

Members

Donald Erickson, Chair
Sean Gaffney, Vice-Chair
Theresa Dusek
Benjamin Fields
Mark Lawlis
Tina Lee
Matthew Nutsch
Erle Thompson
Scott Winship



Agenda

Tacoma Planning Commission

Community and Economic Development Department

Ricardo Noguera, Director
Peter Huffman, Assistant Director
Charles Solverson, P.E., Building Official

Public Works and Utilities Representatives

Kurtis Kingsolver, Assistant Director/City Engineer, Public Works Department
Heather Pennington, Resource Planning Manager, Tacoma Water
Diane Lachel, Community and Government Relations Manager, Click! Network, Tacoma Power

747 Market Street, Room 1036
Tacoma, WA 98402-3793
253-591-5200 (phone) / 253-591-2002 (fax)
www.cityoftacoma.org/planning

(Agenda also posted at: www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Planning Commission" > "Agendas-Minutes-Recordings")

MEETING: Regular Meeting

TIME: Wednesday, September 19, 2012, 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Room 16, Tacoma Municipal Building North
733 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402

A. CALL TO ORDER**B. QUORUM CALL****C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – N/A****D. GENERAL BUSINESS****(4:00 p.m.) 1. Tacoma Link Expansion Project**

Description: Sound Transit staff will provide an overview and status of the planning and environmental processes for exploring potential alternatives for expanding the Tacoma Link light rail system.

Actions Requested: Comment

Support Information: N/A

Staff Contact: Lihuang Wung, 591-5682, lwung@cityoftacoma.org

(4:30 p.m.) 2. Annual Amendment #2013-04 Transportation Element

Description: Review the proposed amendments to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Actions Requested: Discussion; Direction; Authorization for Public Review (as appropriate)

Support Information: See "Agenda Item GB-2"

Staff Contact: Shanta Frantz, 591-5388, shanta.frantz@cityoftacoma.org



(5:00 p.m.) **3. Annual Amendment #2013-07 Adoption and Amendment Procedures**

Description: Review the proposed amendments to the *Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.02 Planning Commission*.

Actions Requested: Review; Discussion; Authorization for Public Review (as appropriate)

Support Information: See "Agenda Item GB-3"

Staff Contact: Lihuang Wung, 591-5682, lwung@cityoftacoma.org

E. COMMUNICATION ITEMS

1. "Conversation RE: Tacoma" 2012 Lecture Series, scheduled for September 27, October 11 and November 8, 2012 – "Agenda Item C-1"
2. Letter to Dale Cope, September 12, 2012, concerning Electronic Signs – "Agenda Item C-2"
3. Report to City Council on Planning Commission Accomplishments and Work Activities, September 11, 2012 – "Agenda Item C-3"
4. Planning Commission Tentative Agenda for October 3, 2012:
 - Capital Facilities Program for 2013-2018 (proposed changes)
 - Planning Commission Retreat

F. COMMENTS BY COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING DIVISION

G. COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSION

H. ADJOURNMENT



City of Tacoma
Community & Economic Development Department

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Shanta Frantz, Comprehensive Planning Division
SUBJECT: Annual Amendment Application #2013-04 Transportation Element
DATE: September 12, 2012

At the September 19th meeting the Commission will review the proposed amendments to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendments seek to:

- Update, reprioritize and consolidate projects contained in the Mobility Master Plan (MoMaP) and the Long-Term Transportation Improvement Projects List – Unfunded (Unfunded Projects List);
- Incorporate “Environmental Justice” into a few relevant policies and the Project Selection and Evaluation Criteria; and
- Make minor changes and corrections to text and maps throughout the document for consistency.

Attached is a draft staff report describing the proposed amendments to the Transportation Element, with “Exhibit A” showing the amendments in tracked changes format. Staff intends to seek the Commission’s authorization of the staff report for distribution for public review (along with other proposed amendments included in the 2013 Annual Amendment Package). The public review will occur in February-March 2013, prior to the public hearing, which is tentatively scheduled for March 20, 2013.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (253) 591-5388 or shanta.frantz@cityoftacoma.org.

c: Peter Huffman, Assistant Director

Attachments (2)



2013 Annual Amendment Application No. 2013-04
Transportation Element

STAFF REPORT

Application #:	2013-04
Applicant:	Community & Economic Development Department
Contact:	Shanta Frantz, Comprehensive Planning Division
Type of Amendment:	Comprehensive Plan Text Change and Map Updates
Current Land Use Intensity:	N/A
Current Area Zoning:	N/A
Size of Area:	Citywide
Location:	Citywide
Neighborhood Council Area:	All
Proposed Amendment:	Amend the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan

General Description of the Proposed Amendment:

The proposed amendments to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan primarily include: (a) updating, reprioritizing and consolidating projects contained in the Mobility Master Plan (MoMaP) and the Long-Term Transportation Improvement Projects List – Unfunded (Unfunded Projects List); (b) incorporating “Environmental Justice” into a few relevant policies and the Project Selection and Evaluation Criteria; and (c) making minor changes and corrections to text and maps throughout the document for consistency.

A general summary of the proposed amendments are listed below (see details in Exhibit “A”):

1. Revise “non-motorized transportation” to “active transportation” to align with current industry standards.
2. Revise “travel demand forecasting” to “transportation demand forecasting”, the more applicable industry terminology.
3. Update information pertaining to the Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center (GTEC) and the City’s first transportation demand management association, Downtown on the Go (DTOG).
4. Acknowledge the City’s recent designation as a Bicycle Friendly Community by the League of American Bicyclists.
5. Revise citation for the definition of “shared-use paths”. This was a scrivener’s error.
6. Enhance the “Demonstration Projects” section within the MoMaP to expand the Safe Routes to School program and establish Safe Routes to Transit, Parks and Employment programs.
7. Update MoMaP tables with current project information.

8. Eliminate the “Bike Facilities and Trails (1140 Fund) – New table from the Unfunded Projects List and move projects to the existing MoMaP tables and the proposed Low-Impact Pedestrian Trails and Shared-Use Paths table in the MoMaP. All of other projects within this table reflect current community efforts to develop our low-impact pedestrian trail resources.
9. Incorporate “Environmental Justice” into the Transportation Element in the following manners:
 - a. Revise **T-LUT-5 Accessibility** to add environmental justice criteria and a definition of “traditionally underserved and vulnerable populations”.
 - b. Add environmental justice background information to the **Policy Intent for Multimodal System**.
 - c. Revise **T-MS-7 Special Transportation Needs** to add environmental justice criteria and a definition of “traditionally underserved and vulnerable populations”.
 - d. Add “Environmental Justice” to the Project Selection and Evaluation Criteria section for certain transportation programs/projects to align with current community standards and most regional and federal grant funding sources.
10. Remove the table for prioritizing classes of bikeway projects. This table was created in the 1990s. Since then, bikeway classifications and criteria for development have been updated with current industry standards (e.g., bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, sharrows, etc.) as reflected in the MoMaP.
11. For the Unfunded Project List: add one new project to the Arterial Street Projects for Pacific Avenue between South 43rd and 56th Streets and revise the 6th Avenue from Sprague to Alder Streets project under Neighborhood Action Strategies.

Additional Information:

The MoMaP section provides a vision, policies and an implementation strategy for how the City of Tacoma can improve conditions for bicycling and walking citywide over the next fifteen years. It moves the City towards social, economic and environmental sustainability and serves as a cornerstone for Tacoma’s climate action goals. It is critical that the information contained in the MoMaP section is kept current and that the recommended projects are adequately prioritized for implementation. Of equal importance is to review the project lists within the MoMaP to those on the Unfunded Projects List to simplify, remove any redundancies and clarify project descriptions as necessary.

The Unfunded Projects List reflects the desires of the community and exemplifies the City’s intent to maintain the service level of the transportation system citywide and meet the concurrency requirements of the Growth Management Act. Projects are selected based on community input and staff recommendation for inclusion in the Unfunded Project List to gain eligibility for future funding. When funding becomes available, unfunded projects may be selected and moved to the Six-Year Program for detailed budgeting and implementation.

Public Outreach:

Mobility Master Plan:

The proposed amendments to this section are from staff observation and expertise, requests from the public and with the oversight of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Committee (BPAC), which is a citizen-based group, established to assist the City in implementing the MoMaP. The BPAC is made up of 15 residents from the pedestrian and bicycling community and has met at least monthly over the past year to oversee the implementation of the MoMaP and to plan and analyze future projects.

Unfunded Project List:

Two (2) unfunded projects were among the project ideas submitted by Neighborhood Business Districts in the summer of 2012, in response to the Public Works Department's community outreach efforts for the annual update of the 2012-2018 Six-Year Program. An initial screening of the project ideas suggested that these projects did not meet the selection criteria for inclusion in the Six-Year Program, but should be considered for inclusion in the Unfunded Project List to gain eligibility for future funding.

Applicable Provisions of the Growth Management Act (and other state laws):

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the transportation element of local comprehensive plans shall include a number of sub-elements. Two of the sub elements are:

- "Facilities and services needs, including identification of state and local system needs to meet current and future demands." (RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(F))
- "Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles." (RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii))

The proposed changes to the MoMaP and the Unfunded Project List include a variety of projects addressing the needs of vehicular traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists, and are consistent with these GMA provisions.

Applicable Provisions of the Comprehensive Plan:

Updating project information in the MoMaP and the Unfunded Project List, with input received from the community, realizes a number of policies and provisions in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, including but not limited to the following:

- T-LUT-5 Accessibility - Situate new transportation facilities in a manner that will assure reasonable access for all modes to places of employment and attraction in the City.
- T-MS-7 Special Transportation Needs - Recognize and accommodate the special transportation needs of the elderly, children, the disabled and the socio-economically disadvantaged in all aspects of transportation planning, programming and implementation. Use local, state or Federal, design standards that satisfy the communities desire for a high level of accommodation for the disabled.
- T-ICCP-4 Citizen Participation – Ensure citizen participation in all transportation planning to accommodate their needs and desires.
- "The Short Term Bike Project as well as the Medium and Long Term Project Lists should be reviewed annually to ensure they reflect current realities on the ground." (See the MoMaP section, under "Implementation")

Amendment Criteria:

Applications for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code are subject to review based on the adoption and amendment procedures and the review criteria contained in TMC 13.02.045.G. Proposed amendments are required to be consistent with or achieve consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and meet at least one of the eleven review criteria to be considered by the Planning Commission. The following section provides a review of each of these criteria with respect to

the proposal. Each of the criteria is provided, followed by staff analysis of the criterion as it relates to this proposal.

1. There exists an obvious technical error in the pertinent Comprehensive Plan or regulatory code provisions.

Staff Analysis: This proposal will be part of an on-going effort to fix scrivener's errors, eliminate redundancies and align the project lists and the maps within the Transportation Element as projects are added, revised, and/or completed. Staff will also continue to propose updates as industry standards and community expectations and needs change.

2. Circumstances related to the proposed amendment have significantly changed, or a lack of change in circumstances has occurred since the area or issue was last considered by the Planning Commission.

Staff Analysis: The proposed amendments include incorporating "Environmental Justice" into a few relevant policies and the Project Selection and Evaluation Criteria. Environmental justice is the term that recognizes the unfortunate U.S. history of large civic and public works projects located in low-income and minority neighborhoods, thereby creating possible disproportionate adverse human health and environmental impacts on such communities. Environmental justice has its roots in the civil rights movement and was codified as Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964. When first coined, the circumstance was often referred to as "environmental injustice". The construction of interstates and freeways during the post war boom is commonly cited as an example of transportation projects that did not account for the people and environment that they often displaced or impacted. In 1994, Presidential Executive Order 12898 directed federal agencies to make environmental justice part of its mission. In 1997, the USDOT issued Order 5610.2 with guidelines on how environmental justice should be incorporated into the transportation decision-making process. (Source: PSRC, Vision 2040 Plan)

The effect of this federal action is that all projects that receive federal funds directly or indirectly through regional agencies must show that the project managers have considered whether the project will have a possible adverse human health and environmental impact on low-income or minority populations. As such, the City already evaluates transportation projects for environmental justice when those projects are funded by grants with federal monies attached. By adding environmental justice to the Transportation Element's "Project Selection and Evaluation Criteria" section, it will also be considered for those arterial streets, curb ramps, sidewalk connections, and bikeway facility projects that will not be funded with federal monies.

3. The needs of the City have changed, which support an amendment.

Staff Analysis: The bicycle and pedestrian project lists are continually evolving as some projects get built and other projects need to be reprioritized.

4. The amendment is compatible with existing or planned land uses and the surrounding development pattern.

Staff Analysis: Not applicable.

5. **Growth and development, as envisioned in the Plan, is occurring faster, slower, or is failing to materialize.**

Staff Analysis: Not applicable.

6. **The capacity to provide adequate services is diminished or increased.**

Staff Analysis: Not applicable.

7. **Plan objectives are not being met as specified, and/or the assumptions upon which the plan is based are found to be invalid.**

Staff Analysis: Not Applicable.

8. **Transportation and and/or other capital improvements are not being made as expected.**

Staff Analysis: Not Applicable.

9. **For proposed amendments to land use intensity or zoning classification, substantial similarities of conditions and characteristics can be demonstrated on abutting properties that warrant a change in land use intensity or zoning classification.**

Staff Analysis: Not applicable.

10. **A question of consistency exists between the Comprehensive Plan and its elements and RCW 36.70A, the County-Wide Planning Policies for Pierce County, Multi-County Planning Policies, or development regulations.**

Staff Analysis: Not applicable.

Economic Impact Assessment:

The proposed projects in the MoMaP and the Unfunded Project List, when funded and implemented, are expected to generate positive economic effects to the community by improving the transportation system and hence increasing development opportunities. However, the impacts to the City's transportation budget are unknown until funding sources are determined and projects are designed and ready to proceed.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the proposed amendment be forwarded for public review and comment.

Exhibit:

- A. Proposed Amendments to the Transportation Element (track changes document)



2013 Annual Amendment Application No. 2013-04

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CHANGES
September 19, 2012

Transportation Element

Index:

Foreword

Section I – General Goal and Policies

Goal

Achieve a multimodal transportation system that efficiently moves people and goods with optimum safety and appropriate speed, maximizes the conservation of energy, and minimally disrupts the desirable features of the environment.

Policies

Land Use and Transportation

T-LUT-1	Land Use Considerations
T-LUT-2	Land Use Patterns
T-LUT-3	Centers and Corridors
T-LUT-4	Support Economic Bases
T-LUT-5	Access to Work
T-LUT-6	Concurrency
T-LUT-7	Street Rights-of-Way
T-LUT-8	Partner with Transit
T-LUT-9	Transit-Oriented Development

Transportation System Management

T-TSM-1	Roadway Classifications
T-TSM-2	Street System Design
T-TSM-3	Traffic Calming Measures
T-TSM-4	Transportation Facilities Maintenance
T-TSM-5	Downtown Parking System
T-TSM-6	Level of Service Standards

Multimodal System

T-MS-1	Transportation Demand Management
T-MS-2	Roadway Capacity
T-MS-3	Inter-Modal Conflict
T-MS-4	Transit Planning
T-MS-5	Transit Operational Efficiency
T-MS-6	Freight Transportation
T-MS-7	Special Transportation Needs
T-MS-8	Partner with Pierce Transit
T-MS-9	Car-Sharing
T-MS-10	Encourage Transit Ridership to Manufacturing/Industrial Centers
T-MS-11	Truck Movement and Infrastructure Design
T-MS-12	Complete Streets
T-MS-13	Walkability
T-MS-14	Minimize Conflicts in Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

Note: These amendments show all of the proposed changes to the existing Transportation Element. The sections included are only those portions of the element that are associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that has been deleted is shown as ~~strikethrough~~.

Commute Trip Reduction

- T-CTR-1 Comprehensive Plan and CTR
- T-CTR-2 Funding for CTR
- T-CTR-3 Collaboration on CTR
- T-CTR-4 Climate Change and CTR
- T-CTR-5 Expansion of CTR
- T-CTR-6 Evaluation of CTR
- T-CTR-7 Leadership on CTR

Environmental Stewardship

- T-ES-1 Minimum Environmental Disruption
- T-ES-2 Noise and Air Pollution
- T-ES-3 Congestion Management
- T-ES-4 Stormwater Management
- T-ES-5 Urban Design
- T-ES-6 Public Awareness
- T-ES-7 Electric Vehicles
- T-ES-8 Emission-free Vehicles and Devices
- T-ES-9 Skateboards
- T-ES-10 Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

Financing and Funding Sources

- T-FFS-1 Reliable Financing
- T-FSS-2 Development Incentives
- T-FSS-3 Transportation Funding for
Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

**Intergovernmental Coordination and Citizen
Participation**

- T-ICCP-1 Intergovernmental Coordination
- T-ICCP-2 Funding Coordination
- T-ICCP-3 Regional ~~Nonmotorized~~ [Active
Transportation](#) Coordination
- T-ICCP-4 Citizen Participation

* * *

Foreword

The Transportation Element includes three sections. The first and third sections pertain to general transportation policies and implementation, while the second section specifically addresses ~~nonmotorized~~ [active](#) transportation issues. The three sections cross-reference and complement each other.

