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May 25, 2007

**Woodland TISP Project**  
Public, Agency and Stakeholder Involvement Plan

**Introduction**  
*Educate, Inform and Involve!*

The Woodland Transportation Infrastructure Strategic Plan will impact the community at-large. This Plan is intended to provide recommendations for dealing with increased freeway and community traffic demand, the need for increased connectivity, and to provide improved and safer access to growing industrial and residential portions of the City. Various groups including neighborhood committees, freight and railways interests, the Port of Woodland, emergency service providers, school districts, diking districts and local businesses will be impacted. Each of these groups has different concerns that need to be addressed over the course of the planning study.

The objective of public, agency and stakeholder involvement is to *educate, inform and involve* the community throughout various stages of the study. *Educating* the community at an early stage in the study will provide informed and specific input to the study team. *Informing* interested parties throughout the multiple stages of the study will minimize the chance of surprises. *Involving* the community early and frequently will create a foundation of knowledge leading to more technically competent input. This will help to ensure that stakeholders, agencies and residents become and remain actively engaged in the planning process, such that the resulting physical recommendations and implementation strategy are fully “owned” by the Plan’s constituents.

**Mission and Goals**

The guiding principles for gaining and maintaining a feeling of ownership in the study include: building trust, employing a vision, carrying out an effective public involvement program, integrating transportation as well as land use and livability issues into the process, developing a transparent alternatives evaluation process, maintaining a regional planning approach and considering issues related to implementation of the resulting improvement projects from beginning to end.

This study’s approach to public involvement is to engage the community and other participants in a process that is exciting, inclusive, informative and responsive. This approach will be continuous through the three phases of outreach and participation (existing conditions, future conditions and improvement options) and each phase of the program is thoroughly integrated with the study’s technical elements.

The study’s agency partners and the Parametrix consultant team have a shared level of commitment to keeping the public informed throughout the study. To accomplish this, the Parametrix team will ensure that a wide range of stakeholders are involved at key milestones of the study.
Study Efficiencies

To use study team members’ time as efficiently as possible, it is recommended that STAC and CAC meetings be held on the same day throughout the course of the planning process. Public events and jurisdictional briefings are similarly recommended to be held on the same day. To use study funds as efficiently as possible, text and graphics from project newsletters and project reports will be used for public presentations and for updates to the project Web page when and wherever practical.

Partner Responsibilities

It is assumed that the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments (CWCWOG) will be responsible for all logistics associated with the STAC and CAC meetings and public events. The CWCWOG will secure a location for all meetings, will provide early notification to all committee members, and will distribute meeting agendas, minutes and other materials that are prepared by the Parametrix team. For public events, it is assumed that the CWCWOG will manage the reproduction of all public meeting materials provided by Parametrix. Project newsletters will provide notice of public events, and the CWCWOG will distribute the project newsletters at least ten days in advance of the public events. STAC / CAC meetings will precede public events by at least one week, to allow STAC / CAC input on public meeting format and materials.

In addition to providing Parametrix with all relevant and available data at the start of the project, and reviewing draft technical reports throughout the project, the CWCWOG will provide regular status reports to local and regional decision-making bodies on planning activities throughout the study process. The Parametrix team will be assisted by the CWCWOG in preparing the STAC and CAC membership rosters, and stakeholder interview lists, the CWCWOG will also provide contact information for those individuals who will be interviewed. The CWCWOG will host the study’s Web page on their agency Web site. Once the CWCWOG has established a Web page hotlink, the CWCWOG will assist the Parametrix team in responding to public queries and comments.

The City of Woodland is also expected to play a major role in this project. In addition to providing data to Parametrix at the start of the project, the City will review all draft technical reports provided by Parametrix. The City will provide a link to the study’s Web page from its own Web site. Early in the project, the City will assist the Parametrix team to identify key media contacts and assist in the coordination of regular media briefings. Following the conclusion of this study, the City will lead implementation of some study recommendations.

The Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) is also expected to play a major role in this project. In addition to providing data to Parametrix at the start of the project, WSDOT will review all draft technical reports provided by Parametrix and provide a link to the study’s Web page from its own Web site.
# Public, Agency and Stakeholder Involvement Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Task</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public, Agency and Stakeholder Involvement Plan</td>
<td>Define the assumptions, expectations, objectives, protocols and procedures for educating, informing and involvement of stakeholders and the public</td>
<td>- Coordinate with CWCOG, the City and WSDOT</td>
<td>- The method and schedule of dissemination of public information and collection of public input</td>
<td>June ’07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Interviews</td>
<td>Identify key issues, concerns and opinions</td>
<td>- Phone and/or in person interviews</td>
<td>- Develop questions&lt;br&gt;- Conduct 16 interviews&lt;br&gt;- Summarize findings</td>
<td>June ’07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering Session &amp; Preliminary Steering/Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Meeting</td>
<td>To build trust by establishing clear lines of communication, resolving potential disagreements, aligning expectations and agreeing on roles and responsibilities. Identify desired outcomes and vision.</td>
<td>- Partnering Session</td>
<td>- One Partnering Session&lt;br&gt;- Meeting materials and agenda&lt;br&gt;- Facilitation&lt;br&gt;- Partnering Charter/Agreement</td>
<td>June ’07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting</td>
<td>Discuss responsibilities of CAC, provide overview of the study, identify desired outcomes and vision</td>
<td>- Establish ground rules about committee’s operations and responsibilities&lt;br&gt;- Inform committee about the study&lt;br&gt;- Gain input on key issues and concerns&lt;br&gt;- Initial discussion of desired outcomes and vision</td>
<td>- One CAC Meeting&lt;br&gt;- Meeting materials and agenda&lt;br&gt;- Meeting summary</td>
<td>June ’07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Task</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Visioning and Determination of Desired | Consensus statement of the overall vision and desired outcomes of the study | Stakeholder Interviews  
Partnering Session  
Coordination with STAC, CAC and public workshop | Vision Statement and desired outcomes                                  | June to August ’07 |
| Outcomes                               |                                                                           |                                                                         |                                                                          |                 |
| First STAC Meeting                     | Discuss results of stakeholder interviews, and summarize findings of the Existing Conditions Technical Memorandum | Review and discuss:  
Stakeholder Interviews  
Desired outcomes and vision  
Existing Conditions Technical Memorandum | One STAC Meeting  
Meeting materials and agenda  
Facilitation  
Meeting Summary | August ’07                     |
| First CAC Meeting                      | Summarize findings of the Existing Conditions Technical Memorandum       | Discuss the Existing Conditions Technical Memorandum  
Review and discuss desired outcomes and vision | One CAC Meeting  
Meeting materials and agenda  
Meeting summary | August ’07                     |
| Kick-off Public Workshop               | Inform the public of the study issues and opportunities. Test study vision and desired outcomes. Obtain feedback on preliminary ideas. | Inform attendees of the purpose and schedule of the study along with opportunities for information and involvement  
Flesh out the list of study issues and opportunities  
Test and refine a study vision  
Test and refine study guiding principles  
Obtain input on preliminary alternatives for improvement | Workshop plans  
Materials and graphics  
Facilitation  
Workshop summary notes | August ’07                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Task</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Second STAC Meeting | Obtain feedback on Future Transportation Technical Memorandum and define criteria for evaluation of improvement options | ▪ Review and discuss findings of Future Transportation Conditions Technical Memorandum and criteria for evaluation of improvements | ▪ One STAC Meeting  
▪ Meeting materials and agenda  
▪ Facilitation  
▪ Meeting Summary | October '07 |
| Second CAC Meeting | Obtain feedback on Future Transportation Technical Memorandum and define criteria for evaluation of improvement options | ▪ Review and discuss findings of Future Transportation Conditions Technical Memorandum and criteria for evaluation of improvements | ▪ One CAC Meeting  
▪ Meeting materials and agenda  
▪ Meeting summary | October '07 |
| Third STAC Meeting | Develop and screen potential alternatives to be documented in Technical Reports | ▪ Review highlights of study findings to date  
▪ Identify candidate alternatives, screen alternatives and identify potential alternatives requiring further analysis | ▪ One STAC Meeting  
▪ Meeting materials and agenda  
▪ Facilitation  
