

Date: October 9, 2024

Time: 8:00 a.m.

Location

City Hall – Council Chambers
415 W 6th Street
Vancouver, WA 98668

Regular Meeting (Convened in person and via video conference)
The meeting agenda materials referenced in these minutes can be found [online](#).

Item 1: Call to Order and Roll Call

The October 9, 2024, meeting of the Parking Advisory Committee Meeting was called to order at 8 am by President Ryan Morin.

Board Members Present: Ryan Morin, Jason Cromer, Kurt Stonex, Jocelyn Cross, Travis Schemp, Garrett Ginter

Board Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Patrick Quinton, Chris Harder, Gabriel Montez, Dan Lloyd, Lori Severino, Maggie Derk, Katherine Kelly, Oliva Kahn, Tina Picchioni, Kimberly Kerlee

Guests: Casey Liles, WSDOT, Shilpa Mallem, ODOT, Katy Belokonny, IBR, Jennifer John, IBR

Public Comment:

Kimberlee Goheen-Elbon stated that when she searched Google for the Parking Advisory Committee the first three listings are outdated. In her opinion this is a continuance of keeping the public, who is the government, unaware of this local city government. Ask people to be a whistle blower, serve God instead of money and government. Commented on a possible light-rail stop at the current Hurley building site. Stated that citizens have voted light-rail down three times however the government is saying they're putting light-rail in.

Approval of Minutes

Cromer motioned, seconded by Cross, to approve the August 14, 2024, minutes. Motion unanimously passed.

Members

Ryan Morin
President

Jason Cromer
Vice-Chair

Garrett Ginter
Kurt Stonex
Jocelyn Cross
Travis Schemp

415 W 6th Street
P.O. Box 1995
Vancouver, WA 98668
cityofvancouver.us

To request accommodation or other formats, please contact:

Economic Prosperity & Housing | 360-487-8657 | Relay 711 | Tina.Picchioni@cityofvancouver.us

Interstate Bridge Replacement Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Montez stated that the IBR team will discuss the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the Interstate Bridge Replacement Program (IBR), focusing on the analysis of the park and Ride options. Montez introduced City staff in attendance, Katherine Kelly and Lori Severino and acknowledged IBR staff attending virtually, Shilpa Mallem and Casey Liles.

Kelly affirmed the walk through of the role map at the August PAC meeting, which provided an overview of all the components of the program. Stated that currently they have a public comment period for the DSEIS. That includes executive summary for each of the components of the program, as well as technical findings. Staff have pulled out very high-level key findings from those reports which will be shared. Would like to get feedback. They, as staff, will submit comments at the close of the comments period. There will not be a formal Council statement on the DSEIS is currently scheduled for mid-2025. There will then be a formal comment from the city and approval of that final design to move forward to construction.

Severino showed and summarized the five potential sites for park and ride facilities that would be near the future light rail station– including three in the Waterfront area and two near the future light rail station at Evergreen Boulevard. Four of these options would require construction of a new facility, while one would utilize an existing structure. The assumed format for sites 1a and 1b in the Waterfront area is the construction of a multilevel aboveground structure. Site 1c is next to the Waterfront Gateway site and 2a, is in the Library Square site. The intent for site 2b would be to lease some of the spaces at the existing parking structure of the Columbia Credit Union building. The IBR program will ultimately include up to one park and ride at each station with no more than two total. The analysis assumes 1,270 spaces total with 700 near Evergreen and 570 near the Waterfront based on previous modeling by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as a part of the grant funding process. These numbers are subject to change.

Once the program gets updated information from the FTA, the City of Vancouver and other IBR program partners will consider the analysis of park and ride options in the Draft SEIS, public comments on the Draft SEIS, consistency with policies, costs, and operational and design factors to determine where and how to accommodate the required parking. The proposed park and ride solution will be documented in the Final SEIS and Record of Decision

The presentation focused on the technical report with the most discussion on the park and ride option. This includes acquisitions and displacement, transportation, visual quality, land use and economics.

Staff comments to-date are:

1. Clarify FTA park and ride requirements as soon as possible. This includes defining what would count as a park and ride space and an understanding of any requirements related to shared-use agreements of existing facilities as well as new transit-oriented development sites.
2. The Draft SEIS compared potential park and ride locations but not potential scenarios of zero, one, or two sites. It also did not analyze potential formats of the park and ride (i.e., existing or new, belowground or aboveground, shared use or single use). These types of comparisons, along with exploration of using existing parking supply, could help inform how much new parking is needed and in which form new parking should be provided. Therefore, work following the Draft SEIS and leading to a Final SEIS should:
 - evaluate the potential to use existing parking spaces to the maximum extent possible,
 - explore a dispersed parking program that connects transit riders to the existing supply, and
 - compare 0, 1, or 2 new facilities, considering the differences between existing and new structures, below- or above-ground structures, and shared use and single use facilities.
3. Conduct more City policy and planning review, including ongoing work related to Downtown parking, redevelopment, and design and Citywide economic and equitable development.
4. Remove the Waterfront Gateway park and ride site as an option.
5. Conduct more in-depth review and provide a more detailed analysis on the potential for negative climate, land use, economic, visual, neighborhood, and equity/environmental justice effects resulting from new, large parking structures.
6. Consider the opportunity costs of building a new parking structure compared to using the existing parking supply to meet demand.

