaining the view shed in that area. Do you mean to say the document should state that the pathway should run through the trees, asked Jill? It is not the committee’s role to design the trail/pathway. It would suffice to say that we want the connectivity in some fashion between the neighborhoods and the middle school.

Goal 3, Action 1: Take out “through the wetlands”. Just leave language about connecting neighborhoods to the school.

Goal 3, Action 3: Advocate for intersection improvements at Davis St and Glacier Hwy.

Goal 3, Add Action: Advocate for pedestrian, bicycle and possibly emergency access across Lemon Creek.

Regarding goal 4, should the first action item about the impact study be kept here? People recalled that Wayne Coogan advocated for its removal. Paul Voelckers said he feels it is appropriate here. Susan Erban liked this goal the way it stands. Michael Short said that study is needed to know how to design.

Stephen Johnson said the point of goal 4 is about dust, etc. and cleaning up from industrial uses in the Lemon Creek area. Susan Erban would like to see the minutes from the 2014 Rorie Watt meeting. Patrick Quigley noted that when the study was done in 2007 there was a lot more anticipation of development than has turned out to be the case. Jill Maclean will forward the requested minutes for committee members to read.

Goal 4 is really only asking the city to fund a study, said Stephen Johnson. Perhaps this is something that could be folded into Goal 1? Sandra Coon suggested asking DOT for any data they already have for their planning and development purposes before initiating any new study.

It was noted that goal 5 has been either deleted or folded into other areas.

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Llewellyn Lutchensky:

She wants to see goal 2 to be moved down in priority. She wants the committee to concentrate on what is already in the neighborhood. If the city decides to fund something for Lemon Creek, she wants the money to go into neighborhoods, transportation access, safety, etc. rather than a bike path connecting downtown to valley, for example, that does not directly improve life in Lemon Creek. Also, she thinks that parks should have more priority.

Joann Rieselbach:

Joann and her husband participated in the charrette. She concurs with Llewellyn about putting emphasis on parks and recreation in Lemon Creek. She stated that it was her understanding that the charrette was just a brainstorm session about how to improve Lemon Creek and integrate the area into the city as a whole. Housing was presented as a topic of discussion at her table and also at her husband’s (another table group). It was presented as in “we may be developing these areas” so access came up in relationship to that development potential. As for item 5 of the charrette output table, she heard people at the workshop talking about preserving a wildlife corridor for bear, deer, etc. Maybe this needs to be added to the document, she suggested.

Joann suggested that if the committee plans to include the charrette list in the final Lemon Creek Plan publication, it would be a good idea to reconvene and ask the charrette participants to prioritize the list, asking what is most

important. It was not presented this way at the workshop. She feels it would be helpful to shift peoples' perception to be asked about their goals for the neighborhood if asked in that way rather than having a wide open, do everything, money-no-object sort of brainstorm.

Joann asked for clarification about if the proposal is for two traffic lights. She wondered what would be good for the overall flow of traffic for both commercial and residential uses. She hopes the committee will consider traffic flow during a variety of times of day and parts of the year. For example, there is heavy traffic at the Renninger intersection when school is in session, not so much during the summer. She suggested looking at patterns of uses at both Anka and Davis streets on both weekends and weekdays.

Joann agreed with Susan Erban's concerns about the wetlands and the view shed and having public access to natural resources. She suggests weighing the multiple uses of these areas and preserving dark zones in the neighborhood. Finally, she commended the committee for looking at positive, integral aspects of Lemon Creek.

Paul Voelckers asked a follow up question about housing discussion at the charrette. Joanne said both she and her husband heard "you might want to consider a pathway in this area, which might open up potential for future housing". She thought housing was not part of the charrette, but nevertheless she heard mention on several occasions during the day's discussion.

Marcy Larson:

Marcy reiterated that DOT has done many studies, and it is a good idea for the committee to review these.

VI. REVIEW ORDER OF UPCOMING CHAPTERS

Susan Erban was concerned about having three meetings in April. Jill Maclean was concerned about losing people and focus if meetings continue into the summer. She will send out dates via email to discover committee members' availability.

Transportation needs to be continued to the next meeting. Jill Maclean will get changes out soon to the committee and hopes members will send comments/questions back in a timely fashion so that at the next meeting the committee can swiftly adopt the Transportation Chapter and move on to the next topic.

Next Meeting Date: March 16, 2017 (Housing and Neighborhoods, tentative)

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 pm.