▪ Meeting summary | January '08 |
| Third CAC Meeting | Develop and screen potential alternatives to be documented in Technical Reports | ▪ Review highlights of study findings to date  
▪ Identify candidate alternatives, screen alternatives and identify potential alternatives requiring further analysis | ▪ One CAC Meeting  
▪ Meeting materials and agenda  
▪ Meeting summary | January '08 |
| Second Public Workshop | Public discussion to test alternatives for improvements | ▪ Test, adjust and adapt alternatives for improvements, examining the trade-offs associated with each | ▪ Workshop plans  
▪ Materials and graphics  
▪ Facilitation  
▪ Workshop summary notes | January '08 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Task</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fourth STAC Meeting        | Obtain feedback on the alternatives and further the development of improvement recommendations | ▪ Discuss the evaluation of alternatives to date  
▪ Develop short and long term improvement recommendations | ▪ One STAC Meeting  
▪ Meeting materials and agenda  
▪ Facilitation  
▪ Meeting summary | April ’08 |
| Fourth CAC Meeting         | Obtain feedback on the alternatives and further the development of improvement recommendations | ▪ Discuss the evaluation of alternatives to date  
▪ Develop short and long term improvement recommendations | ▪ One CAC Meeting  
▪ Meeting materials and agenda  
▪ Meeting summary | April ’08 |
| Third Public Workshop      | Hone previously developed alternatives and produce an implementation plan | ▪ Interactive workshop organized by geographic area or function | ▪ Workshop plans  
▪ Materials and graphics  
▪ Facilitation  
▪ Workshop summary notes | May ’08 |
| City Council Work Session  | Feedback and buy-in from City Council prior to full adoption public hearing | ▪ Discuss process to date, key findings and conclusions about deficiencies and improvement alternatives | ▪ Presentation materials  
▪ Assistance with presentation | July ’08 |
| Project Web Page           | Inform the public, advertise public events and solicit feedback | ▪ Provide study background, updates and meeting notifications  
▪ Establish hot link and respond to public comments | ▪ Informational Material Updates  
▪ Responses and distribution of public comments | June ’07  
July ’07  
December ’07  
April ’08  
August ’08 |
| Project Newsletters/Flyers | Inform the public and advertise public events | ▪ Up to date study information regarding status, key decisions and participation opportunities at key project milestones | ▪ Five print-ready black and white single page newsletters or flyers | June ’07  
July ’07  
December ’07  
April ’08  
August ’08 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Task</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Mailing List                      | Expedite direct communication with key interested individuals throughout the project | ▪ Up to date mailing list of key individuals who have expressed interest in the study  
▪ Consultant and City will meet with key media contacts to provide schedule and activities overview and determine the best means of keeping informed throughout study  
▪ Offer Press “scoop” prior to newsletter distribution  
▪ Provide meeting notification to media contacts | ▪ Project Mailing List                                                                                                                                  | Ongoing                                    |
| Press and Broadcast Media                 | Work with local press and broadcast media to inform the public about the study and advertise public events |                                                                                                                                                                                                       | ▪ Initial media contact  
▪ Media information distribution | June ’07  
July ’07  
December ’07  
April ’08  
August ’08 |
| Public Involvement Plan for Implementation Stages | Outline future Public involvement efforts for refinement, design and construction phases coming out of the study | ▪ Plan to address the method of Public Involvement through later stages of project implementation                                                                                                                                                             | ▪ Implementation PIP                         | July ’08                                      |
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments, in coordination with the City of Woodland and the Washington Department of Transportation, has begun work on the Woodland Transportation Infrastructure Strategic Plan (TISP). The Woodland TISP is a 16-month study that builds on the foundation provided by the Woodland Transportation Plan. The TISP will flesh out earlier plan’s improvement recommendations for the I-5 interchanges and will refine a variety of other recommendations, including improvements to access the Woodland Industrial/Port area. This study will be developed using a collaborative process and will culminate in a strategic infrastructure plan that addresses growing freeway and community traffic demand, increases arterial system connectivity including east/west cross-circulation, and provides enhanced and safer access to growing industrial and residential areas of the city, particularly along SR 503.