Section I – General Goal and Policies – contains an overall transportation goal and a number of general policies that provide guidelines and direction to achieve the goal. These policies are compiled in the following seven categories:

- Land Use and Transportation
- Transportation System Management
- Multimodal System
- Commute Trip Reduction
- Environmental Stewardship
- Financing and Funding Sources
- Intergovernmental Coordination and Citizen Participation

Section II – Mobility Master Plan – specifically addresses ~~nonmotorized~~ [active](#) transportation issues. The section is derived and extracted from the *2010 Mobility Master Plan Study*, a comprehensive study that provides a vision, policies and an implementation plan for how the City of Tacoma can improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists citywide over the next fifteen years. Issues addressed in this section include:

- Guiding Principles
- Prioritizing Transportation Investment
- Vision and Goals
- Policies – pertaining to Implementation, Livability, Environmental Sustainability, Transit Integration, Connectivity and Access, Maintenance, Education and Encouragement, Health and Safety, Engineering, Enforcement, Evaluation, and Funding
- Definitions and Terminology

- Implementation

The *2010 Mobility Master Plan Study*, along with its technical appendices, such as the Design Guidelines (Appendix E of the *2010 Mobility Master Plan Study*), should be used as the official guide for the planning, identification, funding, prioritization, design, construction, and maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and services. It should be updated on a regular basis to keep the information current and to ensure its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and such relevant documentations as the Complete Streets Design guidelines and the Public Works Design Manual.

Section III – General Plan Implementation – contains implementation strategies for the general goal and policies as contained in Section I, with some references to ~~nonmotorized~~ [active](#) transportation. Issues addressed in this section include:

- System Inventory
- Level of Service Standard and Concurrency Management
- Multiyear Financing Plan
- Parking Management
- Regional Coordination
- State-owned Transportation Facilities
- Maps of Arterials, Transit System and Designated Centers
- Project Selection and Evaluation Criteria
- Long-Term Transportation Improvement Projects List – Unfunded

Section I – General Goal and Policies

In accordance with the community's desire for efficient, well-maintained, and safe transportation facilities, and timely transportation improvements, it is the goal of the City to:

Achieve a multimodal transportation system that efficiently moves people and goods with optimum safety and speed, maximizes the conservation of energy, and minimally disrupts the desirable features of the environment.

The following policies provide guidelines and direction to achieve the goal and for the continued development and improvement of citywide transportation facilities and services.

Land Use and Transportation

Policy Intent

Land use type, intensity, and distribution, as a result of developments, greatly influences travel choices and decisions on placement and investments of transportation facilities. Because land use and transportation are fundamentally linked, it is important that transportation facilities be designed to meet both community desires and Federal, state, regional, and local standards for functionality, safety, service, and efficiency.

Accommodating a large percentage of future growth through transit-oriented development (TOD) will help create a safer, more comfortable pedestrian environment, encourage alternative transportation, promote active living, and can enhance the quality of life of residents.

Elements of TOD generally include:

- A mix of land uses, including residential and commercial development;
- Moderate to high density housing;
- Pedestrian orientation/connectivity;
- Convenient access to transportation choices, including transit, bike, and pedestrian facilities;
- Reduced size of surface parking facilities; and
- High quality design.

TOD development can also incorporate specific strategies and innovative techniques such as:

- Transit ride-free areas;
- Neighborhood collector or shuttle transit service;
- Transit marketing;
- Car-sharing; and
- Location efficient mortgages.

Policies

T-LUT-1 Land Use Considerations

Development, expansion, or improvement of transportation facilities should be coordinated with existing and future land use patterns and types of development.

T-LUT-2 Land Use Patterns

Encourage land use patterns and developments, especially in mixed-use centers, that support non-single occupancy vehicle travel, increase community access, improve intermodal connectivity, and encourage short trips easily made by walking or bicycling for recreation and commuting.

T-LUT-3 Centers and Corridors

Give high priority to improvement of transportation facilities and services within designated centers and along identified corridors connecting the centers. Examine parallel low traffic roadways for potential pedestrian and bicycle movement and improvements.

T-LUT-4 Support Economic Bases

Give high priority to those transportation facilities that provide the greatest opportunity to serve and support the existing economic bases and will aid the City in attracting new investments.

T-LUT-5 Accessibility

Situate new transportation facilities in a manner that will assure reasonable access for all modes to places of employment and attraction in the City. [Evaluate whether a transportation facility may be developed and/or sited to help avoid impacting the human and environmental health of traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations. Alternatively, consider how a project may be sited or enhanced to improve the human and environmental health of traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations. Traditionally underserved or vulnerable populations may](#)

[include, but are not be limited to, minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged.](#)

T-LUT-6 Concurrency

Ensure that the City’s transportation network adequately serves the existing and projected land use developments. If adequate service levels are not maintained, pursue improvements to the transportation systems, mitigations of impacts, or modifications to the land use assumptions, where appropriate.

T-LUT-7 Street Rights-of-Way

Establish procedures to implement the authority granted to the City by RCW 35.79 to inventory, evaluate, and preserve right-of-way needs for future transportation or recreational purposes, and wherever possible, make advanced acquisition in order to minimize inconvenience to affected property owners and to safeguard the general public interest.

T-LUT-8 Partner with Transit

Partner with Pierce Transit and Sound Transit to coordinate land use and transportation planning and to promote transit-oriented development.

T-LUT-9 Transit Oriented Development

Encourage and promote transit-oriented development (TOD) and provide incentives for development that includes specific TOD features.

Transportation System Management

Policy Intent

Effective Transportation System Management (TSM) measures should be utilized to increase the efficiency of the transportation system and the safety of its users – pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.

Because transportation facilities can impact the character of neighborhoods and the overall design of a community, the City may consider traffic-calming measures. Implementation of traffic calming design shall be completed

comprehensively to ensure that existing design standards for roadway functional class are not compromised and to safeguard against shifting traffic problems from one neighborhood to another or from arterials to residential streets.

The policies below can help improve the livability in residential environments by discouraging through traffic and excessive traffic volumes on residential and collector arterials, and by encouraging the landscaping and beautification of transportation facilities.

Policies

T-TSM-1 Street Classifications

Adhere to nationally recognized arterial functional class standards to help differentiate roads designed to carry high volumes of traffic and those designed for residential use.

T-TSM-2 Street System Design

Encourage street system design in a grid pattern, which has frequent interconnections to facilitate transit, bicycle, and pedestrian connections; strongly discourage cul-de-sacs.

The City will take steps to enhance its ability to secure roadway funding, from a variety of sources, for the replacement and/or re-design of roadways that are damaged or fail prematurely as a result of overweight vehicles use. The City shall work with its business and transit partners to establish overweight thresholds and roadway designs for improving the longevity of roadway pavement.

T-TSM-3 Traffic Calming Measures

Use sanctioned engineering approaches, such as medians, streetscapes, bulb-outs, traffic circles, traffic controls and bike lanes to protect neighborhood streets from cut-through traffic, high volumes, high speeds, and pedestrian/vehicle conflicts when warranted and integrated with emergency response vehicle access.

T-TSM-4 Transportation Facilities Maintenance

Revise transportation criteria, when warranted, to keep the City’s transportation projects competitive for grant funding and for prioritizing transportation facilities in need of maintenance, rehabilitation or expansion.

T-TSM-5 Downtown Parking System

Develop, in partnership with parking stakeholders, a downtown parking system that seeks balance among competing uses, is financially self-supporting, helps attract investment, discourages turning arterial capacity into angle parking spaces, and meets the needs of both private and public users.

Implement the elements of the Business Plan for the Downtown Parking System. The Plan calls for increased level of parking enforcement, centralization of municipal parking assets, establishment of a fee based parking system, the creation of more off-street parking when warranted, and maintaining a self-reliant parking enterprise system.

Develop and maintain criteria for the purpose of identifying and prioritizing parking facilities in need of repair or expansion. For example, use nationally recognized parking facility criteria to determine if expansion of the municipal parking system is warranted.

Encourage the redevelopment of large stand-alone downtown parking facilities into commercial building space with parking to accommodate a diversity of uses consistent with Destination Downtown Design standards.

T-TSM-6 Level of Service Standards

Establish level of service standards that are consistent with regional and state standards for roadways that reflect arterial functional classifications and the differing development patterns, growth objectives, accessibility for vehicles, transit, pedestrian and bicycle use.

Multimodal System

Policy Intent

An efficient multimodal system is designed to accommodate the needs for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. The city recognizes that freight mobility and access are critical to Tacoma’s economic development. Additionally, the city recognizes that transportation needs and travel choices change over time as alternatives to car travel become available. It is the intent of these policies to reduce car use; minimize intermodal conflicts; enhance freight mobility; and accommodate the mobility needs of Tacoma residents and visitors.

[In implementing an efficient multimodal system, the City recognizes that evaluating transportation projects using environmental justice criteria is consistent with current community standards and is aligned with project analysis for most regional and federal grant funding.](#)

[When considered early in the planning process, environmental justice is an approach that strives to avoid decisions that can have a disproportionate adverse human health and environmental impact on traditionally underserved neighborhoods and vulnerable populations than on the population as a whole. Traditionally underserved or vulnerable populations may include, but are not limited to, minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged.](#)

[The possible adverse impacts of transportation projects may include, but are not limited to, disruptions in community cohesion, restricted access, safety concerns, higher exposures to hazardous materials, raised noise levels, and increased water and air pollution. \(Source: Puget Sound Regional Council’s Draft EIS for Transportation 2040 Plan, May 29, 2009\).](#)

[By adding environmental justice in transportation planning, the City may consider how multimodal projects can be developed and/or sited to help avoid impacting the human and environmental health of traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations. Alternatively, environmental justice may be used to site and/or enhance multimodal projects to improve the human and environmental health of traditionally underserved and vulnerable populations.](#)

Policies

T-MS-1 Transportation Demand Management

Support and promote ~~Travel~~ **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)** strategies aimed at reducing the number and length of car trips and increasing the efficiency of the transportation system.

T-MS-2 Roadway Capacity

Assess roadway capacity on the basis of a facility's total people-carrying capacity in addition to its vehicle-carrying capacity.

T-MS-3 Inter-Modal Conflict

Support programs, regulations, and design standards that separate at-grade crossing conflicts to increase safety and to increase the capacity and timeliness of both over-land and rail freight.

T-MS-4 Transit Planning

Support future transit planning among local and regional governmental agencies to improve the reliability, availability, and convenience of transit options.

T-MS-5 Transit Operational Efficiency

Allow sidewalks to extend up to the travel lane on certain arterial streets to serve as passenger loading platforms to improve transit operational efficiency and safety by avoiding merging and weaving maneuvers into traffic by buses. In principle, such sidewalk extensions may be located along arterial streets on transit routes, with minimum of two travel lanes in each direction and posted speed limit of 35 mph or less. Dimensions must be in compliance with established standards for roadway and traffic engineering and transit facilities.

T-MS-6 Moving Freight

Maintain Tacoma as a primary hub for regional, Alaskan, and military goods movement and as a gateway to national and international markets. Support the integrated development and operation of air, trucking, rail, and water terminal facilities to enhance the freight transportation system and strengthen the City's economic base. Consider the needs for delivery and collection of goods at local businesses by truck.

T-MS-7 Special Transportation Needs

Recognize and accommodate the special transportation needs of the elderly, children, the disabled and the socio-economically disadvantaged in all aspects of transportation planning, programming and implementation. Use local, state or Federal, design standards that satisfy the communities desire for a high level of accommodation for the disabled.

[Evaluate whether a transportation facility may be developed and/or sited to help avoid impacting](#)

[the human and environmental health of traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations. Alternatively, consider how a project may be sited or enhanced to improve the human and environmental health of traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations. Traditionally underserved or vulnerable populations may include, but are not be limited to, minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged.](#)

T-MS-8 Partner with Pierce Transit

Partner with Pierce Transit so that resources may be combined and an efficient multimodal transit system may be created.

T-MS-9 Car-Sharing

Explore car-sharing programs and public-private partnerships with car-sharing businesses to reduce auto-ownership dependence.

T-MS-10 Encourage Transit Ridership to Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

Encourage transit ridership to and from manufacturing/industrial centers by implementing pedestrian improvements near transit stops, outreach to industrial employers and working with Pierce Transit to improve the frequency and location of transit service between high density residential areas and manufacturing/industrial areas.

T-MS-11 Truck Movement and Infrastructure Design

Identify and address areas within manufacturing/industrial centers where efficient truck access and circulation is hindered by infrastructure gaps and inadequate design; ensure future transportation improvements address the needs of large trucks.

T-MS-12 Complete Streets

Apply the Complete Streets guiding principle[1], where appropriate, in the planning and design for new construction, reconstruction and major transportation improvement projects[2], to appropriately accommodate all users, moving by car, truck, transit, bicycle, wheelchair, or foot to move along and across streets. The Complete Streets guiding principle shall also be used to evaluate potential transportation projects, and to

amend and revise design manuals, regulations, standards and programs as appropriate to create over time an integrated and connected network of complete streets that meets user needs while recognizing the function and context of each street.

- [1] The Complete Streets guiding principle is to design, operate and maintain streets to enable safe and convenient access and travel for all users – pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and people of all ages and abilities, as well as freight and motor vehicle drivers – and to foster a sense of place in the public realm.
- [2] Major transportation improvement projects include but are not limited to street and sidewalk construction; street and sidewalk lighting; street trees and landscaping; street amenities; drainage, pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements; access improvements for freight; access improvements, including compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act; and public transit facilities accommodation including, but not limited to, pedestrian access improvements to transit stops and stations.

T-MS-13 Walkability

Provide height bonuses and other incentives to developments that promote walkability through pedestrian orientation, providing amenities such as weather protection and seating, and improving pedestrian connectivity.

T-MS-14 Minimize Conflicts in Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

Design non-motorized facilities in manufacturing/industrial centers in a manner that minimizes potential conflicts with trucks and trains to allow for the safe and efficient movement of both freight and people.

Commute Trip Reduction

Policy Intent

As required by the Commute Trip Reduction Efficiency Act of 2006 (RCW 70.94.521-551) and the associated Washington Administrative Code WAC 468-63, the Tacoma City Council adopted the Commute Trip Reduction Plan on July 10, 2007 (Resolution No. 37220) and

adopted the Commute Trip Reduction Ordinance into the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.15 on December 9, 2008 (Ordinance No. 27771).

The CTR Plan provides guidelines for the City and major employers affected by the State law to implement effective strategies to achieve the goals of 10% reduction in drive-alone trips and 13% reduction in vehicle miles traveled by 2011. The CTR Ordinance establishes requirements for affected employers, including an appeals process, and procedures for the City for program administration, monitoring, enforcement and intergovernmental coordination.

The CTR Plan and Ordinance are designed to achieve the following objectives: improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion, and reduce the consumption of petroleum fuels. With the focus on employer-based programs that encourage the use of alternatives to driving alone for the commute trip, CTR represents a centerpiece of the overall strategy of Transportation Demand Management (TDM).