7. Continue to work with City staff and the community to analyze the appropriate level and design of park and ride for any/all sites that may be required.

Staff is seeking feedback from the Parking Advisory Committee on the following:

- What are your thoughts on the analysis of the Park and Ride options in the Draft SEIS?
- Which option(s) would best align with the draft Downtown Parking Plan?
- What are your thoughts on the feasibility of a dispersed parking program serving future transit riders?
- Do you have any additional feedback?

Reiterated that the Draft SEIS is an important opportunity for the public to get involved. Encourage the Community to share their thoughts on the analysis and their preferences. Indicated ways to provide comment. An open house event will be at Clark College on October 15th. IBR is hosting a range of events to help people understand what the draft SEIS says. The city is supplementing that effort with presentations and outreach through social media and newsletters.

Comments from Committee

Morin asked what went into the decision-making process regarding parking utilization. Park and rides throughout the Portland Max system don't appear to be 100 percent utilized. What makes us believe that Vancouver's park and rides would be 100 percent utilized?

Kelly stated that as the development of the modified locally preferred alternative and the transit component were underway, they looked at how most trips would happen and what the ridership would be for the light rail. The attraction to a new transit facility such as the light rail system was part of the analysis.

Jennifer John, IBR transportation team, stated that one of the things that the model is based on pre-pandemic observed data out in the system. Based on travel behavior based on different modes of transportation. Pre-pandemic the utilization was fairly strong within the TriMet and C-Tran system. It was anticipated that lots would be fuller. Based on travel behavior and how people are perceiving that mode as an option against other modes.

Kelly stated that it is based on origin and destination which takes into account the different land uses. What is the density that would be attracted to come to that new facility as a mode of travel? As we go to final design we need to consider where the sites are in addition to our existing supply

Stonex stated that he was reading an article that said that public transit ridership hasn't come back yet. Does anyone know why?

Kelly stated that ridership is starting to increase but it isn't yet to the pre-pandemic level. Modeling is based in 2040, land use growth and additional growth within the region is based on origin and destination which takes into account the different land uses.

Stonex asked if the park and rides be monitored or regulated?

Kelly stated that those things will be determined as we come to final design not just for the site, but also what are the agreements? How does it operate? How is it enforced? What is the security?

Cromer stated that the preliminary questions are strong and asked if there are any regulatory updates on regulatory for park and rides. Any update to removing that requirement or modifying it?

Kelly stated that she does not have any additional updates on that. The bottom line is there's a sense that parking and park and ride structures in particular are less favorable than they used to be for funding criteria through the Federal Transit Administration.

Cromer stated that that is a big concern of his especially in some of the densest areas of downtown. A land use waste, having a parking structure instead of housing or green space, or really anything else that would be a productive land use.

Morin agreed with Cromer, particularly the option of parking in 2A. Using that large vacant space directly in front of the library for a massive parking structure seems like a potential error from a people centered city. A large parking structure causes worry that there may be issues with livability in that area.

Cross agreed with Cromer and Morin regarding the E1 site. Stated the W2 site is currently not parking. Why using such old aerial photos/maps from 2018? W1 slated to be removed with an off ramp. How does that impact where a park and ride will go? Cross stated that the diagram is confusing.

Casey Liles, IBR, stated that the W2 site is partially overlapping with the site. It's a gravel site owned by a WSDOT and technically not public parking. At one point there was a discussion about a private business with a potential lease from WSDOT on parking. I'm not sure if that's enacted or not so it could be referring to that potential.

Cross inquired about W1 location, employee displacement and the off ramp.

Liles generally described how site W1 would function with the off ramp. It would be listed in the appendix or the acquisition technical report at the end.

Stonex stated that W2 underneath the bridge next to the railroad tracks would be a good option to put one of these park and ride locations, assuming we must have one.

Cross agreed with Stonex. It's also close to the Waterfront, an active area.

Cromer asked about evaluation done on induced demand in the area and environmental impacts of bringing more traffic vehicle traffic to downtown. Because our transportation system plan and our climate action plan want to mitigate that, this seems at odds with both of those plans. Is there any environmental impact evaluation on induced vehicle demand in downtown due to the park and ride?

Kelly stated they look at greenhouse gas inventory. Want to shift to non-single occupant vehicles as much as possible and park and rides as an attractor. Balance between getting people to different travel options. A lot more work to be done on that front.

Cromer gave an example of a creative effective working system in a city he has visited.

Severino provided more details on their comments and wanting more review of the nuances of climate and environmental impacts.

Montez stated that we will work together to draft a memo so we can make an official statement. We can revisit this at our next meeting.

Parking Plan Update

Montez stated that we hope to have an official draft plan for review at our November meeting. Will kick off our public participation phase to solicit feedback from the public. On the City Council agenda for workshop in January and hope to go for official adoption in February.

Adjournment

9:00 am

Ryan Morin, Board President

Meetings of the Parking Advisory Committee are electronically recorded on audio. The audio tapes are kept on file in the office of the City Clerk for a period of six years.