



# Transportation and Mobility Commission

## Meeting Minutes

**Tuesday, October 29th, 2024**

**4:00 p.m.**

**City Hall**

**Aspen Room**

**415 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Vancouver, WA**

**Commissioners Present:**

Jeananne Edwards, Devon Fender, Zack Gatton, Cory Grandstaff, Thinh Phan, Mario Raia, Eduardo Ramos, Sara Schmit, Ken Williams, Derya Ruggles, Devan Williams

**Staff Present:** Kate Drennan, staff liaison; Rebecca Kennedy, staff liaison; Julie Nischik, staff liaison; Becky Rude, staff attorney

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 pm by Chair Ramos.

**Interstate Bridge Replacement (IBR) Program**

Katherine Kelly, Senior Policy Advisor, Lori Severino, Senior Planner, Community Development Department; Ryan LeProwse, Transportation Planning Manager, Shilpa Mallem, Deputy Design Manager, IBR

Staff presented an IBR program overview, a summary of relevant findings in the draft supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS), and a summary of staff comments on findings.

Commission discussion and staff responses:

- How does active transportation impact the numbers of Total Person throughput on the bridge? Staff responded that more people will be incentivized to take active transportation.
- How do you track the data of using multi-modal transportation? Staff responded they are only looking at what crosses the bridge, not the origin of a trip.
- Why are we comparing it to a no-build? Staff responded that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires IBR to analyze the impacts of not taking any action.

## Members

**Eduardo Ramos**  
*Chair*

**Jeananne Edwards**  
*Vice Chair*

Devon Fender  
Zack Gatton  
Cory Grandstaff  
Thinh Phan  
Mario Raia  
Derya Ruggles  
Sara Schmit  
Ken Williams  
Devan Williams

**Community Development Department**

415 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
P.O. Box 1995  
Vancouver, WA 98668  
360-487-7800  
TTY: 711  
cityofvancouver.us

**To request accommodation or other formats, please contact:**

Community Development Department | 360-487-7813 | TTY: 711 | TMC@cityofvancouver.us

- What is the motivation for moving the freeway 40 feet to the left? Staff responded they are trying to avoid environmental and archeological impacts as well as impacts to Fort Vancouver historical site.
- The proposed multi-modal path is triple the height of bridge access now. Why not connect the multi-modal path to Evergreen Blvd to make it less steep? Staff responded the downside of 'the Westward Shift' is impacts to properties, i.e. Regal cinema. The program is looking at potential design options to avoid steepness of multi-modal path without property impacts.
- 29<sup>th</sup> and 33<sup>rd</sup> Overpass replacement bike/ pedestrian pathways? The current plans being updated for 29<sup>th</sup> and 33<sup>rd</sup> will be replicated with the new overpasses with even wider sidewalks. City standards will be reflected in new bike/ pedestrian networks.
- Where could one find the accident history? Staff clarified in the Draft SEIS. Transportation Technical Report section 3.9 had information about the crash frequency and existing conditions.
- How was the park and ride date derived and why was the Waterfront Park and Ride thought to be a better idea when people mainly avoid the waterfront due to already congested roadways? Staff responded it was derived from household surveys, partner data, and assumption of drivers coming from East Vancouver on SR-14.
- Have elevators been looked at to connect multi-modal pedestrian paths? Why were they chosen unfeasible. Staff responded they are not quite to the design phase, but we have looked at elevators the transit stations.
- For the weave-in mentioned, do we have a video that showcases that? Staff confirmed the video, and all information is on the website including different design options, existing and proposed.
- Do we know the acquisition strategy for how this will be in 10 years? Staff responded there is information on the website that it is looking like 20 construction packages to be contracted out over time, including impacts during construction. As of now, there will be 3 lanes in either direction during peak hours during construction. Conversations have been had for property owners impacted by IBR program. Property owners are being invited to meet with IBR to communicate and go over acquisition processes.
- Is there any funding for Public Art for the added parking structures and transit stations? Staff responded there is no Public Art program in IBR however, City standard design elements will be applied to anything built within the city.
- Is there a price analysis for Transit Park and Ride parking price? Staff responded the Economic Prosperity and Housing team for City of Vancouver is working on a Downtown Parking Strategy however the City will not be building the parking garages, and if so, they will be on the responsibility of the IBR program and due to city standards, they would be mixed-use housing.
- Has interstate shade been analyzed and potential impacts for environmental or community health? Staff responded it is being analyzed.
- Is there a low-income tolling program? Staff responded they are advocating for the program to be put into place pre-construction; however, tolling should not begin until post-construction progress.
- Are financial and consumer impacts to the waterfront being analyzed?
- Will there be multi-lingual support for communication to folks who depend on transit and speak other languages? Staff responded they are working on multi-lingual communications and program updates and technical support.