In addition to the mandated program activity, the City of Tacoma is also participating in a voluntary, pilot program encouraged and funded by the State, whereby Downtown Tacoma is designated as a Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center (GTEC). More aggressive CTR strategies will be implemented within the GTEC, involving selected target audiences besides the CTR-affected employers. Expected outcomes of the pilot program are the reduction of auto-dependent trips and the alleviation of the burdens on State highway facilities within and between GTECs. The GTEC program ~~is was~~ effective from July 2008 through June 2012. [The City used State GTEC funds and partnered with Pierce Transit, and the Tacoma-Pierce-County Chamber of Commerce to create the City's first transportation demand management association, Downtown on the Go \(DTOG\).](#)

- [DTOG has a Board made up of downtown businesses and local transportation agencies. Its purpose is to be the transportation advocate for anyone whose daily life is downtown by:](#)
 - [Advocating for transportation choices and land use policies](#)

[that promote a vibrant and integrated downtown; and](#)

- o [Educating and encouraging downtown employers, employees and residents about transportation choices other than driving alone such as transit, ridesharing, biking, walking, and flexible work arrangements.](#)

There are a number of Comprehensive Plan policies and strategies that are supportive of CTR and TDM, including policies contained in the Transportation Element, transportation-efficient land use policies contained in the Generalized Land Use Element, and traffic management strategies contained in the Neighborhood Element. The following policies are intended to provide additional tools to ensure the successful implementation of the CTR [Pan-Plan](#) and Ordinance, and contribute to accomplishing the City's strategic goals of healthy environment, sustainable economy and livable community.

Policies

T-CTR-1 Comprehensive Planning and CTR

Incorporate Commute Trip Reduction in the planning for land use, transportation, housing, capital facilities, environmental protection, open space and recreation facilities, neighborhoods and communities, and other applicable disciplines of comprehensive planning. This will be accomplished by promoting CTR related and supportive policy aspects, such as those listed below:

- Promote transit-oriented development;
- Encourage maximum parking requirements for new development;
- Require [nonmotorized-active transportation](#) connections between retail, living and work places;
- Evaluate land use changes to the Comprehensive Plan and determine how the development furthers the goals of CTR;
- Realize the Complete Street concept;
- Strive for job-housing balance;
- Support an integrated, regional high capacity transit system;

- Enhance walking and bicycling environment;
- Require parking for bicycles where applicable; and
- Ensure that connectivity, accessibility and transferability among multiple modes of transportation are adequate, efficient, safe and friendly for pedestrians and bicyclists.

T-CTR-2 Funding for CTR

Assign higher funding priority to and actively pursue funding opportunities for improvement projects and programs that are related to, supportive of, or integrated with Commute Trip Reduction.

T-CTR-3 Collaboration on CTR

Join force with appropriate jurisdictions and organizations to coordinate the Commute Trip Reduction program efforts; to best utilize and multiply each others' resources, success stories and innovative practices; and to ensure that fair and consistent services are provided to employers across jurisdictions and employers with worksites located in more than one jurisdiction.

T-CTR-4 Climate Change and CTR

Integrate the Commute Trip Reduction program efforts into the work program of the Office of Sustainability and the Sustainable Tacoma Commission on Climate Change (established pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 37631, adopted on October 21, 2008) to effectively reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality.

T-CTR-5 Innovation and Expansion of CTR

Pursue innovative measures of Commute Trip Reduction beyond the statutory suggestions and endeavor in expanding the scope of CTR beyond the statutory requirements, in order to maximize the effects of CTR.

T-CTR-6 Monitoring and Evaluation of CTR

Continually monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of employers' Commute Trip Reduction programs and the City's CTR policies, and implement changes needed to achieve and exceed the statutory goals.

T-CTR-7 Leadership in CTR

The City of Tacoma as an employer should take the leadership role and set a positive example

by maintaining a strong Commute Trip Reduction program for its employees.

* * *

Intergovernmental Coordination and Citizen Participation

Policy Intent

Transportation issues do not respect jurisdictional boundaries. Also, transportation concerns may vary from neighborhood to neighborhood. It is intended that the City's transportation planning and implementation utilize best practices and tools for greater regional coordination and address the specific needs of individual neighborhoods.

Policies

T-ICCP-1 Intergovernmental Coordination

Coordinate with federal, state, regional, and local agencies to assure a planned and coordinated regional transportation system.

T-ICCP-2 ~~Nonmotorized~~ Active Transportation Regional Coordination

Coordinate the planning, construction, and operation of pedestrian and bicycle facilities [and shared-use paths](#) with other agencies where City of Tacoma corridors continue into neighboring jurisdictions. [Including, but not limited to: extension of the Water Ditch Trail, Pipeline Trail, Tacoma Dome to Sumner Trail and the Trail to Mountain Corridor.](#)

T-ICCP-3 Funding Coordination

Coordinate with jurisdictions at local, regional and state levels, the state legislature and the private sector to increase overall funding and provide for reliable financing of growth related transportation improvements.

T-ICCP-4 Citizen Participation

Ensure citizen participation in all transportation planning to accommodate their needs and desires.

Section II – Mobility Master Plan

Policy Intent

The Mobility Master Plan Section of the Transportation Element provides a vision, policies and an implementation plan for how the City of Tacoma can improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists citywide over the next fifteen years. This section was distilled from Tacoma's *2010 Mobility Master Plan Study*. It moves the City towards social, economic and environmental sustainability and serves as a cornerstone for Tacoma's climate action diminution strategies. A sustainable non-motorized transportation network is vital for Tacoma to achieve a substantial reduction in carbon emissions, as well as to provide a healthier environment for its residents.

The Mobility Master Plan Section envisions an interconnected bicycle and pedestrian network that provides safe routes to neighborhoods, schools, transit, business districts recreational facilities, and other destinations.

* * *

Vision and Goals

The vision establishes the overarching concept that acts as a source for future inspiration in Tacoma's transportation planning. And the policies help guide the city towards fulfilling the vision. The vision and a new set of mobility policies support and bolster the [nonmotorized active](#) transportation policy intent of Tacoma's Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element. Tacoma's *2010 Mobility Master Plan Study* is the document with comprehensive planning, implementation and funding strategies that complements the policies in this section. The chapters and appendices in the Mobility Master Plan clarify how the policies, recommended networks and implementation strategies were derived and how they can be advanced.

Vision

Tacoma is a world-class walking and biking community in which pedestrians and bicyclists are top priorities in transportation planning. Tacoma's transportation system is useable and welcoming to people of all abilities. Streets accommodate bicyclists in large numbers, sidewalks are user-friendly, and residents share the road safely and are fully mobile without an automobile.

Goals

- Achieve "Bicycle Friendly Community" status as designated by the League of American Bicyclists by 2015 by developing and enhancing the five E's: Engineering, Education, Evaluation, Enforcement, and Encouragement.
- [The City of Tacoma achieved Bronze level Bicycle Friendly Community status by the League of American Bicyclists in May 2012. Tacoma will continue to work to attain higher level status \(up to platinum\) through implementation of bikeways and addressing the five E's.](#)
- Complete a safe and comfortable bicycling system that connects all parts of the city (north to south/east to west)

and accommodates all types of cyclists by 2025.

- Complete an accessible network of pedestrian supportive infrastructure, including sidewalks, curb ramps, accessible pedestrian signals and shared-use paths, in high-priority pedestrian areas.
- Create a safer street environment that reduces intermodal crashes involving bicyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles by at least 10% from 2010 rates by 2015 and work to meet Washington State's Target Zero goal of eliminating fatal and serious injuries by 2030.
- Increase the [nonmotorized-active transportation](#) mode split to 5% by 2015 and continue gains thereafter in order to achieve the Climate Action Plan goal of reducing greenhouse gases emissions from transportation sources.
- Increase transit use by enhancing pedestrian access and bicycle support facilities through the development of bikeways and walkways that serve transit hubs.
- Implement a benchmarking and measurement system to gauge success for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements and usage.
- Apply implementation and maintenance strategies that expand and sustain Tacoma's pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.
- Promote healthy lifestyles by offering improved opportunities for active living for people of all abilities through the development of a robust non-motorized network, including bikeways, sidewalks, and linear parks.

Policies

Bicycling and walking are low-cost and effective means of transportation that are non-polluting, energy efficient, versatile, healthy and fun. Combined with transit they add to the efficiency of the local transportation system. The Mobility Master Plan lays out strategies for system-wide expansions and improvements. The Plan specifies what needs to be done by 2025 to achieve the City's goals of becoming a better and more accessible walking, bicycling and transit friendly community and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Tacoma is in an excellent position to capitalize on existing pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly attributes, to increase the number of residents and visitors who travel by foot, bicycle and transit, and to increase the transportation options for people with disabilities. Tacoma can take advantage of the anticipated population growth in high-density centers, existing education programs, and high-quality multimodal connections to develop a world class system of bikeways and walkways.

The following policies support the vision, goals and guiding principles and will serve to create a more balanced transportation system throughout Tacoma.

T-MMP-1 Implementation

Implement the Mobility Master Plan's recommendations for developing an active transportation network that reduces auto travel, increases the number of ~~nonmotorized~~ [active transportation](#) users of all ages and abilities, and improves the health of our people and local ecology.

T-MMP-2 Livability

Prioritize infrastructure improvements that connect residential areas to local retail, business, and community services, so residents can access more of the services they need close to home by walking, biking, and using assistive devices.

T-MMP-3 Environmental Sustainability

Encourage and improve the appeal [and convenience](#) of modes of transportation with negligible carbon emissions, such as walking, biking, and using assistive devices, thereby reducing the miles traveled by single occupancy vehicles.

T-MMP-4 Transit Integration

Coordinate with Sound Transit and Pierce Transit to expand ~~nonmotorized~~ [active transportation](#) ~~mobility~~ [access](#) through the integration of pedestrian and bicycle facilities with the transit and streetcar systems.

T-MMP-5 Connectivity and Access

Plan new development on a grid pattern for good street connectivity and access for pedestrians and bicyclists.

T-MMP-6 Maintenance

Ensure that pedestrian and bicycle facilities are clean, safe, and accessible, and promote active use.

T-MMP-7 Education and Encouragement

Increase the public's awareness and usage of the bicycle and pedestrian network in Tacoma through targeted education and encouragement programs. Specific programs are detailed in Chapter 4 of the *2010 Mobility Master Plan Study* and the *2008 ADA Transition Plan*. Example programs include Bike Month, Sunday Parkways, and supporting campaigns.

T-MMP-8 Health and Safety

Promote active lifestyles by working with the Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department (TPCHD) [and other agencies](#) to provide education programs and safe and accessible routes for pedestrians and bicyclists of all ages and abilities.

T-MMP-9 Engineering

Apply high-quality engineering and design to bicycle and pedestrian physical infrastructure.

* * *

Shared-Use Paths

The ~~Revised Code of Washington~~ [WSDOT Design Manual](#) defines shared-use paths as “a [facility physically separated from motorized vehicular traffic within the highway right of way or on an exclusive right of way with minimal crossflow by motor vehicles. Shared-use paths are primarily used by bicyclists and pedestrians, including joggers, skaters, and pedestrians with disabilities, including those who use nonmotorized or motorized wheeled mobility devices. With appropriate design considerations, equestrians may also be accommodated by a shared-use path facility](#)~~facility physically separated from motorized vehicular traffic within the highway right of way or on an exclusive right of way with minimal crossflow by motor vehicles. It is designed and built primarily for use by bicycles, but is also used by pedestrians, joggers, skaters, wheelchair users (both nonmotorized and motorized), equestrians, and other nonmotorized users” (RCW 1020.03 Section 1515.03, July 2012)~~. Shared-use paths provide additional width over a standard sidewalk and, when constructed next to the road, shared-use paths must have some type of vertical (e.g., curb or barrier) or horizontal (e.g., landscaped strip) buffer separating the path area from adjacent vehicle travel lanes.

Transit

Throughout this document, the term transit refers to all existing and proposed transit vehicles and types provided by Pierce Transit and Sound Transit. Existing transit service is provided by bus, the Sounder commuter rail and the LINK light rail. Future transit service may also include streetcars.

Streetcars

Streetcars operate on rails on city roadways and often share a travel lane with automobiles. Streetcars were a basic mode of travel in Tacoma from 1888 to 1938 and helped spur the development of many of Tacoma’s commercial districts. The streetcar network linked neighborhoods and business districts to

downtown and other noteworthy destinations including Pt. Defiance Park. The network also included a cable car system that looped up and down the steep slopes of downtown on South 11th and South 13th Streets so people could avoid the strenuous hill climb on foot. By 1912 Tacoma had developed a comprehensive streetcar line with 125 miles of track in the city and additional electric rail connecting Tacoma to Seattle. But as automobiles began to dominate the streets, streetcars became less financially feasible and the streetcar line closed in 1938.

Tacoma hopes to regain some of the efficiency of its historic rail system with a new streetcar line. Tacoma’s 1.6 mile LINK light rail opened in 2003 and connects the Tacoma Dome area to the downtown theater district. The City is currently planning for expansion of the LINK with streetcars. Tacoma envisions an efficient and sustainable streetcar network that will serve to enhance both the non-motorized and motorized transportation systems. As the streetcar line is developed and designed, access for pedestrians and bicycles will be evaluated and planned simultaneously so users have many mode options for arriving at the station and their destination. Streetcars will be pivotal in creating a more fully integrated multimodal transportation system for Tacoma’s future.



Tacoma LINK Light Rail

* * *

Table 2. Short Term Bicycle Project Priority List¹

Priority	Street	From-To	Length (miles)	Cost ² Estimate	Facility Type
Completed and Underway Projects					
Complete	Tyler St	S 60th St – S Manitou Wy	1.46	\$275,000	Bike Lane
Construction Phase	S Park Ave	S 40th St – E 96th St	3.66	\$177,000	Bicycle Boulevard
Construction Phase	S 40th St	S Park Ave – S G St	0.06	\$11,000	Bike Lane
Construction Phase	Delin St/S G St/S 36th St/Tacoma/S 38th St	S 25th St – S 48th St	1.73	\$312,000	Bike Lane
Construction Phase	Fawcett Ave/S 25th St	6th Ave – Tacoma	1.51	\$84,000	Bicycle Boulevard
Construction Phase	6th Ave	S G St – Fawcett Ave	0.10	\$4,000	Sharrow ³
Construction Phase	S G St	Division Ave – 6th St	0.39	\$19,000	Bicycle Boulevard
Construction Phase	Division Ave/Wright Park	Yakima Ave – N G St	0.07	\$20,000	Shared-Use Path
Construction Phase	N 23th/N 24th/Yakima Ave	Highland – Division Ave	3.39	\$164,000	Bicycle Boulevard
Construction Phase	N Highland St	N 23rd St – N 21st St	0.11	\$5,000	Bicycle Boulevard
Construction Phase	N 26th St	N Stevens St – Pearl St	0.79	\$143,000	Bike Lane
Construction Phase Complete	N 26th St	N Proctor – Alder	0.50	\$90,000	Sharrow/Bike Lane
Construction Phase	S 37th St.	A St – S Hosmer St	1.55	\$75,000	Bicycle Boulevard
Construction Phase Complete	S Alaska St	S 38th St – S 37th St	0.10	\$19,000	Bike Lane
Construction Phase Complete	N 30 th St	Alder St – McCarver St	0.59	\$110,000	Bike Lane/Sharrow
Construction Phase	Historic Water Ditch Trail – Phase 2	S 80 th / S Tacoma Way – S 72 nd and S 60 th – S 56 th Streets	1.82	\$488,000	Shared-Use Path
Total Completed and Underway			17.83	\$1,996,000	
Short Term					
1	N Stevens St	N 46th St – N 37th	0.62	\$118,000	Bike Lane
1 ⁴	Stevens/ Tyler St	6th Ave – S Wright Ave	1.76	\$332,000	Bike Lane
2	S 47th St/S 48th St/E C St/E 46th St/E E St	S Tacoma Wy – McKinley Ave	3.20	\$603,000	Bike Lane
3	Puyallup Ave	Pacific Ave – City Line	1.71	\$322,000	Bike Lane
4	Orchard	S19th – N 26 th	1.70	\$307,000	Bike Lane

¹ All improvements to a WSDOT facility must be coordinated with and approved by WSDOT Olympic Region Development Services

² Cost estimates in 2010 dollars

³ Sharrow = Shared Lane Marking used in situations where bicyclists share the travel lane with motor vehicles

⁴ Projects have the same priority number when they are part of a continuous corridor

Transportation Element – City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan

Priority	Street	From-To	Length (miles)	Cost ² Estimate	Facility Type
5	N 1st St/Broadway	N Tacoma Ave – Prairie Line Trail	1.43	\$69,000	Bicycle Boulevard
6	NE Nassau Ave	Browns Pt Blvd – NE Northshore Pkwy	1.06	\$200,000	Bike Lane
7	S 11th St	Ferry St – Pacific Ave	1.25	\$236,000	Bike Lane
8	S 12th St	S Jackson Ave – S Union Ave	2.51	\$473,000	Bike Lane
9	6th Ave	Ainsworth Ave – E Broadway	0.87	\$165,000	Bike Lane
9	Ainsworth Ave	N Steele St – 6th Ave	0.49	\$24,000	Bicycle Boulevard
9	N 11th St	N Pearl St – N Steele St	2.25	\$109,000	Bicycle Boulevard
10	S Washington	S 60 th – S 43 rd (S Tacoma Way)	1.20	\$230,000	Bike Lane
11	S 66th St	Orchard St – Tacoma Mall Blvd	2.14	\$317,000	Lanes/Sharrows / Bike Boulevard
44 12	N Alder/N Cedar St	N 22nd St – SR 16	2.79	\$527,000	Bike Lane
44 12	S Oakes St/S Pine St	SR16 – S 74th St	3.11	\$587,000	Bike Lane
42 13	Historic Water Ditch Trail	Pine – C St	2.78	\$745,000	Shared-Use Path
43 14	Schuster Parkway Trail	S 7 th – Ruston Way	1.50	TBD	Trail
44 15	Pipeline Road Trail	E 40th St – Waller Rd and 72 nd	2.31	\$618,000	Shared-Use Path
44 15	E I St/E K St/E Wright Ave /Pipeline Rd	D St at Tacoma Dome/McKinley Park/Pipeline Road Trail	1.20	\$58,000	Bicycle Boulevard
44 15	Sheridan Ave	6th St – S 25th St	1.37	\$66,000	Bicycle Boulevard
44 15	S 25th St	S State St/Scott Pierson Trail – Sheridan Ave	0.21	\$40,000	Bike Lane
45 16	Prairie Line Trail (Hood Street)	Pacific Ave Foss Waterway to Water Ditch Trail S 17th to S 25th St	0.80	\$214,000 TBD	Shared-Use Path
46 17	S 64 th St	S Alaska Way – Waller Rd	3.31	\$160,000	Bicycle Boulevard
46	S 66th St	Orchard St – Tacoma Mall Blvd	2.14	\$103,000	Bicycle Boulevard
47 18	S 43 rd St/E E St/E 40 th St	A St – Portland Ave	1.90	\$92,000	Bicycle Boulevard
48 19	S 37 th St/Sprague Ave	Water Ditch Trail – S Steele St	0.87	\$165,000	Bike Lane
49 20	NE 51 st St/NE Northshore Pkwy	NE Harbor View Dr – Hoyt Rd	2.07	\$391,000	Bike Lane
49 20	NE Slayden Rd	NE Marine View Dr – NE Harbor View Dr	0.41	\$15,000	Sharrow
20 21	N Baltimore St	N 46 th – N 26 th St	1.67	\$81,000	Bicycle Boulevard
24 22	N Pearl St/Ferry Landing	N 51 st St – Ferry Station	0.50	\$18,000	Sharrow

Transportation Element – City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan

Priority	Street	From-To	Length (miles)	Cost ² Estimate	Facility Type
22 23	S 80 th /82 nd St	S Hosmer – McKinley Ave	2.07	\$100,000	Bicycle Boulevard
23 24	S Alaska St	S 56 th – 96 th St S	2.51	\$473,000	Bike Lane
24 25	S Mildred St	S 12 th St – S 19 th St	0.50	\$94,000	Bike Lane
25 26	Dock St	S Schuster Pkwy – E D St	1.62	\$59,000	Sharrows
25 26	N 51 st St/Gallagher Dr	N Vassault St – Ruston Way	1.15	\$218,000	Bike Lane
25 26	Ruston Way	N 49 th St – Schuster Parkway	2.37	\$87,000	Sharrows
26 27	S Oxford St/S 8 th St/S Meyers St/S 15 th St	N Skyline Dr – S 19 th St	1.15	\$56,000	Bicycle Boulevard
27 28	N 37 th St	N Shirley St – N Orchard St	0.27	\$73,000	Shared-Use Path
28 29	E Side Foss (D Street)	Murray Morgan Bridge to E 3 rd St	0.42	\$113,000	Shared-Use Path
29 30	S A St	E 96 th St – E 37 th St	3.78	\$183,000	Bicycle Boulevard
30 31	Pearl St	N 11 th – N 9 th (Scott Pierson)	0.20	\$53,000	Shared-Use Path
34 32	Jackson St	N 10 th St – Scott Pierson Trail	0.10	\$18,000	Bike Lanes
33	Dome District to Puyallup Connection	Analysis for best route to River Road/Pioneer from Dome District and reverse direction	.25/TBD	TBD	Bike Lanes
Total Short Term			65.13	\$8,595,000	

Demonstration Projects

In addition to the proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements, the City should start with a few demonstration projects to get momentum going. These projects will also serve to develop enthusiasm and interest from Tacoma residents, and to draw attention to the City's support for ~~nonmotorized~~ active transportation options. Demonstration projects include:

- Install **wayfinding signage** throughout the City indicating to pedestrians and bicyclists their direction of travel, location of destinations, and the walking or riding time/distance to those destinations. Wayfinding signs increase users' comfort and accessibility of the bicycle system and also visually cue motorists that they are driving along a bicycle route and should use caution.
- Hold a **Sunday Parkways/Ciclovía (open streets)** event along Schuster Parkway or other locations to encourage community members and families to become familiar with bicycling in Tacoma.
- ~~Establish a **Safe Routes to Employment** program with a focus on downtown.~~ **Safe Routes** programs provide education and encouragement programming and infrastructural improvements so people can more safely and conveniently access destinations via walking, bicycling and transit.
- ~~Establish~~ Expand the **Safe Routes to School** program to work with interested schools of all levels citywide
- ~~Establish a **Safe Routes to Employment** program with a focus on larger employment centers and downtown Tacoma.~~
- Establish a **Safe Routes to Parks** program with a focus on Regional, Signature and Community Parks as defined by Metro Parks Tacoma.
- Establish **Safe Routes to Transit Centers and Transit Hubs** programs for improved access to Sound Transit, Pierce Transit and Amtrak facilities.

- Use **arterial retrofits**, also known as road diets, to implement bike lanes on key roads.
- Implement **downtown improvements**, including a cycle track and shared lane markings on Pacific leading from Tacoma Art Museum to ~~north downtown~~ the Schuster Parkway trail.
- ~~Develop **bicycle boulevards** on Fawcett, Park and other identified roadways.~~



Tandem Recumbent Cyclists in front of the University of Puget Sound

Bikeway Recommendations

Tacoma's bikeway implementation projects would primarily occur through roadway re-striping, which may require lane narrowing, parking reduction, or removal of a center turn lane. Depending on funding or other constraints, bike lane project implementation could occur in multiple phases. When there is an elimination of parking the City will work with the Commission on Disabilities to determine how best to mitigate the loss for people with disabilities.

* * *

Sidewalk Recommendations

Locations identified as high priority for sidewalk development and pedestrian intersection treatments are areas with higher densities of pedestrian attracting land uses, particularly schools, employment centers, parks and transit centers. Streets recommended for sidewalk improvements are shown in Map 5.

Table 3. Proposed Sidewalk Improvements*

Priority	Street	From-To	Length (miles)
Completed and Underway Projects			
Complete	S I St	S 80th St – S 84th St	0.40
Complete	E 72nd St	E D St – McKinley Ave	0.22
Complete	S Tyler St	S 38th St – S 52nd St	1.55
Complete	N Narrows Dr	N Narrows Dr – Bridgeview Dr	0.22
Complete	E 44th St	E Portland Ave – Swan Creek Park	0.22
Construction Phase	S J St	S 80th St – S 84th St	0.49
Construction Phase	S 60th St	S Adams St – South Tacoma Way	0.25
Construction Phase Phase Complete	S C St	S 25th St – S Tacoma Wy	0.20
Total Completed and Underway:			3.55
Short Term			
1	S 76th St	Alaska Ave – Pacific Ave	0.89
2	NE 51st St	Slayden Rd – Browns Point Blvd	0.35
3	S 66th St	S Verde St Aly – South Tacoma Wy	0.60
4	S 64th St	E J St – E N St	0.42
5	S 66th St	S Junett St – Wapato	0.30
6	S 84th St	Tacoma Mall Blvd – S Alaska St	0.41
7	N Vassault, E	N 26th St – N 24th St	0.09
8	S 92nd Ave	S Hosmer – S D St	0.91
9	S L St	South End Neighborhood Center – S 80th St	0.18
10	N 24th St	N Narrows Dr – Lenore Dr	0.22
11	NE Harbor View Dr/NE 49th St	NE 51st St – Browns Point Blvd	0.90
12	S Wapato	S 64th St – S 68th St	0.51
13	S 64th St	S Orchard St – Tyler St	1.16
14	S 80th St	S Sheridan Ave – S Tacoma Ave	1.09
15	McKinley	E. D St – Wright St	0.30
Total Short Term:			8.33
Medium Term			
16	S 58th St	S Durango St – South Tacoma Way Aly	0.43
17	S Adams St	S 56th St – S 66th St	0.80
18	N 21st St	W of N Pearl St – Highland St	0.07
19	Union Ave	Center – Hwy 16 S 19 th St	0.20
20	S Pine St/S Cedar St	S 19th – Hood St	0.80
21	N 11th St	N Highland St – N Orchard St	0.32
22	S 62nd St	S Clement Ave – S Wapato St	0.61
23	N 11th St	N Adams St – N Union Ave	0.27

24	S M St	S 84th St – S 88th St	0.34
25	S 56th St	Tacoma Mall Blvd – S Alaska St	0.49
Total Medium Term:			4.33

* The projects in this table are recommended in addition to projects recommended in the City's *ADA Transition Plan*

* * *

Intersection Improvement Recommendations

Intersection improvements are recommended for locations that previously experienced pedestrian crashes or that were identified by members of the public as needing improvement. Intersection improvements include high-visibility crossings, curb extensions, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and other treatments as outlined in the Design Guidelines (Appendix E of the *2010 Mobility Master Plan Study*). Priority locations for intersection improvements include:

Table 4. Proposed Intersection Improvements

Priority	Intersection	Original Prioritization ¹
Completed/Underway		
Complete	N 26th St & N Proctor St	Not Classified ²
Complete	E Portland Ave & E 56th St	Medium
Construction Phase Complete	S Commerce St & S 9th St	Short
Construction Phase Complete	S 25th St & Pacific Ave	Short
Planning Phase	S Mildred St & S 19th St	Long
Short-Term		
1	Tacoma Ave S & S 9th St	Short
2	S I St & Division Ave	Short
3	Division St & Sprague & 6th Ave	Not Classified
4	Tacoma Mall Blvd & S 48th St	Long
5	S J St & S 19th St	Long

Medium-Term		
6	E 56th & E McKinley Ave	Medium
7	A St & S 38th St	Medium
8	Tacoma Ave & N 1st St	Medium
9	S 74th St and Tacoma Mall Blvd.	Medium
10	S 72nd St and Hosmer	Medium
11	I-5 NB off-ramp terminus at Portland Ave/E 28th St ³	Medium
12	S Puget Sound Ave & S 56th St	Medium
13	S 84th & Pacific Ave	Medium
14	S 96th St & Pacific Ave	Medium
15	S Steele St & S 96th St	Medium
16	S 38th & McKinley Ave	Not Classified
17	E Portland Ave & E 32nd St	Not Classified
18	N 11th St & N Pearl St	Not Classified
19	S Hosmer St & S 84th St	Medium
20	S 38th St & Pacific Ave	Medium
21	E Portland Ave & E 29th St	Medium
22	S 54th and Tacoma Mall Blvd	New
Long-Term		
23	N 26th & N Pearl St	Long
24	S 56th St & Pacific Ave	Long

³ Work at this location is being done under the I-5: Portland Ave to Port of Tacoma Rd – Northbound HOV Project. This project will also include minor re-channelization at the off-ramp terminus at Portland Avenue/E 28th Street as well as rebuild the signal. Construction is scheduled to begin January 2012. Project information is available at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/PierceCountyHOV>

Sub-Area Plan Recommendations

There are certain areas of the city that pose the greatest challenges to pedestrian and bicycle movement where more intensive analysis is warranted. The following areas are recommended for sub-area plans to determine best active transportation routes and access:

- Tacoma Mall
- NE Tacoma
- Tacoma Community College – and its associated transit hub
- Downtown – Comprehensive Transportation Vision
- Tideflats (Port)



Bicycles parked at the 2008
“Bike to a Better Tacoma” event



2009 City Council and Planning Commission
Bike Ride on the Scott Pierson Trail

Low-Impact Pedestrian Trails

The City of Tacoma has a number of low-impact [pedestrian](#) trails that provide recreational opportunities for pedestrians and in some cases serve as pedestrian routes through open space corridors. When planning for these trails, on-street bicycle and pedestrian access to these facilities and bicycle parking should be considered. [However, when a low-impact pedestrian trail is not designed for bicycles, then on-street bicyclists should be parking and then walking the trails. Preliminary trail descriptions are located in the Table below. A notation is included indicating whether a trail is envisioned only as low-impact pedestrian trails \(LIPT\) or may have an opportunity to be designed as a shared-use path \(SUP\). Multi-use paths are also listed in the MoMaP tables as Shared-Use Paths.](#)

[The City recognizes that the design, planning and creation of some low-impact pedestrian trails will be require collaboration with our partners including, but not limited to, Metro Parks of Tacoma, the Port of Tacoma and our surrounding jurisdictions.](#)

These trails include:

- ~~Garfield Gulch~~
- ~~Julia's Gulch~~
- ~~Bayside Trails~~
- ~~Puget Gulch~~

Table 5. Low-Impact Pedestrian Trails and Shared-Use Paths

Program/Project	From - To		Trail Type
Point Defiance Trail System (public access to/within the park – the City will strive to coordinate/leverage resources with Metro Parks Tacoma)	Within/connecting to Point Defiance Park		SUP/LIPT
Northeast Tacoma Trail Network (slope top of Marine View Dr. Includes an extension from Browns Pt. Blvd. to Northshore Parkway and a connector between Crescent Heights and Alderwood Parks.)	Slayden Road	Norpoint Way	SUP/LIPT
B Street Trail (trail within and view points within/adjacent to B Street Gulch)	Dock Street/Puyallup Avenue vicinity	Northeast portion of the McKinley neighborhood	SUP/LIPT
E. N St. (Pedestrian connection between the top of the hill towards E. Portland Avenue (see "goat trail" in 2008 City aerals - requested by the ENACT)	E. 35th Street	E. 29th Street	LIPT
E. 34th St. steps - (Improvement of existing steps - requested by the ENACT)	West of Portland Avenue		LIPT
Bayside Trails (trail system providing recreational access to the Schuster Slope and a connection from downtown to the Schuster Parkway)	Garfield Gulch	Stadium Way	LIPT
Garfield Gulch Trail/Public Access (provides pedestrian access to the gulch and from residential area at the top of the slope to the Schuster Parkway)	Tennis Court/Borough Road	Schuster Parkway	LIPT
Buckley Gulch Public Access (provides visual and/or pedestrian access to portions of the gulch)	N.29th Street	N. 16th Street	LIPT

Program/Project	From - To		Trail Type
Puget Gulch Trail/Public Access (provides pedestrian access to the gulch and from residential areas and Puget Park to Ruston Way)	N. Monroe Street	Ruston Way	LIPT
Mason Gulch Public Access (trail or viewpoints providing visual and/or pedestrian access to portions of the gulch)	N. 37th Street	Waterview Street	LIPT
Swan Creek Trail System (public access to/within this open space corridor – the City will strive to coordinate/leverage resources with Metro Parks Tacoma)	River Road	E. 64th Street	LIPT
Julia's Gulch Trail System (natural areas trails for habitat restoration, wildlife viewing and recreation)	Adjacent to Norpoint Road	29th Street NE	LIPT
First Creek Trail System (trail and/or view points within the First Creek corridor)	E. 29th Street	Swan Creek vicinity	LIPT

Implementation Costs

Tacoma has the potential to build on the existing walkway and bikeway networks and transform itself into a community where walking and bicycling for transportation and recreation are popular activities. This section lays out the approximate cost for completing the system. This network builds upon previous and on-going local and regional planning efforts and reflects the extensive input offered by City staff, the Mobility Master Plan Steering Committee, bicycle and pedestrian stakeholder groups and Tacoma residents.

The charts below show the total projected mile of new facilities as well as the approximate cost. All cost estimates include only the pedestrian and bicycle facility treatment and not any additional costs of roadway expansion or improvement. Please note: these cost figures and those provided in the charts below are in 2010 dollars.

