



**City of Vancouver**  
**SE Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan (NTMP)**  
**Steering Committee Meeting Summary**  
**January 24, 2002**

**Members Present:**

Terry Brown for Lyn Wilson  
Jim Etzkorn  
Patrick Greene  
Chuck Hoover  
Dennis Johnson  
Tom Miletich  
Tim Schauer  
Gary Thomsen  
Mary White

**Project Team Members:**

Todd Boulanger, City of Vancouver Transportation Services (COV)  
John Manix, COV  
Chris Maciejewski, DKS Associates  
Randy McCourt, DKS Associates  
Matt Ransom, COV  
Jessica Stalberger, The JD White Company, Inc. (TWC)

**Introductions/ Review**

Todd Boulanger, City of Vancouver Transportation Services, began the meeting by introducing himself. Todd is the project manager of the SE Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan. Introductions were done around the table.

**NTMP Goals/ Policies Review**

Todd stated that Chapter 3 is more or less a policy by which older streets are retrofitted. Todd asked if anyone had any thoughts about the chapter.

Chuck Hoover asked if part of the intention of the document was for presentation to the Vancouver City Council. Todd answered it would be presented to the City Council. Chuck stated it seems a bit long and wordy. He suggested summarizing it into a few short paragraphs.

Todd asked if anyone else had any thoughts regarding that section of the document. There were no other issues raised regarding that section.

Todd stated he wanted to discuss the traffic impact guidelines.

Patrick Greene inquired if the guidelines were based on the volume of traffic. Todd answered yes, they are based on volume as well as street design.

Jim Etzkorn stated it is important to have these guidelines and that they are absolutely necessary.

Chuck suggested emphasizing the effort to get the most value out of the available finances. It should be repeated several times throughout the text of the document.

Dennis Johnson suggested including a table or chart that would list the various steps and stages of the overall neighborhood traffic management process, making it easier to understand.

Todd asked if anyone had any thoughts on the speeds or the scoring points laid out in Chapter 3 of the document. He stated the scoring procedure is based on street types similar to other cities. The point system functioned as more of a planning activity.

Chuck mentioned there should be enough flexibility to have options to choose from. Todd agreed that choices are needed.

There was some discussion about the 500-vehicle-per-day volume for a "D" category street being too high of a threshold. Todd asked John Manix, City of Vancouver Transportation Services, what his opinion was of the 500-count threshold. John responded it sounds fairly high for a cul-de-sac type street design. On the other hand, setting it too low needs to be avoided as well. Setting it at 400 might be a good starting point. He also stated demographics of the street need to be considered along with the volume of traffic.

Todd asked if anyone had any thoughts on how the scoring was prioritized in Section 3.21, Table 3-10. Jim stated he thought there was a better term to use than "low-income area." John proposed the term "block grant qualifying." It was agreed that a different term such as the one mentioned would be used.

#### **Chapter 4**

Randy McCourt, DKS Associates, stated while Chapter 3 is geared toward addressing existing problems, Chapter 4 is directed toward future development and takes more of a proactive stance. The intent is to identify criteria for the impacts of new development and street design. Randy asked if there were any questions about Chapter 4.

Dennis mentioned the first two sentences of the second-to-last paragraph in Section 4.5. He suggested that different wording be used. As it is currently stated, the language refers to mitigating something that does not exist.

Chuck Hoover questioned the vehicle thresholds used in Chapter 4. Randy discussed thresholds that were chosen for the "C" and "D" street categories listed in Section 4.3. The intent of setting the daily volume total for "C" streets at 1,000 vehicles per day is to set a threshold to determine that action will be needed to improve the street. John Manix agreed that 1,000 vehicles per day is an appropriate threshold for "C" routes. Thresholds for "D" streets were set at 500 vehicles per day to account for lower through volumes on these local streets.

The second threshold of vehicles was set based on peak-hour trip generation. The amount of traffic generated by a site depends on the size of land use. The criteria listed in Chapter 4 are typical of many subdivisions common to the southeast Vancouver area. The peak-hour trip generation criteria are fairly new and are different from most traffic management plans. Ninety-nine percent of traffic management plans in the US are reactive instead of proactive. Salem, Oregon, and Camas, Washington, both use criteria similar to this and neither have had to make any adjustments yet. Their criteria have been in place for two to three years.

Randy stated the criteria are easy to monitor. The intent is to identify emerging issues before they become a significant problem.

Tim Schauer suggested adding a sentence to the document that would clarify what it means if a threshold is reached. It means only that improvements need to be looked into; it is not automatically binding to anything specific. He also stated if a neighborhood has some type of traffic-calming program implemented, it lends a marketable aspect for that community.