Vice-Chair Edwards left the meeting.

## **St Johns/ St James Safety and Mobility Project**

Emily Benoit, Senior Transportation Planner, Brett Setterfield, Associate Transportation Planner, Community Development; Derek Abe, Alta Planning and Design, Consultant Project Manager

Staff presented an update on the St Johns/ St James Safety and Mobility Project including an overview of the project timeline, community engagement, as well as design concept options from Fourth Plain to 68<sup>th</sup> St. Proposed elements are protected mobility lanes, improved crosswalks, and narrowed travel lanes.

Commission discussion and staff responses:

### **Segment 1a St Johns Blvd: Fourth Plain Blvd to 29<sup>th</sup> St**

- What areas are we proposing crosswalk improvement and illumination? Staff responded that all existing crossings to enhance visibility, as well as R St and X St.
- Will there be consideration in placement of bollards for cyclists turning left? Staff responded that the goal of the bollards is for protection in separation of cars and bikes, and it will connect left-turning cyclists intentionally to the City's Bike and Small Mobility network.
- Will St. Johns and Fourth Plain crossing be improved for bike and pedestrian users? Staff responded that there will be design improvements to the crossing including a signal to connect cyclists to a future 2-way cycle track on the south side of Fourth Plain Blvd. Improving the crossing is on the list for improvements in the short-term.

### **Segment 1b Fort Vancouver Way: Fourth Plain Blvd to 29<sup>th</sup> St**

- Is the intersection of 29<sup>th</sup> and Fort Vancouver Way being analyzed for traffic calming and is it being reviewed by this program or the 29<sup>th</sup> and 33<sup>rd</sup> Safety & Mobility Project? Staff responded they are in coordination with the 29<sup>th</sup> and 33<sup>rd</sup> Safety & Mobility Project and seek to make changes that align with their proposed designs including markings on the road in the short-term and pedestrian islands and vertical delineation in the long-term.
- Will the removal of the center turn lane extend all the way to the intersection? Staff confirmed the removal will extend the length of the segment and with research they determined the volume of left-turns in the segment was very low. However, there may be possibility to keep a turn lane at the intersection as there are less space-constraints.
- Will transit times be impacted by the proposed changes in the segment? Staff confirmed there will not be any high impacts to any transit operating within the segment.

### **Segment 2 St Johns Blvd: Fort Vancouver Way to Petticoat Ln**

- The St Johns and 33<sup>rd</sup> traffic signal needs to be updated. How is it determined that traffic signals get radar, and which do not? Staff responded that there are long-term plans to update the 33<sup>rd</sup> intersection signal as well as roadway configurations to upgrade the intersection.

### **Segment 3 and 4 St Johns Rd and St James Rd: Petticoat Ln to Minnehaha St**

- What is the posted speed limit? Staff responded it ranges from 25-35.
- What are the traffic calming measures we are considering? Staff responded that speed tables and cushions are common traffic calming measures, as well as road narrowing.
- Has any part of this project considered a roundabout? Staff responded that in Segment 1a and 1b at the intersection of Fort Vancouver Way there is a possibility for a long-term recommendation to add a roundabout.
- Are there plans to improve illumination and visibility along the corridor? Staff confirmed that crossings will have added light and there is a study being conducted along the corridor for where there needs to be additional lighting?
- Are there recommendations to add additional signage or improvements to the on-ramp of SR 500 to improve the experience of active transportation users and drivers to clarify when and where cyclists and pedestrians will be going. Staff responded that they plan to partner with WSDOT to improve this intersection.
- Freight trucks often utilize this corridor for driving through as well as parking. Trucks often block the bike lanes so it would be helpful to have better wayfinding for trucks to find safe, consolidated parking to improve the corridor for everyone. Staff responded with gratitude for raising the concern

of truck parking and confirmed they are working with Freight to clarify this issue and continue improvements.

- The intersection of Cherry St needs improved visibility for cyclists. Staff responded it is on the list of proposed intersection work.
- Why are 3 and 4 two different sections? Staff responded that the slope of the road is slightly different between the two sections and the traffic volumes are different.