The time frames are as follows: short term is 1-5 years, medium term 6-10 and long term, 11-15 years. The total implementation cost of the Tacoma Mobility Master Plan is estimated at approximately \$42.2 million, as shown in Table 6. Approximately 11% (\$4.6 million) of the total build out is in planning/construction phase or has been completed. Short-term recommendations account for approximately \$15.3 million.

Table 56. Tiered Facility Lengths

Facility Type	Completed/ Underway	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term	Total
Bicycle Boulevards	10.61	22.76	12.18	5.57	51.12
Bike Lanes	5.23	29.19	31.83	10.18	76.43
Sharrows	0.10	4.90	1.38	0.00	6.38

Cycle Tracks	0	0	3.84	0.00	3.84
Sidewalks	3.30	8.33	4.33	0.00	15.96
Shared-Use Paths	1.89	6.78	5.66	25.92	40.25
Total	21.13	71.96	59.22	41.67	193.98

Table 67. Summary of Construction Costs for Recommended Projects

Facility Type	Completed/ Underway	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term	Total
Bicycle Boulevards	\$524,000	\$1,101,000	\$590,000	\$270,000	\$2,485,000
Bike Lanes	\$960,000	\$5,499,000	\$5,840,000	\$1,835,000	\$14,134,000
Shared Lane Markings	\$4000	\$179,000	\$51,000	\$0	\$234,000
Cycle Tracks	\$0	\$0	\$1,029,000	\$0	\$1,029,000
Sidewalks	\$2,384,000	\$6,454,000	\$3,381,000	\$0	\$12,219,000
Intersection Improvements	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$714,000	\$84,000	\$1,218,000
Shared Use Paths*	\$508,000	\$1,816,000	\$1,517,000	\$7,055,000	\$10,896,000
Total	\$4,590,000	\$15,259,000	\$13,122,000	\$9,244,000	\$42,215,000

* Costs do not include projects programmed in the FY 2010-2015 Capital Facilities Program, including the Historic Water Ditch Trail and Pipeline Road Trail. [Projected costs are approximate and based on a simple 10' asphalt path with two feet of crushed gravel on either side. This may not be an adequate width to accommodate the growing number of users in many instances.](#)

All cost estimates include only the pedestrian and bicycle facility treatment and not any additional costs of roadway expansion or improvement. Intersection cost estimates are based on the average cost of installing eight new ADA ramps and four crosswalks per intersection. Additional work may be required at some intersections to make them safe for cyclists and pedestrians. Table 7 provides an estimate of maintenance costs for the recommended projects. Maintenance costs do not include sweeping and other repair that is part of regular street maintenance activities. Maintenance costs are estimated annually, with the overall cost amortized by the frequency of maintenance tasks.

Table 78. Summary of Maintenance Costs for Recommended Projects

Facility Type	Completed/ Underway	Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term	Total
Bicycle Boulevards	\$4,700	\$10,200	\$5,500	\$2,500	\$22,900
Bike Lanes	\$128,700	\$718,200	\$754,200	\$250,700	\$1,851,800
Sharrows (or Shared Lane Markings)	\$100	\$4,100	\$1,100	\$0	\$5,300
Cycle Tracks	N/A	\$0	\$130,000	\$0	\$130,000
Shared Use Paths	\$64,000	\$229,400	\$191,600	\$891,300	\$1,376,300
Total	\$197,500	\$961,900	\$1,082,400	\$1,144,500	\$3,386,300

Table 89. Short Term Project Costs

Street	From - To	Length (Miles)	Construction Cost	Maintenance Estimate ¹
Bicycle Boulevards				
Ainsworth Ave	N Steele St – 6th Ave	0.49	\$24,000	\$200
E I St/E Wright Ave/E K St/Pipeline Rd	McKinley Park – Pipeline Road Trail	1.20	\$58,000	\$500
N 11th St	N Pearl St – N Steele St	2.25	\$109,000	\$1,000
N 1st St/Broadway	N Tacoma Ave – Prairie Line Trail	1.43	\$69,000	\$600
N Baltimore	N 46th – N 26th St	1.67	\$81,000	\$800
S 43rd St/E E St/E 40th St	S A St – Portland Ave	1.90	\$92,000	\$900
S 64th St	S Alaska Way – Waller Rd	3.31	\$160,000	\$1,500
S 66th St	Orchard St – Tacoma Mall Blvd	2.14	\$103,000	\$1,000
S 80th/82nd St	S Hosmer – McKinley Ave	2.07	\$100,000	\$900
S A St	E 96th St – E 37th St	3.78	\$183,000	\$1,700
S Oxford St/S 8th St/S Meyers St/S 15th St	N Skyline Dr – S 19th St	1.15	\$56,000	\$500
Sheridan Ave	6th St – S 25th St	1.37	\$66,000	\$600
Bike Lanes				
6th Ave	Ainsworth Ave – E Broadway	0.87	\$165,000	\$21,500
N 51st St/Gallagher Dr	N Vassault St – Ruston Way	1.15	\$218,000	\$28,400
N Alder/N Cedar St	N 30th St – SR 16	2.79	\$527,000	\$68,700
N Stevens St	N 46th St – N 37th	0.62	\$118,000	\$15,400
NE Nassau Ave	Browns Pt Blvd – NE Northshore Pkwy	1.06	\$200,000	\$26,100
NE 51st St/NE Northshore Pkwy	NE Harbor View Dr – Hoyt Rd	2.07	\$391,000	\$50,900
Orchard	S 19th – N 26th	1.70	\$307,000	\$41,900
Puyallup Ave	Pacific Ave – City Line (bike lane only)	1.71	\$322,000	\$42,000
S 11th St	Ferry St – Pacific Ave	1.25	\$236,000	\$30,800
S 12th St	S Jackson Ave – S Union Ave	2.51	\$473,000	\$61,700
S 25th St	S State St/Scott Pierson Trail – Sheridan Ave	0.21	\$40,000	\$5,200
S 37th St/Sprague Ave	Water Ditch Trail – S Steele	0.87	\$165,000	\$21,500
S 47th St/S 48th St/E C St/E 46th St/E E St	S Tacoma Wy – McKinley Ave	3.20	\$603,000	\$78,600
S Alaska	S 56th – 96th St S	2.51	\$473,000	\$61,700
S Mildred St	S 12th St – S 19th St	0.50	\$94,000	\$12,200
S Washington St	S 60th – S 43rd (S Tacoma Way)	1.20	\$230,000	\$29,500
S Oakes St/SPine St	SR 16 – S 74th St	3.11	\$587,000	\$76,500
Stephens/ Tyler St	6th Ave – S Wright Ave	1.76	\$332,000	\$43,200

¹ Maintenance costs include re-striping, signage replacement, and roadway patching depending on facility type. Estimates do not include sweeping and other repair that is part of regular street maintenance activities. Estimated maintenance costs are presented on an annual basis, however the overall cost has been amortized by the frequency of maintenance tasks. For example, the need for re-striping is estimated to occur every other year, so the total cost (\$4.50 per LF) is divided in half for the annual estimate.

Transportation Element – City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan

Street	From - To	Length (Miles)	Construction Cost	Maintenance Estimate ¹
Jackson St	N 10th – Scott Pierson Trail	0.10	\$18,000	\$2,500
Sharrows²				
Dock St	S Schuster Pkwy – E D St	1.62	\$59,000	\$1,400
N Pearl St/Ferry Landing	N 51st St – Ferry Station	0.50	\$18,000	\$400
NE Slayden Rd	NE Marine View Dr – NE Harbor View Dr	0.41	\$15,000	\$300
Ruston Way	N 49th St – Schuster Parkway	2.37	\$87,000	\$2,000
Sidewalks				
S 76th St	Alaska Ave – Pacific Ave	0.89	\$698,000	
NE 51st St	Slayden Rd – Browns Point Blvd	0.35	\$274,000	
S 66th St	S Verde St Aly – South Tacoma Wy	0.60	\$433,000	
S 64th St	E J St – E N St	0.42	\$329,000	
S 66th St	S Junett St – Wapato	0.30	\$217,000	
S 84th St	Tacoma Mall Blvd – S Alaska St	0.41	\$321,000	
N Vassault, E	N 26th St – N 24th St	0.09	\$71,000	
S 92nd Ave	S Hosmer – S D St	0.91	\$713,000	
S L St	South End Neighborhood Center – S 80th St	0.18	\$141,000	
N 24th St	N Narrows Dr – Lenore Dr	0.22	\$172,000	
NE Harbor View Dr/NE 49th St	NE 51st St – Browns Point Blvd	0.90	\$705,000	
S Wapato	S 64th St – S 68th St	0.51	\$400,000	
S 64th St	S Orchard St – Tyler St	1.16	\$909,000	
S 80th St	S Sheridan Ave – S Tacoma Ave	1.09	\$854,000	
McKinley Ave	E D St – Wright St	0.30	\$217,000	
Intersection Project Improvements				
S I St & Division Ave			\$42,000	
Tacoma Ave S & S 9th St			\$42,000	
Division St & Sprague & 6th Ave			\$42,000	
Tacoma Mall Blvd & S 48th St			\$42,000	
S J St & S 19th St			\$42,000	
Shared-Use Paths³				
E Side Foss (D Street)	Murray Morgan Bridge – E 3rd St	0.42	\$113,000	\$14,200
Pearl Street	N 11th – N 9th (Scott Pierson)	0.20	\$53,000	\$6,800
Historic Water Ditch Trail³ (construction phase)	North	2.78	\$745,000	\$94,100

² Sharrows, or Shared Lane Markings, are roadways marked with a bicycle symbol and chevrons where cars and bicycles share the same space. The Sharrow delineates the area where the cyclist is safest riding.

³ Costs for the ~~Historic Water Ditch Trail~~, N 37th St Trail and Pipeline Road Trail have been allocated into the FY 2010-2015 CIP and are not included in cost estimate totals. Projected costs for trails are approximate and based on a simple 10' asphalt path with two feet of crushed gravel on either side. This may not be an adequate width to accommodate the growing number of users.

Street	From - To	Length (Miles)	Construction Cost	Maintenance Estimate ¹
N 37th St ³	N Shirley St – N Orchard St	0.27	\$73,000	\$9,200
Pipeline Road Trail ³	E 40th St – Waller Rd	2.31	\$618,000	\$78,100
Prairie Line Trail	Pacific Ave to Water Ditch Trail	0.80	\$214,000	\$27,000
Total Short Term Projects		71.96	\$15,259,000	\$962,000

Table 910. Medium Term Project Costs

Street	From - To	Length (mile)	Construction Cost	Maintenance Estimate ¹
Bicycle Boulevards				
Court D/St Helens Ave	S G St – S 9 th St	0.64	\$31,000	\$300
J St	N 3 rd St – S 27 th St	1.87	\$91,000	\$800
J St	S 37 th St – S 84 th St	3.05	\$148,000	\$1,400
N 37 th St	N Orchard St – N Proctor St	0.78	\$38,000	\$300
N 45 th St/N Verde St/N 45 th St	N Baltimore St – N Stevens St	0.57	\$28,000	\$300
N 7 th St	N Orchard St – N Pine St	1.48	\$72,000	\$700
N Highland St	N 23 rd St – N 21 st St	0.11	\$5,000	\$0
S 56 th St	S Washington St – S State St	1.16	\$56,000	\$500
Skyline Dr	N 17 th /Westgate Blvd – N 11 th St	0.36	\$17,000	\$200
State St	S 25 th St – N Grant Ave	1.53	\$74,000	\$700
Upper Park St/E 29 th St/E L St	E 26 th St to McKinley Park	0.63	\$30,000	\$300
Bike Lanes				
Center St	S Orchard St – S 25th St	3.44	\$649,000	\$84,600
E 11th St/Taylor Way	SR 509 – Marine View Dr	2.76	\$521,000	\$67,900
E 38th St	A St – Portland Ave	1.11	\$210,000	\$27,400
E McKinley Ave	S 72nd St – E D St	3.17	\$598,000	\$78,000
Jackson Ave	SR 16 – S 12th St	0.60	\$114,000	\$14,800
Marine View Rd	SR 509 – NE Slayden Rd	0.51	\$97,000	\$12,600
McCarver St/Tacoma St	N Schuster Pkwy – S Tacoma Ave	1.50	\$283,000	\$36,900
N 17th St/Westgate Blvd/N 21st St	N Narrows Dr – N Proctor St	2.23	\$420,000	\$54,800
N 21st St/N I St/S I St	N Alder St – Division Ave	1.66	\$313,000	\$40,800
N 46th St	N Vassault St – N Baltimore St	0.61	\$116,000	\$15,100
NE 49th Ave	NE 45th Ave – NE 33rd St	0.70	\$155,000	\$21,000
N Ferdinand St	Ruston Way – N 46th St	0.49	\$93,000	\$12,100
N Highland	N 21st – N 11th	0.51	\$110,000	\$14,000
NE Norpoint Way	Marine View Dr – NE 29th St	1.20	\$58,000	\$15,100
Puyallup Ave	Holgate – Pacific Ave	0.10	\$18,000	\$2,300
S 19th St	Mildred – Yakima Ave	3.80	\$716,000	\$93,400
S 35th St	S Pine St – S Sprague St	0.43	\$82,000	\$10,700
S 56th St	S State St – Pipeline Trail	2.90	\$547,000	\$71,300
S 56th St	S Orchard St – S Washington St	0.96	\$181,000	\$23,600
S Yakima Ave /Thompson Ave	S 27th St – S 56th St	2.28	\$430,000	\$56,100
Tacoma Ave	N 3rd St – S 2nd St	0.30	\$65,000	\$7,500

¹ Maintenance costs include re-striping, signage replacement, and roadway patching depending on facility type. Estimates do not include sweeping and other repair that is part of regular street maintenance activities. Estimated maintenance costs are presented on an annual basis, however the overall cost has been amortized by the frequency of maintenance tasks. For example, the need for re-striping is estimated to occur every other year, so the total cost (\$4.50 per LF) is divided in half for the annual estimate.

Street	From - To	Length (mile)	Construction Cost	Maintenance Estimate ¹
Yakima Ave	Wright Park – S 27th St	1.49	\$282,000	\$36,700
Sharrows²				
Five Mile Dr/N 51st St	N Vassault St – N 54th St	0.48	\$18,000	\$400
Ruston connection	N 51st St – Ferry Landing Road	0.53	\$19,000	\$400
S 96th St	Park – Pacific	0.37	\$14,000	\$300
Cycle Tracks				
SR 509	Pacific Ave – Marine View Dr	3.84	\$1,029,000	\$130,000
Sidewalks				
S 58th St	S Durango St – S Tacoma Way Aly	0.43	\$337,000	
S Adams St	S 56th St – S 66th St	0.80	\$627,000	
N 21st St	W of N Pearl St – Highland St	0.07	\$55,000	
Union Ave	Center – Hwy 16 S 19 th St	0.20	\$144,000	
S Pine St/S Cedar St	S 19th – Hood St	0.80	\$627,000	
N 11th St	N Highland St – N Orchard St	0.32	\$251,000	
S 62nd St	S Clement Ave – S Wapato St	0.61	\$478,000	
N 11th St	N Adams St – N Union Ave	0.27	\$212,000	
S M St	S 84th St – S 88th St	0.34	\$266,000	
S 56th St	Tacoma Mall Blvd – S Alaska St	0.49	\$384,000	
Intersection Improvements				
A St & S 38th St			\$42,000	
E 56th & E McKinley Ave			\$42,000	
E Portland Ave & E 29th St			\$42,000	
S 74th St & Tacoma Mall Blvd			\$42,000	
S 72nd St & Hosmer			\$42,000	
I-5 NB off-ramp terminus at Portland Ave/E 28th St			\$42,000	
S 38th St & Pacific Ave			\$42,000	
S 38th & McKinley Ave			\$42,000	
E Portland Ave & E 32nd St			\$42,000	
N 11th & N Pearl			\$42,000	
S 84th & Pacific Ave			\$42,000	
S 96th St & Pacific Ave			\$42,000	
S Hosmer St & S 84th St			\$42,000	
S Puget Sound Ave & S 56th St			\$42,000	
S Steele St & S 96th St			\$42,000	
Tacoma Ave & N 1st St			\$42,000	
S 54th & Tacoma Mall Boulevard			\$42,000	
Shared-Use Paths				
Pipeline Trail Connection	Collaborate with neighboring jurisdictions for connectivity	0.97	\$260,000	\$32,900
Schuster Parkway Trail	Cost is for 10' asphalt trail alone and does not include slope stabilization or other infrastructure	1.30	\$349,000	\$44,000

