



City of Tacoma
Transportation Commission

Justin Leighton, Co-Chair
Jane Ann Moore, Co-Chair
Gary Hofmann
Michael Hutchinson
Judi Hyman
Yoshi Kumara
Jacki Skaught
Andrew Strobel
John Thurlow
Kristina Walker

MINUTES

MEETING: Regular Meeting
TIME: Wednesday, April 16th, 6:00pm
PLACE: 9th Floor Visibility Center, Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402
PRESENT: Kristina Walker, Judi Hyman, Jacki Skaught, Andrew Strobel, Gary Hofmann,
Yoshi Kumara, John Thurlow, Jane Ann Moore
ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

Jane Ann Moore called the meeting to order at 6:02pm.

2. ROLL CALL

John Thurlow arrived at 6:05pm. Justin Leighton and Mike Hutchinson were absent.

Gerrit Nyland, a member of the Commission on Disabilities, attended to introduce the group and state interest in following the TC's work. He listed examples of the Commission's work, including reviews of new buildings and remodels to ensure proper accessible designs for people with disabilities. Gerrit has a specific interest in anything that is being worked on in the public right-of-way. The Commission on Disabilities meets the first Thursday of each month from 4-6pm.

Evette Mason, Local Government Contact for the Port of Tacoma was also present.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Judi Hyman asked for clarification on whether Greenroads in the minutes refer to the organization or the type of road and indicated that the Commission should make sure this is clear in future discussions and documentation. Meeting minutes from the March 19, 2014 meeting were reviewed and approved with clarifications on green roads vs Greenroads.

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Heavy Haul Corridor Updates – Jennifer Kammerzell

Jennifer Kammerzell explained the special chapter of the Tacoma Municipal Code that provides permits for vehicles in excess of legal weight limits carrying "sealed ocean-going containers" and weighing over 80,000lbs. Many other ports have adopted similar permits, which are more efficient for moving goods and yield an economic benefit for the City. The program also allows the City to monitor and charge these vehicles. Other vehicles may apply for similar permits if



The City of Tacoma does not discriminate on the basis of disability in any of its programs, activities, or services. To request this information in an alternative format or to request a reasonable accommodation, please contact the Public Works Department at (253) 591-5525 (voice) or TTY-711.

747 Market Street, Room 408 ■ • Tacoma, WA 98402 ■ • (253) 591-5525 ■ • FAX (253) 591-5097 ■

• <http://www.cityoftacoma.org/publicworks>

they don't meet the same weight standards. Fees are \$3,000 per year, generate approximately \$170,000 per year, and have produced approximately \$1.3 million thus far. Prior projects include Portland Avenue, the Lincoln Avenue Bridge, Milwaukee Way, and Port of Tacoma Road. Fees also support a roadway enforcement officer. There are 5 proposed additions to the Heavy Haul Industrial Corridor Network – Thorne Road, Maxwell Way, Alexander Avenue, Lincoln Avenue, and Milwaukee Way. Jennifer explained the purpose of each proposed additional corridor. IPS will review these corridors in June and make a recommendation to the City Council. The intention for presenting this topic to the TC is to make Commissioners aware of the different systems, partnerships, and funding that come out of the Heavy Haul Corridors.

Kristina Walker Question: Is there a requirement on Heavy Haul Corridors for bicycle and pedestrian standards generally or is it project by project?

Evette Mason Response: Money for Port of Tacoma Road design came from the Federal Surface Transportation Program so it required sidewalk. There is no requirement for sidewalks on these corridors generally.

Josh Diekmann Comment: The lack of other good alternatives for biking and walking in the area was the impetus for this infrastructure, less so the Heavy Haul Corridor itself.

Andrew Strobel Question: Since the D St ramp project seems like it's continuing on SR 509, has there been thought on making this a Heavy Haul Corridor as well?

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: This process typically occurs as needed so this facility could be reviewed and added in the future as appropriate.

Andrew Strobel Question: Has there been coordination with the City of Fife on Alexander Avenue for similar permitting?

Yvette Comment: State Heavy Haul permit on SR 509 exists and no issues have ever come up from Fife.

Gary Hofmann Comment: Mainly designed for Port of Tacoma trucks that are already contained within SR 509, not all other trucks.

No other questions or comments.

b. Transportation Master Plan – Land Use and Travel Modeling – Ian Munce and Kendra Breiland

Ian Munce: Under GMA, local communities are required to accommodate the growth assigned to them with the exception of the Puget Sound Region, which must follow Vision 2040. Vision 2040 includes policies that all communities within the region must follow. The goal is to decentralize growth but it's not working well yet as people still try to enter King County. Vision 2040 focuses on approximately 30 regional growth centers and manufacturing / industrial centers in order to focus transportation infrastructure toward these centers. PSRC must approve the plan in order for the City to get any funding for planned projects. Tacoma currently has a population of 200,000 people and is expected to plan for 270,000 people even though PSRC is only forecasting for 230,000 people. If the City doesn't plan for 270,000 then it risks losing its funding allocations. There are currently 100,000 jobs in Tacoma and the PSRC target is 60,000 additional with 40,000 to 50,000 expected. The City must allocate most of its employment and population growth to the growth centers, such as the Tacoma Dome, Downtown, and the Tacoma Mall. When the City competes for funding on projects it tends to do well and it has positioned key people on regional boards.