A key element of this planning effort will be to ensure that there is robust community involvement in the identification of transportation system needs and the development of specific improvement projects. This effort began with a series of stakeholder interviews designed to provide a basic understanding of the community’s key issues, concerns, and opinions regarding the corridor. Sixteen stakeholder interviews were conducted by Parametrix and Normandeau Associates during the month of June 2007. Interviewees included those who live, own businesses, or work in Woodland, as well as governmental staff and elected officials. The interviews focused on identifying existing transportation system issues that could affect the development of the Woodland TISP, including potential impacts on businesses and residences, project funding options, and locations for potential transportation improvements. The information gained from the stakeholder interviews will help to frame the issues for discussion in the kick-off public meetings to be held on August 16, 2007. This information will also be used to develop and refine project improvement alternatives, as well as the guiding principles and criteria that will facilitate an evaluation of these alternatives.

1.2 WOODLAND PROFILE

Based on the interviews, a profile of Woodland was developed. Woodland is a complex community, whose members have a great variety of reasons for choosing to live there. Some Woodland residents were born there and chose to remain for work and/or family reasons, while others were attracted to the area by affordable housing, the region’s natural beauty and/or the city’s small-town charm. While residents have a variety of reasons for choosing to remain in Woodland, many business owners chose Woodland for its close access to Interstate 5 (I-5), its abundance of developable land, and its relatively low cost of doing business compared with Clark County. Woodland residents and business owners/employees agree that congestion is a growing problem which threatens the success and livability of their community.
2. INTERVIEW METHODOLOGY

The stakeholders interviewed for this project included: six local business owners/managers, five individuals representing local economic development interests, five elected officials, and three officials representing affected jurisdictions. Before beginning each stakeholder interview, the interviewees were assured of their anonymity to encourage a frank and open expression of the issues. The interviews consisted of a brief introduction to the work scope for the Woodland Transportation Investment Strategic Plan, followed by a set of eleven open-ended questions developed by the Project Team. Each open-ended question had one or more subtopics associated with it in case there was need to prompt additional information from interviewees. Questions were as follows:

1. Why have you chosen to live and / or work in Woodland? Did Woodland’s location and / or transportation system play a part in your decision?

2. Identify the quality of life and business issues that you think are the biggest challenges presently facing your community. Are there any transportation related issues that rank high on your list?

3. Identify the quality of life and business issues that will pose future challenges to your community. Are there any transportation related issues that rank high on this list?

4. How do transportation issues affect your businesses and / or your daily life? How do you see these issues improving or getting worse over time?

5. Do you see a relationship between development (residential, commercial, industrial) and the transportation issues identified in questions #2 through #4 above? If yes, what development and what impacts do you foresee?

6. Are there transportation issues that should be addressed on I-5 and / or at the I-5 interchanges? If yes, please describe the issues (for example, congestion, traffic safety, emergency vehicle access, railroad crossings, pedestrian safety, bicyclist safety, freight delivery) and how you think they should be addressed. Which of these issues are most important?

7. Are there transportation issues that should be addressed on SR 503? If yes, please describe the issues and how you think they should be addressed. Which of these issues are most important?

8. Are there transportation issues that should be addressed on Woodland’s city streets? If yes, please describe the issues and how you think they should be addressed. Which of these issues are most important?