Randy stated the intent of this neighborhood traffic management plan is geared toward the livability of neighborhoods. One funding option for this plan would be to require developments to mitigate

their impacts as part of the approval process. He also mentioned that with the cash-out option for developers, the burden of coming up with a solution is placed on the city. With the cash-out option, funds collected for calming improvements are pooled and then used when and where they are needed.

Another funding option is a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF). With this type of program, it doesn't matter where the impact is; everyone contributes financially. With this type of program, there needs to be a strong nexus between impacts and funding.

Tim stated he would advocate against a TIF because it tends to create a hot button issue. Most of the committee agreed.

Randy stated most developers are okay with paying impact fees as long as they don't have to pay every time. If it is made less confusing for them, such as with a TIF program, then the burden of traffic impacts is off the developer. It is also important to avoid making the process too automatic without any room for choices.

Tom Miletich brought up the issue of traffic-calming devices needing to be conducive to emergency response vehicles.

John raised the concern that, with the nexus approach, developers will do only the minimum required impact improvements. It would be better if they could financially contribute to something that would make a more meaningful impact instead.

Tim stated that developers want their impact fees to be used to improve their developments. In Clark County, there is already a stigma against all the money going into one fund and then being dispersed from there.

Chuck suggested there should be a process to drive developers away from using the least expensive possible solution. The example of speed humps was used. There needs to be a definite process concerning what type of traffic-calming devices to apply in certain situations.

John mentioned the next step would be some type of buy-out program. He asked if the impact improvements would be the city's prerogative with this type of program. Randy answered it would be the neighborhood's prerogative, and there would need to be some type of neighborhood process.

Jim stated that because certain traffic-calming solutions do not work for emergency response vehicles, this would help to narrow the list of options.

Randy stated the intent is to be able to select from a set of standards that are appropriate for Vancouver. The standards will take time to develop, and educating the public will come much sooner than the solutions will.

Gary Thomsen mentioned that school buses need to be accommodated when considering traffic-calming solutions.

Next, Randy discussed the current criteria of street standards. Currently, there are set minimum standards. The goal for the future is to establish maximum standards. Randy gave the example of setting a maximum standard width of 28 feet for a street. Currently, it is set at 36 feet.

Tim commented that, generally, 28 feet works well for neighborhood streets.

A short discussion of on-street parking followed, and a question was asked about enforcement of on-street parking. Tim commented that on-street parking is affected by the presence or absence of driveways attached to the street. If so, the amount of on-street parking is limited.

Randy stated they were going to lay out the new standards and will have them ready for review next month. He stated one of the last issues for discussion is the link between connectivity and traffic calming. Connectivity is very important for emergency response vehicles. There need to be multiple routes to choose from. Linking livability with safety is equally important. At some point, there may have to be a tradeoff between the cost of various traffic-calming devices and safety.

Jim suggested that a document be created that focuses on the needs of emergency response vehicles and school buses. It should be made readily available to everyone, including developers and neighborhood associations.

Randy asked the group if Chapter 4 makes sense to everyone. The group consensus was yes.

### **Connectivity Modeling Results Summary**

Chris Maciejewski, DKS Associates, distributed maps of potential connections in Evergreen Airport area neighborhoods that were tested in the 2020 forecast model to determine the effectiveness of connectivity as a traffic management tool. Randy also displayed a large map of southeast Vancouver.

Randy stated the testing was aimed at various concepts. The intent was to track micro neighborhoods of travel patterns and aim to understand the connectivity of these areas. They were also looking to see what the impact was to certain neighborhoods when connections were added. Overall, the same lesson was replicated throughout the east side of the study area. However, it did not replicate itself at all on the west side.

One question they were seeking to answer was this: "Is connectivity a viable traffic calming measure?" The answer found was yes. Connectivity can be used to spread travel patterns to the streets that provide access into the neighborhoods.

Gary asked if the models accounted for cut-through traffic. Randy responded in the affirmative.

Randy emphasized there were two major findings of the modeling. One finding was that connectivity and livability must go hand in hand. The other major finding was that certain neighborhoods would have greater benefits from connectivity than other neighborhoods.

### **Demonstration Project Selection/ Discussion**

Chris handed out a document containing the list of potential demo projects. Randy asked the group to focus on the last page where the projects were divided into two categories: large capital investments and small capital investments. The projects with a large capital requirement are too big for the focus right now. The projects requiring a small investment are more neighborhood oriented. He stated the best way to go with the demo projects is where there will be an actual benefit.

Jim suggested that the intersection of McGillivray Boulevard and Village Loop be added to the list because of a recent near fatality. The committee agreed that this project would be a good traffic management demo project as part of the 160<sup>th</sup> bike corridor project.

**Map Updates**

Chris then handed out the Chapter 2 updates and the maps. Randy stated the maps have been updated and encouraged the group to review them.

**Wrap-Up**

The next meeting will be held Thursday, February 28, from 5:30–7:00 p.m. at Fire Station 89.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.