

From: [JAMES DESMOND](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Worley, Steve](#); [Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar](#)
Subject: DO NOT WANT ANY CHANGES TO OUR CITY STREETS
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 1:40:42 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jamescoydesmond@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Especially your plans for McGillvary, do not eliminate traffic lanes. Remove vehicle travel lanes is STUPID, ALL my NEIGHBORS AGREE. SO if you remove lanes, we will see to it that you and those of your friends and those in your political parties, will be removed from office. Please tell me what you are going to do.

James C. dezZ Desmond, 17417 SE GRAHAM RD, 98683-5815

From: [D.Christensen](#)
To: [Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar](#)
Subject: Save our streets
Date: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 11:00:26 AM

You don't often get email from d.christensen@ymail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing to let you know that like many residence, I oppose plans being made by the city without community involvement that involves removing lanes from streets and restricting car travel. Especially on the east side where we have ample sidewalks and bike lanes that are rarely used as it stands. This is the wrong direction for the city to go and it is unacceptable to make these changes with community input.

Dale Christensen

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Jason Cromer](#)
To: [Kennedy, Rebecca](#)
Cc: [Tabor Kelly](#); [Benoit, Emily](#); [Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar](#); [Ken Williams](#); [Leah Jackson](#)
Subject: Re: Upper Main St Project Proposal Not Meeting TSP Guidelines
Date: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 11:02:18 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Rebecca,

Thank you, and we appreciate your work on this!

Best,
Jason

On Wed, Apr 17, 2024 at 6:47 AM Kennedy, Rebecca
<Rebecca.Kennedy@cityofvancouver.us> wrote:

Thanks Jason, we continue to work on this project and appreciate you and the group's engagement and willingness to spend time working toward a solution. I've forwarded this to the project team. We'll discuss more in the next few weeks and follow up. As always, appreciate your partnership.

Rebecca Kennedy | Deputy Director

Pronouns: She/Her

City of Vancouver, WA

Community Development Department

M: (360) 624-6070 | **O:** (360) 487-7896

rebecca.kennedy@cityofvancouver.us

www.cityofvancouver.us



Learn more about [Our Vancouver](#): an effort to update our City's plan for growth and development over the next 20 years.

From: Jason Cromer <jasonmcromer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 7:06 PM
To: Kennedy, Rebecca <Rebecca.Kennedy@cityofvancouver.us>
Cc: Tabor Kelly <taborkelly@gmail.com>; Benoit, Emily <Emily.Benoit@cityofvancouver.us>; Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar <TransMobilityCommissionAgendaCal@cityofvancouver.us>; Ken Williams <ken_williams_98664@msn.com>; Leah Jackson <nichewine@gmail.com>
Subject: Upper Main St Project Proposal Not Meeting TSP Guidelines

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Rebecca,

I wanted to bring up the current [Upper Main St project](#) and the current designs proposed. We've had two meetings with the project team (Maggie Derk), and also attended the TMC meeting where the designs were shown. The current design only has bicycle and mobility lanes proposed down to 40th St, and nowhere else in the corridor going south.

According to the [TSP](#) (that was voted in by City Council), Upper Main is identified as a mobility corridor and has mobility lanes outlined in the TSP along the entire corridor. You can see these on pages **26**, **33**, and **39** of the TSP, outlining that Upper Main will require micromobility lanes. Tabor testified on this in the last TMC meeting in April, and referenced that this is in the TMC. The proposed designs for this project completely neglect this.

Furthermore, since we (are supposed to) follow NACTO guidelines in WA, and this is supposed to be a Complete Streets project, the lack of any mobility lanes connecting to 39th St or 33rd St goes against those guidelines. It's also worth noting that since Upper Main has businesses that are utilized by many bicyclists, not adding safe infrastructure for micromobility across this corridor goes against our initiatives as outlined in the Climate Action Plan and Vancouver's Comprehensive Plan. It presents a danger to anyone using micromobility and doesn't encourage the usage of micromobility.

In our meeting with Maggie today, she mentioned that from 33rd to 39th St, a northbound lane is being removed, opening an entire lane width. Her proposed design would make this space an interior buffer that is completely unused. This could instead be a bicycle lane that would connect to the 33rd St mobility network. In our meeting, she acknowledged this and stated that it would be possible, but that the TSP doesn't require it. My response to this is two fold: Firstly, it is required in the TSP. Secondly, even if it is not required, why not use the otherwise wasted space to turn into bicycle lanes that would connect 33rd and 39th with Upper Main.

I couldn't get a direct response to that during the meeting.

I wanted to raise this because I fear that this project is dodging what is outlined in our TSP, and is completely missing two serious connections in the mobility network: Upper Main and 39th, and Upper Main and 33rd. The width/space is there, it's outlined in our TSP, it's outlined in NACTO and Complete Streets documentation, and it would create a nice grid of connections amongst several bicycle corridors, both existing and planned.

Thank you.

Best,

Jason

From: [Jason Cromer](#)
To: [Derk, Maggie](#); [Kennedy, Rebecca](#); [Lopossa, Ryan](#)
Cc: [Leah Jackson](#); [Peter L. Fels](#); [Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar](#)
Subject: Dutch Cycling Embassy on Cycling & Intermodality
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 1:44:40 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi all,

I just wanted to share [this short article](#) on combined modalities from a Dutch planning perspective.