Jacki Skaught Question: Does the TMP go with the plan to Planning Commission?

Ian: The Planning Commission and City Council will receive feedback on TMP and Transportation Element from the Transportation Commission before sending the Transportation Element to PSRC. We need to demonstrate how the City will create Complete Streets and reach other infrastructure goals in order to compete with other counties and cities and continue receiving funding.

Kendra Breiland presented the land use forecasts for population and employment currently, in 2035 based on current trends, in the 2030 Pierce County targets, in the 2035 PSRC targets, and in Vision 2040 targets. The TMP should consider Vision 2040 but aim for funding transportation projects within a reasonable range of these targets. Land use and transportation influence travel behavior, which helps determine level of service expectations, infrastructure needs, and costs of the plan.

Dan Grayuski Question: Can you explain the computer modeling involved?

Kendra Breiland Response: We use computer modeling to test different growth scenarios and understand infrastructure needs. At the same time, we use logical checks to make sure the analytical results make sense.

Josh Diekmann Comment: The travel demand model helps meet the land use goals and satisfy the PSRC based on the demand for travel created by this land use growth.

c. Transportation Master Plan – Land Use Policy – Justin Resnick and Kendra Breiland

Justin explained the policy handouts, which include a draft set of policies for the land use goal in text format and a review table that specifies the Fehr & Peers recommendation for each policy and also provides space for Transportation Commissioners to make their own recommendations. The intention of these documents is for Commissioners to review the land use policies and provide feedback.

Kendra and Dan stated that the Vision Statement and Goals should be driving these policies.

No other questions.

d. Transportation Master Plan – Key Corridors – Dan Grayuski and Justin Resnick

Dan provided an overview of the activity; the aim is for Fehr & Peers to understand how the Transportation Commission thinks. Justin explained the background of the activity and how to use the Streetmix interface. Commissioners broke into 3 smaller groups to redesign their streets and then reported their results to the group.

Group 1: S 56th St

Started with a 5-lane cross section with no bike facilities, a sidewalk on each side with a narrow planter strip. Most of the corridor serves residential. Wanted to install bike lanes because University Place has a bike lane and it connects to Tyler Street, which also has bike facilities. Would keep the landscape buffer for the sidewalk and remove the center turn lane in order to maintain proper width.

Kristina Walker Question: How do we represent a buffered median with turn pockets as needed? Would be particularly helpful for bus and bike lane combinations.

Kendra Breiland Response: Not available in Streetmix but a good idea.

Group 2: S 19th St

Kristina described that this street is very hilly, serves UW-T, and functions as a thruway for Downtown. They also narrowed the lanes and added landscaping to calm traffic. The group considered including bike lanes but felt that this street wasn't the best candidate given another nearby bike facility.

Jacki Skaught Question: Would these widths allow emergency vehicles to pass?

Judi Hyman Comment: Noted that strong bicyclists would ride this street with or without bike facilities.

Group 3: E Portland Ave

Andrew explained that the group was creative and focused on the connection between I-5 and SR 512, as well as the desire for transit by local residents. They removed the center turn lane because it doesn't function well currently. The group did not include bike lanes but considered it and is open to input. The area does have some crime issues so they added lighting on both sides of the street. Many residents in this area don't own cars and sidewalks are unpleasant for walking, hence adding wide sidewalks. The corridor would likely evolve as it moves south toward more residential uses. The group was concerned with speed as many drivers go well over the posted 30mph speed limit. Pedestrian crossings are another issue – the food bank and the transit connections are across the street from each other but lack a crosswalk.

Kristina Walker Question: Are 10' drive lanes feasible?

Josh Diekmann Response: 10' center turn lanes are fairly standard but 10' is generally too narrow for travel lanes without additional buffering. You can narrow lanes for passenger vehicles but should still include additional width for larger vehicles.

Kristina Walker Question: Is a two-way cycletrack with a median possible?

Justin Resnick Response: Yes, this is what the Broadway Streetcar and Cycletrack Project is doing in Seattle right now. Requires about 10-12' of width for cyclists.

5. Other Business

No other business.

6. STAFF REPORTS

Jennifer discussed topics for upcoming meetings. The Transportation Master Plan intends to move through new modes in each meeting. There are also other groups and topics that are interested in presenting. The May meeting will include TMP – Land Use Policy and TMP – Transit. Parklets, bus rapid transit, and other topics have also been highlighted.

Judi Hyman Question: Is there a way to share research on these topics as they get reviewed in advance?

Jacki Skaught Comment: It would be nice to have information on potential agenda items in advance.

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: Yes, we would distribute any requested information to all Commissioners. Any information sent to individual Commissioners for agenda items should be forwarded to Jennifer for general distribution.

The May and June meetings intend to focus TMP efforts on transit in order to feed information to Sound Transit for ST3. Jennifer advised that the TC allow BPTAG to head up the pedestrian and bicycle pieces and report to the TC. A liaison from the TC to the BPTAG meetings would be good. They meet on third Mondays of the month for one hour and will likely spend more time for these meetings. Jennifer also recommended that Gerrit from the Commission on Disabilities attend the pedestrian session.

Tentative schedule for the future: finish up land use, work on transit, oversee BPTAG for ped / bike, then do auto / freight and review the rest in July.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

8. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05pm.