### **Segment 5 St Johns Rd: Minnehaha St to NE 68<sup>th</sup> St**

- Which NE 68<sup>th</sup> St does this project end at? Staff confirmed this is an off-set intersection and it ends at the North side of the railroad tracks. Most recommendations will be on the South side of 68<sup>th</sup> but there are sidewalk improvements and mobility lane reconfigurations to ease access to the North side of the tracks.

Staff then asked for feedback on safety and design improvements prioritization, i.e., protected mobility lanes, illumination, transit access, traffic calming, intersection crossing markings, etc. but due to time constraints, this feedback is to be emailed to the planning team.

Brief speech by newly appointed City Manager, Lon Pluckhan regarding the City's support for Commissioners.

### **Community Forum**

- Jennye Helzer was present to comment against the removal of parking in Carter Park. Jennye commented on speeds observed on the corridor advocating for more speed bumps. Jennye commented on the low bike volume on 29<sup>th</sup> and 33<sup>rd</sup> and the lack of need to add bike infrastructure on the corridor.
- Bill Dickey was present to comment on the removal of parking on the south side of 33<sup>rd</sup> and the lack of houses with driveways for parking. Bill advocated for sharrows.
- Michael Trabert was in support of better bike infrastructure on 29<sup>th</sup> and 33<sup>rd</sup> and advocated for fully protected bike lanes in the long-term design plans.
- Jonathan Wheeler was in support of better bike infrastructure along St. Johns and St. James, especially protected bike lanes and elimination of the "door zone" causing a cleaner separation between cars and active transportation users. Jonathan affirmed that the project aligns with City goals of lessening Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and making active transportation more accessible.
- Israel Lopez was present to comment on St. James and St. Johns Safety and Mobility Project as a cyclist, advocating for a better intersection on SR 500 and encouraging a possible partnership and grant process with WSDOT. Israel also commented on leaves in the bike lane and potential safety concerns.
- Alyssa wheeler was in support of St. Johns and St. James better bike infrastructure. Alyssa commented on the lack of connection within the City's Bike and Small Mobility Network and asked for a commitment to connect all the different bike lanes to the greater network. As well as a comment on including active transportation users in City funding decisions.
- Jason Hernandez was present to advocate for better bike infrastructure, including support for fully protected bike lanes on the St. Johns and St. James corridor, and opposition in the use of sharrows.
- Jason Cromer was in support of better bike infrastructure on 29<sup>th</sup> and 33<sup>rd</sup> and St. Johns and St. James. Jason also commented on including active transportation users and non-drivers in City-funding decisions. Jason also expressed gratitude for the projects.

### **Public Hearing 112<sup>th</sup> Ave Safety and Mobility Project**

Kate Drennan, Transportation Planning Program Manager; Monica Santos-Pinacho, PointNorth, Consultant Project Manager

Staff presented an overview for the project. This included project goals, public engagement, and recommended concepts. They also presented a timeline for the project in concurrency with City Paving and Capital Improvements Projects in alignment with the newly developed Transportation System Plan, (TSP) which NE 112<sup>th</sup> exists on in every modal network.

Commission discussion and staff responses:

**Near-term Recommendations: 2026-2028**

- What would be preventing the Shared Use Path, between NE 18<sup>th</sup> St and NE 28<sup>th</sup> St, sooner rather than later? Staff responded that property needs to be purchased. How wide is the sidewalk currently? Staff responded that sidewalk is currently 5-9 feet, and we would need at least 12 feet.
- On the future shared use path, will there be a designated bike lane? Staff responded there will be a distinction both visibly and physically to denote the bike path from the pedestrian path, however, they will be elevated to the same level.
- Why doesn't the project extend to Fourth Plain? Staff commented that it overlaps with WSDOT property and has yet to be put on the paving schedule.
- Will there be a sidewalk added to the intersection of Morrow Lane? Staff confirmed yes.
- Commissioner raised concern on steepness of Four Seasons Lane.
- Commissioner raised concern for pedestrians sharing path with active transportation users and noted that a tactile marker would need to extend the length of the path and offered that it may not be the best use of resources.
- Will there be a possibility of an all-way crossing for cyclists? Staff responded that there is already a leading pedestrian cycle and "no right on red" but it may not be a possibility due in part to Transit times. Commissioner advocated for more education and road paint.
- Is the proposed greenway considered near-term or long-term? Staff confirmed near-term.
- Commissioner echoed that turning left from 28<sup>th</sup> St onto 109<sup>th</sup> where the proposed greenway is, is a very dangerous turn.
- Commissioners were in support of adding "no right on red" to 28<sup>th</sup> and 112<sup>th</sup> intersections.