Quote from the article that I feel is relevant to our adapting city today, and how we could lean more into these changes to further increase share in modalities:

Even cars can benefit from a strong bicycle plan. As many say: the best car plan is a bicycle plan. By stimulating car drivers to switch to other modalities, such as the bike, more space on the road is opened up, which can be used by essential traffic such as emergency services and heavy goods transport.

Best,
Jason

From: [Anna S](#)
To: [Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar](#)
Subject: SE 34th Street, SE Vancouver Traffic Issues
Date: Monday, April 29, 2024 8:57:12 AM

You don't often get email from anna217@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the planned Mobility Lanes on SE 34th Street. Over the past few weeks, the road has been reduced to just one lane in each direction due to sidewalk repairs. SE 34th Street is a heavily traveled route. This situation has become increasingly untenable, causing significant delays and frustration for commuters and residents alike.

Adding to already congested conditions, the planned development of the VIC is projected to generate an additional 29,000+ daily trips through the area. This influx of traffic will only exacerbate the existing problems and further strain the infrastructure. Add to that your plan of reducing the road from 4 to 2 lanes. It is already hard to turn left onto SE 34th Street from SE 172nd Street, causing frequent accidents; it will be extremely challenging once there is only one lane in each direction. Instead of improving traffic flow and infrastructure, you are worsening the conditions.

Furthermore, it is perplexing to note that existing bike lanes on SE 29th and 20th streets are rarely utilized. Instead of focusing on adding more mobility lanes, why don't you promote these existing underutilized bike lanes?

Thank you for your consideration,

Anna

Christopher
P.O. Box 872134
Vancouver, WA 98684

May 7th 2024

Chair Ramos and Transportation and Mobility Commission members,

McGillivray Approval/Request To Rescind

Having reviewed the last 12 months of the Commission's meeting and minutes I see that none of the legitimate questions brought to you by those concerned with the lane removal on McGillivray was brought to the city by the Commission. If the purpose of the Commission is not to also listen and serve as a liaison between the city and citizens, what is it?

Public Testimony 26 Pro 26 Con

Public Comments 31 Pro 84 Con

Concerns Addressed 0

Through Public Records, I have received a copy of the "McGillivray online survey" results.

62% of the Respondents thought the program would help little or not at all.

Question #5, which was the 1st Essay Free Text question:

389 Negative Comments

42 Positive

The balance of open comments followed the same pattern. The city reported the results of this survey to you and the city council as:

"While some community members expressed concern with the idea of repurposing a vehicle travel lane in each direction, many community members were supportive of having more space for people walking, riding bicycles and other small mobility devices within the existing Right-of-Way."

Most of our questions remain unanswered about this program. The city talked to us in February of 2023 and we have not heard from them since. This was but one of the 10-15 consistent questions and concerns raised and unanswered in testimony and comments to the commission before your approval.

This lane removal is a major quality of life issue for 11% of the population that live in and rely on McGillivray. Our questions and concerns are valid and worthy of answers. As determined by the titles of the members we falsely believed the commission to have some citizen's advocate role. Behavior suggests the opposite with all indications that the commission only fulfills the final role of the planning department.

I've attended several commission meetings to observe and as a participant to provide public testimony. Questions I've raised repeatedly in writing and verbal testimony are unanswered with no indication from the records that the commission addressed any with the city. I feel as if I have spoken and written to an empty room. Even reviewing the draft minutes for the 24-04-02 meeting prepared for tonight's meeting, I see that some of you were upset that they were not removing lanes in segments 2 & 3 of Fourth Plain. Has the commission no advocate for those who prefer or rely on car travel? Have you this little regard for the 97% who drive?

I've reviewed a year's worth of projects seen by the commission and see that your work on McGillivray is typical of the commission's tag-along thought independent behavior.

MAC

From: [Carol Hostetler](#)
To: [Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar](#)
Subject: Proposed reduction of lanes on McGilivray Blvd
Date: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 12:01:26 AM

You don't often get email from carolahostetler@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commission Members,

I strongly disagree with the plan to reduce the driving lanes on McGilivray Blvd from two lanes each direction to just one lane each direction. I have followed the communication from the City to residents, attended meetings and responded to the survey. I strongly feel the process was not designed to solicit or actively consider the opinion of residents. The survey asking for response to the proposed plans did not allow any disagreement or way to submit suggestions. I did figure out if I marked NO, that the plan did not meet the established goals, then I got an option to comment. None of the residents I talked to had figured out a way to input comment.

I respect the needs of providing safe avenues of transportation for walkers, bikers and other type of mobility, but I do not think the needs of these few override the needs of our many drivers.

I suggest that most of the goals and improved safety for all can be achieved keeping our two lanes of traffic in each direction. Safety can be increased with more consistent use of lineage and signage, clearer designation of turning lanes, more btightly lined and signed crosswalks, more restricted 'no parking' area before intersections, additional blinking pedestrian signs at school intersection crosswalks, and electronic monitoring and ticketing of speed limit.

I request further meetings to consider resident suggestions.

Carol Hostetler

2909 SE Blairmont Drive, Vancouver, WA 98683