² Sharrows, or Shared Lane Markings, are roadways marked with a bicycle symbol and chevrons where cars and bicycles share the same space. The Sharrow delineates the area where the cyclist is safest riding

Street	From - To	Length (mile)	Construction Cost	Maintenance Estimate ¹
Total Medium-Term Projects:		56.75	\$12,432,000	\$1,010,200

Table 4011. Long Term Project Costs

Street	From - To	Length (mile)	Construction Cost	Maintenance Estimate ¹
Bicycle Boulevards				
Cheyenne St	N 46th – 6th	2.46	\$119,000	\$1,100
N Fife St/N 15th St/N Pine	N Yakima Ave – S 12th St	1.86	\$90,000	\$800
S 18th St	S Puget Sound Ave – S Pine St	0.40	\$20,000	\$200
S 43 rd St	Park Ave – A St	0.50	\$110,000	\$1,100
S Puget Sound Ave	N 7th St – S 18th St	0.85	\$41,000	\$400
Bike Lanes				
N Baltimore St	N 49th St – N 46th St	0.29	\$55,000	\$7,200
Portland Ave	Puyallup Ave – S 72nd St	3.52	\$665,000	\$86,700
Proctor St	N 37th St – S 19th St	2.67	\$504,000	\$65,700
Regents St/Center St	Princeton – Tyler St	1.29	\$243,000	\$31,700
S 11th St	Dock St – E Portland Ave	0.85	\$161,000	\$21,000
S 25th St	S Sheridan Ave – MLK Jr Way	0.21	\$40,000	\$5,200
S 66th St/S 64th St Bridge	Tacoma Mall Blvd – S Alaska St	0.20	\$37,000	\$4,900
Uphill Bike Lanes				
6th Ave	S Walters Rd – S Jackson Ave	1.15	\$130,000	\$28,300
Intersection Improvements				
N 26th & N Pearl St			\$42,000	
S 56th St & Pacific Ave			\$42,000	
Shared-Use Paths				
E Side Foss	S 11th – Waterway Park	1.65	\$443,000	\$56,000
Garfield/Ruston Way	Garfield Gulch – Ruston	0.76	\$204,000	\$25,800
Hill Climb Access	Stadium Way – Schuster	0.23	\$63,000	\$8,000
NE Tacoma Trail Network	Slayden Road – Norpoint Way	8.79	\$2,357,000	\$297,700
Puyallup River Levee Trail	City Limits – 11th St	2.1	\$670,000	\$84,600
Point Defiance Trail (Metro)	Point Ruston – Vashon Ferry	2.26	\$605,000	\$76,500
<u>Dome to Pt. Defiance</u>	<u>Foss Esplanade to Pt. Ruston</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>TBD</u>
President's Ridge Trail	SR 7 – Jennie Reed – <u>S. 34th St</u>	2.31 <u>9.5</u>	\$620 <u>790,000</u>	\$78,300 <u>99,800</u>
PresRidge Trail	34th St Detour	0.64	\$170,000	\$21,500
West Slope Trail	Pt. Defiance – Titlow/S. 19 th	6.03	\$1,616,000	\$204,100
<u>Trails with undetermined alignment. Coordination with neighboring jurisdictions critical for connectivity.</u>				
<u>Trail to Mountain Corridor</u>	<u>Tacoma Dome to Mt. Rainier</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<u>Tacoma Dome to Sumner</u>	<u>Tacoma Dome to Sumner</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>TBD</u>
Total Long Term Projects		41.02 <u>38.2</u>	\$9,047,000 <u>6,627,000</u>	\$1,106,800 <u>801,1000</u>

¹ Maintenance costs include re-striping, signage replacement, and roadway patching depending on facility type. Estimates do not include sweeping and other repair that is part of regular street maintenance activities. Estimated maintenance costs are presented on an annual basis, however the overall cost has been amortized by the frequency of maintenance tasks. For example, the need for re-striping is estimated to occur every other year, so the total cost (\$4.50 per LF) is divided in half for the annual estimate.



First Annual Tacoma Bike Swap, May 2009

Implementation Strategies

Implementation strategies and their related action items support the goals and policies and projects outlined above.

1. Implementation

Implement the Mobility Master Plan's recommendations for developing an active transportation network that reduces auto travel, increases the number of ~~nonmotorized~~ active transportation users of all ages and abilities, and improves the health of our people and local ecology.

Action 1.1: Connected Network

Complete the connected network shown on Maps 2, 3, 4 and 5 of sidewalks, trails, bike lanes, bike boulevards, shared lane markings, and cycle tracks throughout the city that serves pedestrians and all bicycle user groups. Complete short term network by 2015, medium term by 2020, and long term by 2025.

Action 1.2: Monitor Progress

Monitor the implementation progress of the Mobility Master Plan to ensure long-term success.

Action 1.3: Meet or Exceed Standards

Design all bicycle and pedestrian facilities to meet or exceed the latest federal, state, and local standards so there is universal access for all users of the system.

Action 1.4: Partner with Transit

Work cooperatively with adjoining jurisdictions and transit agencies to coordinate ~~nonmotorized~~ active transportation planning and implementation activities.

Action 1.5: All Ages and Abilities

Increase pedestrian trips and bicycle ridership with a system that provides facility types and designs that are comfortable for pedestrians and bicyclists of all ages and abilities. The overarching goal is to create a system that will invite the interested but concerned rider as well as the strong, fearless rider to shift from automobile to bicycle travel. Inexperienced cyclists are most likely to use high quality bike boulevards, shared use trails, and cycle tracks.

Action 1.6: Wayfinding Signage

Install wayfinding signage in proximity to bike lanes, bike boulevards, shared-use paths and destinations.

Action 1.7: Land Use Considerations

Prioritize the completion of proposed shared-use paths that maximize access to key recreational and transportation destinations in order to encourage recreational and commute trips.

* * *

4. Transit and Streetcar Integration

Coordinate with Sound Transit and Pierce Transit to expand ~~nonmotorized~~ [active transportation](#) mobility through the integration of pedestrian and bicycle facilities with the transit and streetcar systems.

Action 4.1: Connections and Transfers

Increase the number of multimodal trips that include traveling as a pedestrian or bicyclist for at least one trip segment by improving and simplifying connections and transfers.

Action 4.2: Incorporating Bikeways into Transit Projects

Consider incorporating bikeways in transit projects that include exclusive transit use of a right-of-way, such as bus mall, bus rapid transit or streetcar.

Action 4.3: Support Bus, Rail, and Streetcar Network

Support a frequent and convenient bus, rail, and streetcar network to magnify the impact of planning for movement by pedestrians and bicyclists.

Action 4.4: Routes to Transit

Provide safe and accessible routes and intersections to transit for pedestrians of all abilities.

Action 4.5: Bicycle Facilities at Transit Hubs

Provide safe end-of-trip facilities (bike parking, bike lockers, etc) at all streetcar stations and transit facilities served by four or more routes.

5. Connectivity and Access

Plan new development on a grid pattern for good street connectivity and access for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Action 5.1: Cul-de-Sac Connectivity

Enhance mobility in existing cul-de-sac development with shared-use paths for through access for pedestrians and bicyclists to adjacent street corridors.

Action 5.2: Regional Connectivity

Work cooperatively with adjoining jurisdictions on bicycle and pedestrian connections and trail projects to ensure regional links for commuters and recreational users in and outside of Tacoma

6. Maintenance

Ensure pedestrian and bicycle facilities are clean, safe, and, accessible, and promote active use.

Action 6.1: Prioritize Safety

Prioritize pedestrian and bicyclist safety during construction and maintenance activities and ensure that the City's accessibility guidelines are followed.

Action 6.2: Inspection and Maintenance

Create safe and accessible bikeways and walkways through regular inspection and maintenance.

Action 6.3: Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes through Construction Zones

Identify safe, convenient, well-marked and accessible alternative routes for bicyclists and pedestrians through construction zones.

Action 6.4: Establish Routine Maintenance Program

Establish a routine maintenance program that encourages citizens to report maintenance issues that impact bicyclist and pedestrian safety.

Action 6.5: Ongoing Maintenance Strategy

Develop an on-going city-wide maintenance strategy for ~~nonmotorized~~ [active](#) transportation facilities.

7. Education and Encouragement

Increase the public's awareness and usage of the bicycle and pedestrian network in Tacoma through targeted education and encouragement programs. Specific programs are detailed in Chapter 4 of the *2010 Mobility Master Plan Study* and the *2008 ADA Transition Plan*. Example programs include Bike Month, Sunday Parkways, and supporting campaigns.

Action 7.1: Safety Education

Educate the general public on bicycle and walking safety issues and encourage ~~nonmotorized~~ [active](#) transportation with programs that target pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists.

Action 7.2: Linking Trips Education

Educate the general public about linking trips (trip-chaining) to reduce the number of trips taken per day.

Action 7.3: Promotion through City Sponsored Events

Encourage pedestrians and bicyclists through City-sponsored events and expanded Bike Month activities.

Action 7.4: Safety Education for Children

Educate school children on safe pedestrian and bicycle behavior.

Action 7.5: Education on Laws and Regulations

Educate the general public on bicycle and pedestrian laws and regulations via the City's website and other educational programs.

Action 7.6: Education for Drivers

Educate drivers (transit drivers, delivery drivers, etc.) on bicyclist rights and safe motoring behavior around bicyclists. Provide appropriate materials to pedestrians, motorists and cyclists convicted of specified violations

Action 7.7: Safe Routes to Schools

Establish Safe Routes to School Programs in collaboration with Tacoma schools. Apply for Safe Routes to School grants through the Washington State Department of Transportation.

Action 7.8: Proper and Safe Behavior

Educate bicyclists and pedestrians on proper and safe behavior for biking and walking via the City's website and other education programs.

Action 7.9: Awareness of Pedestrians with Disabilities

Improve the general public's awareness of the transportation needs and requirements of people with a variety of mobility and sensory disabilities via the City's website and other education programs.

8. Health and Safety

Promote active lifestyles by working with the Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department (TPCHD) to provide educational programs and safe and accessible routes for bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities.

Action 8.1: Partner with TPCHD

Collaborate with the Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department on active living and active transportation projects that address and seek to reduce health-related issues such as obesity.

Action 8.2: Reduce Crashes

Reduce crashes involving bicyclists, pedestrians, and motor vehicles by at least 10 percent by 2015.

Action 8.3: Address Conflicts

Use current engineering best practices for minimizing and mitigating conflicts between bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles.

Action 8.4: Barriers and Hazards

Reduce barriers and hazards to ~~nonmotorized~~ [active transportation](#) users by ensuring safe and sufficient crossings of major roadways and by providing routes that minimize steep slopes.

9. Engineering

Apply high-quality engineering and design to bicycle and pedestrian physical infrastructure.

Action 9.1: Signal Prioritization

Install signal prioritization for ~~nonmotorized~~ [active transportation](#) users in appropriate locations.

Action 9.2: Bicycle Detection at Intersections

Install bicycle detection mechanisms at signalized intersections.

Action 9.3: Traffic Calming

Install traffic calming facilities where appropriate for improved [safety and nonmotorized active transportation](#) travel.

Action 9.4: Separated Bicycle Facilities

Install separated bicycle facilities where bike lane striping does not provide appropriate riding conditions.

Action 9.5: Design Guidelines

Adopt and adhere to facility standards which support the Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Guidelines as presented in the *2010 Mobility Master Study*, *2008 ADA Transition Plan*, and *Complete Streets Design Guidelines*.

10. Enforcement

Enhance safety for all road users through increased traffic enforcement on city streets, walkways and bikeways.

Action 10.1: Traffic Law Enforcement

Enforce traffic laws consistently for all users through collaboration with the Tacoma Police Department.

Action 10.2: Traffic Skills Course

Collaborate with law enforcement and the court system on the development of a traffic skills education course aimed to reduce aggressive and/or negligent behavior among drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians by providing the option of taking a traffic skills education course in lieu of fines for traffic violations.

Action 10.3: Obstruction Prevention

Prevent the obstruction of dedicated bikeways and walkways.

Action 10.4: Violation Reporting

Develop and promote efficient mechanisms for reporting behaviors and conditions that endanger cyclists and pedestrians to law enforcement.

11. Evaluation

Establish benchmarks measurements and monitor the effectiveness of the Mobility Master Plan on an annual basis.

Action 11.1: Bicycle Tracking

Track citywide trends in bicycle usage through the use of Census data, annual user surveys, annual bicycle counts, and PierceTrips.com.

Action 11.2: Bicycle Collision Data

Monitor bicycle collision data with the goal of reducing bicycle-related collisions.

Action 11.3: Pedestrian/Bicycle Report Card

Produce a regular report card tracking pedestrian and bicycle trends in Tacoma including percent of the system that has been completed, funds invested, identification of ongoing problems, public feelings of safety, status of reaching Health and Safety goals, and educational outreach efforts.

Action 11.4: Track Implementation

Track citywide implementation of improved and increased walkway and bikeway facilities, ADA accessible features, and amenities with supervision of the Implementation Committee.

Action 11.5: Collaboration

Collaborate with state, regional and federal partners to reform system performance measures and mobility standards in order to reflect the movement of persons rather than vehicles and to favor green transportation.

12. Funding

Pursue a dedicated source of funding to implement the expansion and enhancement of walkways and bikeways in Tacoma. Supplement dedicated funds with other funding sources. A comprehensive list of funding opportunities can be found in the *2010 Mobility Master Study*.

Action 12.1: Prioritize Funding

Prioritize funding and construction of ~~nonmotorized~~ [active transportation](#) facilities in recognition of the livability, environmental and health benefits these forms of mobility provide.

Action 12.2: Grant Funding

Pursue state, regional and federal grant funding for shared-use paths and other ~~nonmotorized~~ [active transportation](#) facilities.

Action 12.3: Multiple Strategies

Work with the Implementation Committee, advocates and elected officials to identify and pursue multiple strategies to increase funding for green transportation.

Action 12.4: Dedicated Portion of Transportation Budget

Dedicate a percentage of the City's overall transportation budget to ~~nonmotorized~~-active transportation projects.

Action 12.5: Simultaneous Improvements

Leverage investments made in road improvement projects by installing improved bicycle and pedestrian projects simultaneously regardless of the priority previously placed upon the bike or pedestrian facilities.

Action 12.6: New Dedicated Source of Funding

Pursue establishment of a new dedicated source of funding for Mobility Master Plan improvements, such as a portion of an additional locally determined vehicle tab tax, impact fees, street utility tax, and levy lid lift.



Cyclists cruising down 9th Street

Section III – General Plan Implementation

System Inventory

Street and Highway System

Tacoma is served by two interstate freeways, i.e., I-5 and I-705, and several state highways, including SR-16, SR-7, SR-167, SR-163, and SR-509. Key north-south arterials include S. Tacoma Way, Pacific Avenue, Portland Avenue, McKinley Avenue, Jackson Avenue, Pearl Street, Orchard Street, Stevens Street, Proctor Street, Union Avenue, Sprague Avenue, Port of Tacoma Road, and Schuster Parkway. Key east-west arterials include 6th Avenue and N. 30th, N. 26th, N. 21st, S. 12th, S. 19th, S. 38th, S. 56th and S. 74th/E. 72nd Streets. A 2001 inventory indicates that Tacoma has approximately 282 lane-miles of principal arterials, 209 of minor arterials, 164 of collector arterials, and 582 of residential streets, with a total of approximately 1,237 lane-miles. See Transportation Figure 1.

Nonmotorized Active Transportation Facilities

Implementation strategies for ~~nonmotorized~~ active transportation facilities are included in Section II – Mobility Master Plan. All the references to ~~nonmotorized~~ active transportation in this Section remain valid and complement those in Section II.

Municipal Parking Facilities

The 2004 inventory of the downtown municipally owned parking facilities consists of 3310 stalls and represents an increase of 840 stalls or 34% from the year 2001. The following table depicts the facilities of the municipal parking enterprise.

Facilities	Stalls
Tacoma ('A' St.) Parking Garage	954
Convention Center	566
Park Plaza North	492
Park Plaza South	381
I-705 Parking Lots (3)	321
Museum of Glass Broadway Parking Lot	180
Municipal Building Parking Lot/Garage	136
Bicentennial Pavilion	120
Union Station Parking Lot	86
Carlton Bldg Lot/Garage	74
Total	3,310

* * *

~~Travel~~ Transportation Demand Forecasting and Traffic Impact Analysis

The concurrency assessment mentioned above is part of the on-going ~~travel~~ transportation demand forecasting process that incorporates the following elements:

- Trip Generation, which estimates the trips produced by and attracted to each transportation analysis zone (TAZ);

- Trip Distribution, which links the trip ends from trip generation to form matrices of zone-to-zone travel demand;
- Traffic Assignment, which determines zone-to-zone travel routes over the transportation network and accumulates the zone-to-zone travel demand (by mode) using each network segment; and
- Mode Split, which estimates how much of the total zone-to-zone travel demand uses each mode of travel available.