**Longer-term Recommendations:**

- What is the goal for Mill Plain and 112<sup>th</sup> intersection? Staff responded they plan to finish the roadway configuration north of Mill Plain in 2026 as well as some intersection work done by C-Tran for a new Vine station.
- What is the purpose of the median island? If they stop in the median island and the signal times out, are they stuck there? Staff responded that signal is timed very generously and allows for plenty of time to get across. Also, the median island increases daylighting and draws attention to the crossing for drivers to be encouraged to pay better attention near a crosswalk.
- What is the current east-west speed of Mill Plain? Staff responded 112<sup>th</sup> Ave is 35 being reduced to 30 and Mill Plain is currently 35.
- Commissioner was in support of reducing speeds to increase safety.

**Public Testimony**

- Alyssa wheeler was in support of 112<sup>th</sup> Ave Project and expressed generosity for better bike infrastructure. They asked for better turn options for cyclists and consistency in those changes. Alyssa advocated for fully protected bike lanes from 28<sup>th</sup> to 51<sup>st</sup> including bollards.
- Jason Cromer was in support for better bike infrastructure on 112<sup>th</sup> Ave and commented on keeping infrastructure consistent and easy to follow for active transportation users and drivers.
- Jason Hernandez was there to comment on all projects. Including safety of roadways within the City and the need for better protections. Jason was in support of bollards, speed bumps, and rumble strips. Jason also raised concern for safety concerns of flashing beacons.
- Samin Sepasi was present to comment on all projects. In favor of better bike infrastructure and better crossings for pedestrians. In favor of a Complete Streets Initiative.
- Chris Erickson was in support of the 112<sup>th</sup> Ave Project. Chris commented on the Vancouver City Center Redevelopment Authorities Pipeline. Chris was in support of active transportation infrastructure on 112<sup>th</sup> to address the growth and need of the 112<sup>th</sup> corridor.

- Tabor Kelly was present to support neighborhood greenways and was opposed to the neighborhood greenway proposed in the 112<sup>th</sup> Ave plans. Tabor was in support of a greenway on 109<sup>th</sup> north of 28<sup>th</sup> St. Tabor also referenced the goals of the TSP.

**Commission Deliberation**

Commissioner Ken Williams agreed with the public comments that this is not a perfect solution, but this is a very important corridor.

Commissioner Fender supported the project and the changes to increase safety.

Commissioner Ruggles supported the project and use of paint to increase safety.

Commissioner Gatton had concerns with the timeframe of the parallel greenways and asked that they get done concurrently with the rest of the project. Overall, was in support of the improvements.

Commissioner echoed the pedestrian challenges in this area and was grateful for the improvements.

Commissioner Phan preferred a 30-mph speed and was in support.

Commissioner Devan Williams echoed support for the improvements and better separation between cars and active transportation users will make it safer for all.

Commissioner Schmit was in support of the project but had questions about the future projection of cycling.

Chair was in support of safety and illumination at all bus stops, photo enforcement, and lower speeds.

**Motion** by Commissioner Ken Williams, seconded by Commissioner Ruggles that the Transportation and Mobility Commission recommend the near-term roadway design in segments 1 & 2, long-term projects and design in segments 2 & 3, and other related safety and mobility projects as presented and discussed in the recommendations report.

**Roll Call Vote**

Commissioner Ruggles	Yes
Commissioner Grandstaff	Yes
Commissioner Devan Williams	Yes
Commissioner Gatton	Yes
Commissioner Phan	Yes
Commissioner Raia	Yes
Commissioner Schmit	Yes
Commissioner Ken Williams	Yes
Commissioner Fender	Yes
Chair Ramos	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

**Staff Communication**

Rebecca – Thanks to Corey Grandstaff for his service to the City and on this Commission. Thanks to Julie, as this is her last meeting. Election of officers will occur in December.

**Commission Communication**

Ramos – Thanks to Security and Police presence at meetings. Ending service at end of 2024.

The meeting adjourned at 8:46 pm.

DocuSigned by:  
  
 062AD82A7F0D4E6...  
 Eduardo Ramos, Chair

12/5/2024