9. Would you consider voting in favor of a measure which would help fund Woodland specific transportation improvements (non-I-5 or SR 503 projects), such as a local improvement district?
10. What information do Woodland residents and employers need to know to build consensus on the Transportation Infrastructure Strategic Plan? Who should we involve in our outreach efforts? How do we contact them? Are there mailing lists we can use to reach these individuals and organizations? Do you want to be involved as the Strategic Plan is developed?

11. Are there other issues or ideas you want shared with the project team and advisory committee?
3. INTERVIEW RESPONSES

Results of the stakeholder interviews are summarized in this section. Responses to the various questions that were asked of each interviewee were grouped into a series of categories. This grouping provides structure for understanding the issues of greatest concern to the community. These categories focus on the following key issues or observations:

- Traffic congestion
- Street connectivity or the lack thereof
- Safety
- Ideas on potential improvement projects
- Roundabouts
- Truck freight
- Alternative transportation modes
- Community growth and infrastructure
- Funding
- Public outreach during the planning process

3.1 CONGESTION

Congestion at freeway ramps, along SR 503, at railroad crossings and in downtown has become a problem for businesses and reduces the quality of life for residents. Currently, the two freeway ramps are frequently backed-up and it is likely this congestion will only worsen with time. Many residents, business owners/employees mentioned that they plan their daily commute and recreation around congestion high points, such as school drop-off and pick-up times and when workers leave major businesses at the end of their shift. Business owners also mentioned that worsening congestion directly impacts their access to I-5, thus increasing their business costs. It was also mentioned that congestion discourages Woodland residents living east of I-5 from using businesses west of I-5, impacting the vitality of Downtown Woodland.

3.2 CONNECTIVITY

Interviewees noted that having limited I-5 crossings increases the congestion problems on SR 503 and at the interchanges. Some thought a new over/under pass, perhaps at Scott Avenue, was needed to divert traffic from the freeway ramps, and to reduce congestion and enhance the flow of traffic along an east-west travel corridor. Interviewees also supported an improved vehicular connection between Dike Road and Downtown Woodland to provide better access between industrial companies in southern Woodland and the Dike Road Interchange, and to provide more direct access between Dike Road and Downtown Woodland businesses.

3.3 SAFETY

Safety issues mentioned by interviewees included roads with sharp turns, especially on SR 503; congestion delays to emergency response times at the current and future police/fire stations; flooding near the Dike Road Interchange; poor signage leading to driver confusion.
about one-way or two-way streets; and congested evacuation routes. An interviewee also mentioned that railroad blockage of Scott Avenue and Davidson Avenue has a negative impact on emergency response to northwestern Woodland, an issue that was expected to become more severe when a new high school is built near Dike Road.

3.4 PROJECT IDEAS

The interviewees had a significant knowledge of local transportation issues. Though the interviewees contributed a number of ideas for transportation projects to ease congestion, connectivity and / or safety problems, on the whole, the interviewees expressed an openness to the ideas that would emerge out of the TISP. A sampling of project ideas from the interviewees included:

- Scott Avenue:
  - Closing the existing two Woodland Interchanges and creating one “super interchange” at Scott Avenue
  - Creating an additional interchange near Scott Avenue
  - Move the southbound I-5 access from the SR 503 Interchange to a new Scott Avenue interchange
  - The creation of a new over/under pass, possibly at Scott Avenue
  - Redesigning the intersection of SR 503 (Lewis River Road) with Scott Avenue intersection – possibly making Scott Avenue a one-way street and / or adding a roundabout at this intersection