The forecasting is conducted using the EMME/2 model, in cooperation and coordination with the models used by Pierce County and the Puget Sound Regional Council. In addition to ~~travel~~[transportation](#) demand forecasting, EMME/2 is also used in traffic impact analyses for specific projects or development proposals, in order to determine the need for mitigation and maintain the concurrency requirements.

* * *

Regional Coordination

The City will continue to coordinate with other regional entities to address transportation issues, which do not respect jurisdictional boundaries. Listed below is an example of transportation related agencies, coalitions and projects that Tacoma is actively and dutifully involved in:

- Washington State Department of Transportation
- Puget Sound Regional Council – on VISION 2040 (Regional Growth Strategy) and Destination 2040 (Regional Transportation Plan)
- Sound Transit – on the continued development of the commuter rail system, a part of the Phase I projects, as well as the implementation of the voter-approved Phase II projects
- Pierce Transit – on the continued transit system improvement in Tacoma
- Pierce County – on ~~travel~~[transportation](#) demand forecasting and modeling, commute trip reduction and other county-wide transportation issues
- Port of Tacoma – on Tideflats transportation improvements
- FAST – Freight Action Strategy along the Tacoma-Seattle-Everett Corridor
- RAMP – Regional Access Mobility Project Coalition of Pierce County

* * *

Project Selection and Evaluation Criteria

The Community and Economic Development Department (CED) and Public Works Department (PW) jointly developed an evaluation/prioritization process to provide a method of prioritizing projects in such a way as to:

- Make it easier for the City to compete for grants that bring tax dollar back to the community.
- Ensure that the transportation policies are carried out and that development regulations of the Comprehensive Plan and GMA concurrency requirements are met.

- Ensure that the public are aware of and involved in the planning, identification and prioritization of transportation projects.
- Provide ~~equitable~~ consideration to all modes of travel in the short and long range planning, programming and implementation of transportation projects.
- Program, at a higher priority, capital and transportation facilities improvements that will alleviate and mitigate impacts on the environment and reduce energy consumption, such as those projects in the City’s designated mixed-use centers, which will allow for higher intensity, more efficient land development.
- [Use environmental justice principles to evaluate whether a project may have a disproportionate adverse human health and environmental impact on traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations \(e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged\). Alternatively, evaluate whether a project will provide a transportation opportunity or improved mobility for such neighborhoods or populations.](#)

The prioritization process will be used by CED and PW program managers to determine which projects should be included in the *Six-Year Comprehensive Transportation Program* for funding and implementation. Program managers will also use the project criteria score as a base when applying for project funding. [The following programs are dependent on the City’s ability to fund them. However,](#) projects could be implemented in the short-term without regard to the project score, if funding became available or other constraints have been minimized.

The following criteria allows for ~~equitable~~ comparison of each project within the program.

Project Selection and Evaluation Criteria and Rating System

1. Program: Arterial Streets – New Construction or Major Improvement

I. Safety

- **Accidents** - Answer “Yes”, if the roadway has greater than 10 accidents
- Per Million Vehicle Miles (score is weighted by total number of accidents). The accident data is compiled by the Public Works Dept and includes only those incidents investigated by an enforcement agency.

II. Average Daily Traffic

- **Traffic Volumes** - Answer “Yes”, if the current volumes are greater than 5,000 (ADT). The total prioritization score is weighted by total volume.

III. Encourage Alternatives to Driving Alone

- **High Pedestrian Route** - Answer “Yes”, if the location is with ¼ mile radius of transit centers, schools, libraries, high density retail, museums, major employment centers, within the CBD, elderly care facilities etc.
- **Bike Route** - Answer “Yes”, if the location is on a Bicycle Route as identified in the City’s *Comprehensive Plan*.
- **Enhancement to Pierce Transit** - Answer “Yes”, if the project location would assist Transit in access to the street system or mobility once within the street system.

- **HOV Lane** - Answer “Yes”, if the improvement provides new HOV lanes and/or accessibility to other HOV facilities.

IV. Enhance Freight Mobility

- **Port/Industrial Location** - Answer “Yes”, if the project location is within the Port Area or within another highly industrialized area of the City.

V. Environmental/Public Support/Environmental Justice

- Answer “Yes” if project creates no significant impact on environment.
- Answer “Yes” if project creates no significant relocation/ROW impacts.
- Answer “Yes”, if the location has been brought to the attention of the Public Works Department by a source outside (e.g., the City Council, Neighborhood Councils, neighborhood groups, business groups, and individual citizens) of City staff and/or has known other support (documentation via letters of support is encouraged).
- [Answer “Yes” if the project has been evaluated for possible disproportionate adverse human health and environmental impacts on traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations \(e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged\).](#)
- [Answer “Yes” if the project will provide a transportation opportunity or improved mobility for traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations \(e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged\).](#)

VI. Comprehensive Plan

- **Project located on a Corridor connecting Centers** - Answer “Yes”, if the project is located on a Corridor as identified in the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
- **Project located in a “Center”** - Answer “Yes”, if the project is located in a designated Center as identified in the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
- **Project included in the Comprehensive Plan** - Answer “Yes”, if the project is recommended in the City’s Comprehensive Plan and/or its adopted elements.

* * *

**9. Program:
Curb Ramp Construction**

I. Safety

- Answer “yes” if a written or telephone request has been received from a disabled person.
- Answer “yes” if a written request has been received from a disabled advocate group.
- Answer “yes” if other written public support of the proposed curb ramps have been received.

II. Accessibility/Transportation System Completeness

- Answer “yes” if one or more ramps already exist at the intersection.
- Answer “yes” if the intersection is on a designated arterial street.

III. Encourage Alternatives to Driving Alone

- Answer “yes” if the sidewalk is on a designated transit route.

IV. Environmental Justice

- Answer “Yes” if the project has been evaluated for possible disproportionate adverse human health and environmental impacts on traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations (e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged).
- Answer “Yes” if the project will provide a transportation opportunity or improved mobility for traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations (e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged).

IV. Comprehensive Plan

- Answer “Yes”, if the project is located in a designated Center as identified in the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
- Answer “Yes”, if the project is recommended in the City’s Comprehensive Plan and/or its adopted elements.

**10. Program:
Missing Link New Sidewalk Construction**

I. Safety

- Answer “yes” if the missing sidewalk is five or fewer blocks from a public school.
- Answer “yes” if the missing sidewalk is two or fewer blocks from a senior group housing building.
- Answer “yes” if the missing link sidewalk is on a public school bus route.
- Answer “yes” if written public support of the sidewalk construction has been received.

II. Accessibility/Transportation System Completeness

- Answer “yes” if on a designated city arterial street.

III. Encourage Alternatives to Driving Alone

- Answer “yes” if the sidewalk is known to be a high pedestrian use sidewalk (e.g., Ruston Way, CBD, vicinity of Dome, etc.).
- Answer “yes” if the sidewalk is on a designated bicycle route.
- Answer “yes” if the sidewalk is on a designated transit route.

IV. Environmental Justice

- Answer “Yes” if the project has been evaluated for possible disproportionate adverse human health and environmental impacts on traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations (e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged).
- Answer “Yes” if the project will provide a transportation opportunity or improved mobility for traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations (e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged).

IV. Comprehensive Plan

- Answer “Yes”, if the project is located in a designated Center as identified in the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
- Answer “Yes”, if the project is recommended in the City’s Comprehensive Plan and/or its adopted elements.

11. Program:

Nonmotorized Active Transportation Facilities – Bikeways

- Use the following table to prioritize bikeway projects. See the “Implementation” section of the Mobility Master Plan and its associated Tables for guidance on project evaluation and prioritization for bikeway facilities.

I. Environmental Justice

- Answer “Yes” if the project has been evaluated for possible disproportionate adverse human health and environmental impacts on traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations (e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged).
- Answer “Yes” if the project will provide a transportation opportunity or improved mobility for traditionally underserved neighborhoods or vulnerable populations (e.g. minorities, seniors, youth, low-income, those with limited English proficiency, and/or the physically challenged).

Criteria to Prioritize Classes 1, 2, 3 or 4 Bikeway Projects	Maximum Points (Partial Credit for Minor Compliance)	Maximum Points per Category
<p><u>Category I – Network</u></p> <p><u>Is regional, i.e., lying on a corridor which is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an existing or potential designated route or • a regional route or connected to other jurisdiction’s bike corridor <p><u>Is important to Tacoma by connecting to or very close to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employment area or center or transit center (+2) • major destination, large park • middle or high school, elementary school (+0.5 each) • counts for Class 4 projects [Parks – Titlow, Marine, Pt. Defiance, Wapato, Swan Creek] <p><u>Lacks alternative accommodation</u> (+0.5 for each ½ mile to alternate)</p> <p><u>Additions to existing network:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • joins two completed similar segments (+1) • extends or joins a complete, similar segment (+0.5) • crosses a major barrier (e.g., freeway, gulch, railroad) (+3) 	<p>+5</p> <p>+4</p> <p>+4</p> <p>+3</p>	<p>16</p>
<p><u>Category II – Safety</u></p>		<p>16</p>

Arterial Street Projects – New Construction	
6 th Avenue at Sprague and Division	Roundabout
E. 48 th St. from Pacific to McKinley	Roadway Improvement
E. 56 th St. from McKinley Ave. to 'A' St.	Roadway Improvement
E. Fairbanks St. from E. McKinley to Roosevelt Ave.	Roadway Improvement
N. 26 th Street from Huson St. to Pearl St.	Roadway Improvement
N. 37th Street from Shirley to Orchard **in 6 YR Program**	New link
38 th Street NE. from BPB to 33 rd Street N.E.	Roadway Improvement
Norpoint Way at Browns Pt. Blvd.	Intersection Improvement
Norpoint Way from Marine View Dr. to NE 29th St. **Duplicate**	Arterial Improvement
Northshore Pkwy. From Norpoint to 49 th Ave. NE	Roadway Improvement
N. Orchard from 6 th Ave. to N. 46 th St.	Roadway Improvement
N. Union St. from N. 18 th to N. 30 th	Roadway Improvement
Pacific Ave from 72 nd to South City limits	Arterial Boulevard Treatment
Pine Street near Tacoma Mall	Arterial Improvement
Point Defiance Entrance Redesign and Beautification Project (Pearl at Pt. Defiance Park entrance and N. 51st from Vassault to Pearl Street) **in 6 YR Program**	Possible roundabout and arterial rechannelization, lighting, signage, nonmotorized accommodation and medians
Roosevelt Ave. from Wright Ave. to E. 44 th St.	Roadway Improvement
S. 19 th Street from Jackson to Seashore	Roadway Improvement
S. 19 th St. to S. 21 st St. from Jefferson to Tacoma Ave.	Roadway Transition
S. 31 st from Orchard to Mullen	New Arterial
S. 35 th to S. 36 th St. between Pine to Sprague	Roadway Transition
S. 47 th /48 th St. from S. Tacoma Way to Tyler	New Link
S. 48 th /49 th St. from Tyler to Orchard	New Link – Roadway Improvement
S. 66 th Street from Oakes to Puget Sound	Roadway Improvement
S. 66 th Street from Tacoma Mall Blvd. to Oakes St.	New Link
S. Alaska from S. 56th to S. 72nd St. **in 6 YR Program**	Roadway Improvement
*SR-167 w/ full Interchange at I-5	Limited Access Roadway from Port of Tacoma to Puyallup
Tacoma Ave. from 4 th to S. 25 th	Tacoma Avenue Beautification – Design & rebuild Tacoma Ave between Division Ave and Center St to include landscaping, streetscape, pedestrian crossings (S 4 th , 8 th , 10 th) and light rail accommodations.
East-West Corridor (from S. 38 th at S. Tacoma Way to 40 th St. W. at Orchard)	New Arterial
Norpoint Way between Marine View Dr. & 29 th St. NE	Arterial Improvement
E. 34 th between E. Portland & Roosevelt	Arterial Improvement
Mildred between S. 12 th & 19 th	Arterial Improvement
S. 12 th between Cedar & Stevens	Arterial Improvement
Thompson between S. 35th & S. 45th **Duplicate**	Arterial Improvement
E. Roosevelt between E. 34 th & George	Arterial Improvement
East Fairbanks between Portland & Roosevelt	Reconstruct to eliminate potholes and to restabilize roadway
South Thompson between South 37th <u>35th</u> and 46 th Street	Reconstruct to eliminate potholes and to restabilize roadway

South 74 th Street between South Tacoma Way and West City Limits	Reconstruct to eliminate potholes and to restabilize roadway
North Alder between North 15 th & 19 th Streets	Reconstruct to eliminate potholes and to restabilize roadway
Pacific Avenue (between South 43rd and South 56th Streets)	Roadway Improvement- Complete Street elements, specifically pedestrian amenities
Non-Arterial Street Projects	
E. 37 th between Portland & Roosevelt	Roadway Improvement
Wright Ave. east of Portland Ave.	Roadway Improvement
Traffic Signals – New Construction	
E. 84th & McKinley	New Signal
E. 96th & McKinley	New Signal
Norpoint Way at 45th Ave. NE	New Signal
Northshore Pkwy at 45th Ave. NE	New Signal
Northshore Pkwy at Browns Pt. Blvd.	New Signal
Northshore Pkwy at Norpoint Way	New Signal
Rehabilitation Projects – Sidewalk and Curb Ramps (Neighborhood Planning Projects) (To be determined)	
Rehabilitation Projects – Bridge Repairs and Maintenance	
Union Ave. from So Tacoma Way to So 35th St.	Redeck
Traffic Safety Projects – UNFUNDED	
Traffic Enhancements – Guardrail/Barricade/Fence (Locations to be determined)	
RXR Surface Improvements, Railroad Signalization/Control	
S. 56 th and Washington Street	Vertical separation of RXR and Roadway
S. 74 th and S. Tacoma Way	Vertical separation of RXR and Roadway
Pine Street and South Tacoma Way	Vertical separation of RXR and Roadway
Midblock Pedestrian Signals (Locations to be determined)	
N. 26 th in proximity to North and South Westgate Plaza's	Pedestrian Crossing
Pearl Street between N. 21 st and N. 26 th	Pedestrian Crossing
Miscellaneous Projects	
E. 11th and Dock St. **in 6 YR Program**	Pedestrian Access Project
*I-5 @ River Road (SR-167) **WSDOT Project**	Reconfigure Interchange
*Southbound I-5 at 38th Street—direct access to Tacoma Mall Blvd. **in 6 YR Program**	Improved Ramp Access

Hill Climb Access from Fireman’s Park to Dock St.	Nonmotorized <u>Active transportation</u> access		
Water Trails (per the OSHRP, these are conceptual recreational boating routes and associated docking facilities and they connect Tacoma’s waterfront from the Foss Waterway around Pt. Defiance to the Titlow Marina.)	Nonmotorized Recreational <u>recreational</u> boating route and docking facilities		
Bike Facilities and Trails (1140 Fund) – New — SUP = Shared Use Path			
Location	Limits		Type
Union Ave. **in MoMaP – Tables 3 and 10**	S. 19th St. Center	SR-16 S 19th St	SUP
Puyallup R. Levee Trail **Requested by community but challenges with inter-agency coordination/support (e.g., BNSF, Puyallup Tribe, Army Corps)**	E. 11th St.	City Boundary	SUP
Pipeline Trail **in 6 YR Program**	McKinley St.	City Boundary	SUP
West Slope Trail (per 1989 Shoreline Trails Plan and OSHRP) **moved to MoMaP – Table 11**	Point Defiance Park	City limits at S. 19th St.	SUP
Waterfront Connection Trail (with connection to CBD) **moved to MoMaP Table 11**	Dock St./ Thea Foss	Ruston Way/ Asarco/ Point Defiance	SUP
Water Ditch Trail Extension (connect existing and funded trail east to Chambers Creek) **moved to MoMaP Table 11**	Oak Tree Park	City Boundary, extending to Chambers Creek (City of University Place)	SUP
Tacoma Dome To Sumner Trail **moved to MoMaP – Table 11**	Tacoma Dome area	Eastern City Limits extending into Pierce County	SUP
Trail to the Mountain (follows rail corridor south beyond the City limits ultimately connecting to Mt Rainier) **moved to MoMaP – Table 11**	Tacoma Dome area	City Boundary at E McKinley & 72nd St, continues south along rail line	SUP
Center for Urban Waters E. D St **moved to MoMaP – Table 9**	Murray Morgan Bridge	E 3rd St	SUP
Prairie Line Trail (former BNSF Rail Corridor) **in 6 YR Program**	Dock Street	South 27th Street	SUP
Tacoma Dome to Point Defiance Trail (completion and enhancement of non-motorized route) **moved to MoMaP – Table 11**	Tacoma Dome area	Point Defiance Park	SUP
Bayside Trails (trail system providing recreational access to the Schuster Slope and a connection from downtown to the Schuster Parkway) **moved to LIPT Table 5**	Garfield Gulch	Stadium Way	Ped Path
Garfield Gulch Trail/Public Access (provides pedestrian access to the gulch and from residential area at the top of the slope to the Schuster Parkway) **moved to LIPT Table 5**	Tennis Court/ Borough Rd	Schuster Parkway	Ped Trail