- SR-503:
  - Straightening curves along SR 503
  - Eliminating or consolidating some existing private driveways along SR 503 between Hillshire Drive and E Scott Avenue
  - Creating improved road connections between NE Woodland residential areas (e.g., Insel Road and Gun Club Road areas) and Old Pacific Highway, to divert traffic away from SR 503 and the interchange at I-5, and to direct it toward the I-5 interchange at Dike Road
  - A better road connection between SR 503 and Old Pacific Highway to divert traffic towards the interchange of I-5 at Dike Road and away from the interchange at SR 503
  - Add turn lanes on SR-503 at Gun Club Road and Insel Road
  - Widen SR 503 to 4 lanes, including the comment that SR 503 should be widened and also be turned into a dike to provide greater protection to the city from periodic Lewis River flooding.
  - Add traffic signals on SR 503 at the Insel Road and Gun Club Road intersections
  - Create a roundabout at the SR 503 interchange with I-5
  - Institute access control, whether in the form of a median or other technique, along SR 503

- Dike Road:
  - Create a new road east of the Dike Road interchange that would connect the interchange to SR 503 roughly three miles to the east of I-5.
o Increase the length of the northbound on ramp at the Dike Road interchange to allow traffic (particularly trucks) more time to achieve freeway speeds before merging onto I-5

o Modify existing signal timing to increase the amount of time devoted to serving traffic on the freeway off ramps at the Dike Road interchange (based on a concern that traffic backs up on the off-ramps during peak travel periods)

o Add two new roads, one on either side of the railroad tracks, linking Davidson Road with the Dike Road interchange

- Woodland Interchanges:
  - Turn both of Woodland’s interchanges into Single Point Urban Interchanges (SPUIs)

- Woodland City Streets:
  - Add left turn lanes to Goerig Street
  - A variety of ideas to improve Pacific and Atlantic Avenues were suggested, including:
    - Improving the connections between these frontage roads and the rest of Woodland’s street network
    - Making Atlantic Avenue one-way northbound, so as to reduce collisions along this street in the vicinity of the SR 503 Interchange (it was suggested that many drivers fail to understand that Atlantic Avenue is currently a two-way street)
    - Disconnect Pacific and Atlantic Avenues from the two Woodland interchanges. One individual commented that Pacific and Atlantic Avenues could possibly be used as local traffic circulators
  - Remove the stop signs facing Goerig Street at its intersection with Park Road (it was stated that Goerig Street is the primary travel street and should be unimpeded). It was acknowledged by the interviewee that if the stop signs on Goerig Street were removed, it might make it difficult to make left turns off of Park Road.

### 3.5 ROUNDABOUTS

Interviewees had positive and negative comments on roundabouts. Negative comments included the statement that roundabouts don’t work well for trucks, and if they are designed large enough to accommodate trucks, the drivers of passenger cars will “crowd in” and it will be too hard for trucks to take their turn at entering the roundabout. Another negative comment included the statement that roundabouts slow traffic and that roundabouts are being removed in Europe because they don’t work. Other interviewees recommended roundabouts as a means to decrease congestion and improve safety at intersections.

### 3.6 TRUCK FREIGHT

Congestion was frequently cited as an issue of concern for businesses that depend heavily on moving freight by truck. Projects recommended to ease this congestion were included in the “Project Ideas” section above. In addition, an interviewee suggested the TISP seek to segregate traffic trying to get to the port properties from traffic destined for businesses along the frontage roads and in Downtown Woodland.
Specific transportation improvements were identified to ease the movement of manufactured homes into and out of Woodland. The following issues were identified in order of priority for freight movement:

1. The turning radius at the intersection of Lakeshore Drive and Goerig Street was said to be too tight to accommodate these oversize loads, requiring that trucks carrying manufactured homes take all travel lanes and cross over the sidewalk when making turns.

2. The narrowness of SR 503 and the turning radius at the I-5 southbound on-ramp was a concern. It was recommended that the street be widened to keep trucks carrying oversize loads from entering the adjacent lane while turning.

3. The I-5 undercrossing height on SR 503 is too short to accommodate the movement of manufactured homes, forcing northbound deliveries to first travel south to Ridgefield, before turning around to head north on the freeway. It was suggested that the solution to this problem would be to lower the road to provide additional clearance (minimum clearance needed for the movement of manufactured homes was stated to be 16’ 6”).

As a result of the perceived expense of the Goerig Street / Lakeshore Road intersection issue identified above, it was suggested that Bozarth Avenue be altered to create a new route for moving manufactured homes to I-5 (new recommended route would be north on 5th Street, right on Bozarth Avenue, and left on Goerig Street to reach I-5). Recommended Bozarth Avenue alterations would include: raising the power lines crossing Bozarth Avenue to at least 16’ 6” and moving the stop sign in the southbound lane on Goerig Street to behind the existing crosswalk.

It was stated that providing an improved route for freight vehicles to reach the Dike Road interchange (to use as an alternate for vehicles heading north) was unlikely to help the movement of manufactured homes for several reasons: 1) train delays at the existing at-grade crossing of the BNSF tracks would be problematic to the movement of large vehicles; 2) if an overcrossing of the tracks were constructed concern was expressed that this facility would have approach and departure slopes that were too steep to accommodate the overhang of manufactured homes (causing them to scrape the pavement and, potentially be damaged) and 3) the Dike Road interchange underpass of the railroad and freeway cannot accommodate the height of vehicles carrying manufactured homes.

### 3.7 ALTERNATE TRANSPORTATION MODES

The presence of bicycle and pedestrian facilities is very limited in the City of Woodland. There are not specifically designated bicycle lanes or paths except for roadway shoulders. The sidewalk system is disconnected or lacking in many areas which requires that walkers also use roadway shoulders where available. Public transit service is very limited or entirely unavailable in many parts of Woodland. The lack of these services and facilities causes people to be entirely dependent on their cars for transportation and feeds the growing congestion and safety problems.

One interviewee stated that priorities for enhancement of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure include linking NE Woodland with Downtown, the Elementary School, the Skate Park, and the future High School on Dike Road. It was stated that the City of Woodland has funds set aside for park uses and that, perhaps, some of those parks dollars should be used to purchase right of way for future bicycle and pedestrian trails.

It was also noted that pedestrian crossing improvements are needed to provide safe travel from area hotels to the Safeway grocery store and to Downtown Woodland.
3.8 COMMUNITY GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Whether interviewees supported or opposed growth, interviewees felt growth and congestion were linked. Most interviewees mentioned the need for improvements which would, at a minimum, ease congestion from the growth that has already occurred.

Future residential growth is expected in Woodland east of I-5, possibly as far east as Cougar, and on farmland to the west of I-5. More commercial development is expected in Woodland, as this is the only significant commercial center between Longview and Vancouver. Additional industrial development is also expected, largely to the west of I-5. A new large destination resort may also be constructed in Skamania County, which would further compound existing congestion problems on SR 503 and at the I-5 interchange.

3.9 FUNDING

Interviewees held a variety of opinions about the potential success of a local measure to fund improvements to Woodland’s transportation system. Some interviewees felt that local businesses (and not residents) would support such a measure, because the businesses would have an understanding of the positive impact improved transportation would have on their operations. Others felt that residents (and not businesses) would support a funding measure. Regardless of opinions on who would support a measure, many stated that the specific projects to be funded and the benefits of those projects would have to be clearly explained, as any ambiguity would jeopardize everyone’s willingness to support such a measure.

3.10 PUBLIC OUTREACH

Interviewees suggested making the plan visually appealing with pictures and diagrams to gain public support. Many also stated that frequent opportunities for public input were needed. Booths at public events, along with comment forms, were mentioned. Several groups were suggested for outreach efforts, including the Chamber of Commerce, City Council, Lions Club, Rotary Club, informal neighborhood associations and attendees of a senior citizen lunch that occurs on Fridays at the Oak Tree. Local and regional newspapers were suggested as good outreach tools, including the Reflector, Lewis River News, the Columbian, the Daily News, and the Valley Bugler.