Buckley Gulch Public Access (provides visual and/or pedestrian access to portions of the gulch) **moved to LIPT Table 5**	N. 29th Street	N. 16th Street	Ped Trail
Puget Gulch Trail/Public Access (provides pedestrian access to the gulch and from residential areas and Puget Park to Ruston Way) **moved to LIPT Table 5**	N. Monroe Street	Ruston Way	Ped Trail
Mason Gulch Public Access (trail or viewpoints providing visual and/or pedestrian access to portions of the gulch) **moved to LIPT Table 5**	N. 37th Street	Waterview Street	Ped Trail
Swan Creek Trail System (public access to/within this open space corridor—the City will strive to coordinate/leverage resources with Metro Parks Tacoma) **moved to LIPT Table 5**	River Road	E. 64th Street	Ped Trail
Point Defiance Trail System (public access to/within the park—the City will strive to coordinate/leverage resources with Metro Parks Tacoma) **moved to LIPT Table 5**	Within/connecting to Pt Defiance Park		Ped Trail
Northeast Tacoma Trail Network (slope top of Marine View Dr. Includes an extension from Browns Pt. Blvd. to Northshore Parkway and a connector between Crescent Heights and Alderwood Parks.) **moved to LIPT Table 5**	Slayden Rd.	Norpoint Way	SUP
President's Ridge Trail (along the south side of I-5) **Located in MoMaP – Table 11**	S. 38th St. interchange	McKinley Park	SUP
E. N St. **moved to LIPT Table 5**	E. 35th St	E. 29th St	Ped Trail
E. 34th St. steps **moved to LIPT Table 5**	West of Portland Ave.		Ped Trail
<u><i>Shared-Use Paths Requested of WSDOT Projects requiring Bike and Pedestrian Facilities</i></u>			
*S.R. 509 (East West Rd.)	Marine View Dr.	Pacific Ave.	<u>SUP Lane</u>
*Cedar St. Underpass	SR-16		Lane
*D. St. Overpass	I-5		Lane
*S. 48th St. Overpass	I-5		Lane
*S. 56th St. Overpass	I-5		Lane
*S. 72/74th St. Overpass	I-5		Lane
*S. 84th St. Overpass	I-5		Lane
*Sprague Overpass	SR-16		Lane
Notes: * Indicates projects would be built with primarily non-city funding sources, which are also unfunded until further confirmation. ** Indicates project has received at least partial funding and is also included in the Six-Year Transportation Program.			

The list includes projects that have been identified by other jurisdictions (e.g., WSDOT, Pierce County, the Port of Tacoma, and the Puyallup Tribe of Indians) and will be developed jointly with the City. Inclusion within the Unfunded Project List is a necessary step for competitive funding. Those Tacoma projects that truly reflect the desire of the community but are not part of the Washington Transportation Plan are intended to assist the State in determining future listing and funding of such projects, as appropriate.

The following is a list of projects compiled from the Neighborhood Action Strategies or based on the recommendations of the various Neighborhood Councils.

Transportation Projects from Neighborhood Action Strategies	
Location	Improvement Type
64 th Ave NE between 26 th St NE and 28 th St NE; 65 th Ave NE between 19 th St NE and 24 th St NE; 19 th St NE between 65 th Ave NE and city limits east	Northwood Arterial Improvements – Provide sidewalks and curbing along main thoroughfares within city limits, 24 th St NE, 65 th Ave NE, and 19 th St NE
29th Street NE from 53rd Avenue NE to Norpoint Way	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Storm Drainage, Asphalt Paving
33rd Street NE/Browns Point Blvd from 49th Avenue NE to 45th Avenue NE	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Storm Drainage, Asphalt Paving
51st St. NE from Browns Point Blvd to Harborview Dr.	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Storm Drainage, Asphalt Paving
53rd Avenue NE from 29th St NE to 33rd St NE	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Storm Drainage, Asphalt Paving
6th Ave (Huson to Jackson)	Streetscape improvements and construct bike lanes
6 th Ave from Jackson to Orchard	6 th Ave Traffic Calming – Install landscape medians on 6 th Ave between Jackson and Orchard
Baltimore (N 46th to Orchard)	Streetscape improvements and construct bike lanes
Browns Point Blvd from 45th Avenue NE to 42nd Avenue NE	Complete Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Asphalt Paving on the south side
Browns Point Blvd from 51st St. NE/Northshore Pkwy to Parkview Dr.	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Storm Drainage, Asphalt Paving
Browns Point Blvd from Parkview Dr. to Norpoint Way	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Asphalt Paving on the west side
Browns Pt. Blvd. from 33rd to Norpoint Way NE **Duplicate**	Roadway improvements (street, sidewalk, barrier removal)
McKinley Ave. from S. 72nd to S. 96th Streets **Done**	Arterial improvement
Mildred (S 19th to SR 16)	Streetscape improvements and construct bike lanes
Mildred/N 51st (Pearl to Point Defiance Park)	Stripe bike lanes
N 14th (Orchard to Pearl)	Stripe bike Lanes
N 21st (Huson to Pearl)	Complete street construction, include streetscape improvements and construct bike lanes
N 21st (Proctor to Pearl)	Complete sidewalk network
N 26th (Vassault to Huson)	Stripe bike lanes

Transportation Element – City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan

N 30th (Pearl to Huson)	Stripe bike lanes
N 45th (Vassault to Huson)	Stripe bike Lanes
N. 36th & Alder Way	Design and construct a walkway on one side of North 36th Street and Alder Way to achieve improved pedestrian access to the waterfront.
N. 51st & Vassault	Evaluate need for Caution Light or other mechanism at the intersection
Nalley Valley Area/ S. 48th St Extension	Improve access west to Orchard St.
Nalley Valley Area/ Union Ave. access	Improve/add access to industrial area
Norpoint Way NE from 29 th St NE to Marine View Drive	Complete Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights: 1 lane southbound, 2 lanes northbound, turn lane at Point Woodworth, sidewalks one side only **this portion completed**
Norpoint Way NE from approx. 200' west of Nahane West to Nahane East	Complete Curb and Gutter and asphalt paving
Norpoint Way NE from Browns Point Blvd to Agnes Road	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Asphalt Paving on the north side
Northshore Pkwy from East City Limits to Nassau Avenue	Complete Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Asphalt Paving on the north side
Northshore Pkwy from Norpoint Way NE to Ridge Drive	Complete Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Asphalt Paving on the north side
Old Town District **Duplicate**	Pedestrian waterfront access over rail lines
Orchard (Huson to N. 46th)	Streetscape improvements and construct bike lanes
Orchard (N 46th to N 35th)	Streetscape improvements, widen roadway and construct bike lanes
Pearl St (S 19th to Pt Defiance)	Complete sidewalk & bike lanes
S 12th (Huson-Jackson) Streetscape Improvements Extension recommended through Central NC Area with possible removal of planter strips	Streetscape improvements and construct bike lanes
S 12th St (Orchard to Jackson)	Complete streetscape improvements and construct bike lanes
S 19th (SR 16 to Jackson) Recommend extension into Central Neighborhood NC	Complete streetscape improvements and construct bike lanes
S 54th St @ I-5 off-ramp (proposed)	Design and construct barrier for local access only traffic
S. 96th from Pacific to McKinley Ave.	Provide arterial improvement
Tacoma Ave & N 6th St	Feasibility of a roundabout
Thompson from S. 34th to S. 37th	Slow traffic on Thompson St.
Walters Rd (S 19th to 6th)	Install sidewalk, curb and gutter
E. M Street between Harrison and E. 34 th Streets	Asphalt Paving
E. 34 th St. from E. M St. to McKinley Ave.	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Storm Drainage
Division Lane from approximately the 600 block to the 400 block	Install a landscape median allowing for angle parking
E. N St. from Morton to E. 35 th St.	Curb and Gutter, Sidewalks, Streetlights, Storm Drainage
Fairbanks St. from E. L St. to Grandview Ave.	Roadway Rehabilitation
E. T St. from E. 32 nd to E. 38 th St.	Roadway Rehabilitation

South 19 th from Jefferson to Market	UWT Hillclimb – Design & build extension of UW Tacoma hill climb (S 19 th) from Jefferson to Market to include stairs, ADA ramps, decorative paving, landscaping, streetscape, art, and lighting.
Yakima from Center to S 34 th and Tacoma from Center to S 34 th	Lincoln Park Freeway Lid – Design & construct a landscaped lid over I-5 between Yakima/Thompson and Tacoma/G Streets to reconnect downtown with neighborhood.
S 23 rd & Pacific Ave	S 23 rd & Pacific Crossing – Design & build signalized crossing at S 23 rd & Pacific Ave, which includes decorative pavement
Browns Pt Blvd from 38 th Ave NE to Norpoint Way NE (to the north-west)	Browns Pt Blvd Improvement Project Phase II – Roadway improvements between 38 th Ave NE and Norpoint way NE to include sidewalks.
Browns Point Blvd from 33 rd St NE at the west near 43 rd Ave NE and 33 rd St NE at the east near Meeker Ave	Browns Pt Blvd Improvement Project Phase III – Roadway improvements between 33 rd St NE at the west near 43 rd Ave NE and 33 rd St NE at the east near Meeker Ave to include sidewalks and access to Alderwood Park & Kobetich Library
Northshore Parkway from Nassau to Norpoint Way	Northshore Parkway Improvements – Provide uphill (eastbound) passing lane, bike lanes, sidewalks on north side, landscaping between Nassau and Norpoint Way, and evaluate signal at 45 th Ave NE and/or 42 nd Ave NE
Northshore Parkway	Dash Point State Park Access – Provide parking along Northshore Parkway and a path between parking & trail system in Dash Point
Marine View Drive from 1902 Marine View Drive to Norpoint Way	Marine View Drive Improvements – Extend two-way left turn lane to driveway of 1902 Marine View Drive, which includes widening roadway
St Helens and 6 th Avenue and Baker	St Helens Gateway Renovation Project – Improve the intersection of St Helens, 6 th Ave, and Baker St to include a rain garden, art, landscaping, converting Baker to one-way, and pedestrian crosswalk treatments consistent with the Broadway LID.
S 66 th & South Tacoma Way	S 66 th & South Tacoma Way Roundabout – Install a new roundabout for better cross traffic
Manitou from Tyler to Gunnison	Manitou Rehabilitation – Repave Manitou between Tyler and Gunnison to eliminate ruts and cracks. Neighborhood does not want a slurry seal.

S 58 th & Puget Sound Avenue	S 58 th & Puget Sound Intersection Traffic Calming – Install traffic calming devices and/or realign Puget Sound to provide better sight distance
Jackson between S 19 th and SR 16	Jackson Ave Traffic Calming – Install traffic calming devices on Jackson between S 19 th and SR 16
Browns Point Blvd from 33 rd St NE to intersection with Norpoint Way near 21 st Ave NE	Complete sidewalks along at least one side of Browns Point Blvd from 33 rd Street NE to intersection with Norpoint Way near 21 st Ave NE with priorities between Crescent Heights to Norpoint Way, Norpoint Way to 51 st St NE, Howard's Corner to McMurray Rd, and 51 st St NE to the north end of Norpoint Way NE.
SR509 and Slayden Road	Install traffic control devices on all legs of the intersection to improve access and intersection movements.
McMurray Road from Marine View Drive to Browns Point Blvd	Install streetlights and sidewalk on at least one side
45 th Street NE from Nassau Ave NE to Norpoint Way	Install pedestrian protected crosswalk
Jackson Ave from S 19 th St to SR 16	Install traffic calming devices
N 23 rd St and Shirley St	Install a roundabout or traffic calming devices near the intersection for pedestrians crossing to Kandle Park
South Tacoma Gateways	South Tacoma Gateways – Install streetscape improvements at all arterial entryways to the South Tacoma Neighborhood Council area
S 60 th from Oakes to Pine Street	Install sidewalk
Washington Street from S 54 th to S 58 th Street	Improve existing sidewalk and add separation between on-street parking
South Tacoma Sound Transit Station	Complete sidewalks along S 58 th and S 60 th to connect to South Tacoma Way
S 68 th St between S Mullen and S Gove St	Install sidewalks on the north side
S 60 th at Lawrence, Montgomery, and Alder St	Install ADA ramps at each intersection.
McKinley Hill to downtown Tacoma	Complete sidewalks
Residential areas located just north of the intersections of East 38 th and Howe and East 38 th and K Streets	Install streetlights and pedestrian improvements, such as crosswalks
E 54 th St from Pacific Ave to Bell St	Street improvements
Railroad Crossings at E 48 th and E 52 nd	Improve roadway over railroad tracks
Pedestrian overpass between Old Town Business District and Ruston Way	Grade separated pedestrian link over the rail lines
N 29 th Crossing between White and Carr St	Install pedestrian crossing/connection between Ursich Park and Old Town Park
North 9 th and North 11 th St	Rehabilitate cobblestone streets
N Steele and M St	Install historic style streetlights

Sprague Ave from SR 16 to S 19th St **Done**	Install streetscape improvements at entryway
6 th Avenue from Sprague to Alder St	Complete sidewalk network and provide crosswalks, lighting, landscaping and bulbouts
Union Ave between SR 16 and S 23rd St **Done**	Complete sidewalk network and provide crosswalk between shopping center and Senior Center
S 15 th , S 19 th , Prospect, and Trafton St	Provide street improvements to unimproved streets in this area.



City of Tacoma
Community & Economic Development Department

Agenda Item
GB-3

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Lihuang Wung, Comprehensive Planning Division

SUBJECT: Annual Amendment Application #2013-07 Adoption and Amendment Procedures

DATE: September 12, 2012

At the September 19th meeting, the Planning Commission will review the proposed amendments to the *Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.02 Planning Commission*. The proposed amendments are primarily intended to streamline the adoption and amendment procedures for the Comprehensive Plan, area-wide rezones, moratoria, and interim zoning.

Attached is a draft staff report describing the proposed amendments, with “Exhibit A” detailing the amendments in tracked changes format. Staff intends to seek the Commission’s authorization of the staff report for distribution for public review (along with other proposed amendments included in the 2013 Annual Amendment Package). The public review will occur in February-March 2013, prior to the public hearing, which is tentatively scheduled for March 20, 2013.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (253) 591-5682 or lwung@cityoftacoma.org.

c: Peter Huffman, Assistant Director

Attachments (2)



2013 Annual Amendment Application No. 2013-07
Adoption and Amendment Procedures

STAFF REPORT
(For Planning Commission's Review on September 19, 2012)

Application #:	2013-07
Applicant:	Community & Economic Development Department
Contact:	Lihuang Wung, Comprehensive Planning Division
Type of Amendment:	Regulatory Code Text Changes
Current Land Use Intensity:	Not Applicable
Current Area Zoning:	Not Applicable
Size of Area:	Not Applicable
Location:	City-wide
Neighborhood Council area:	City-wide
Proposed Amendment:	Amending TMC 13.02 to enhance the reporting and working relationships between the Planning Commission and the City Council, and to streamline and clarify the adoption and amendment procedures for the Comprehensive Plan, area-wide rezones, moratoria, and interim zoning.

General Description of the Proposed Amendment:

The proposed amendments to the *Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) Chapter 13.02 Planning Commission* are intended to (1) enhance the reporting and working relationships between the Planning Commission and the City Council; (2) streamline and clarify the adoption and amendment procedures for the Comprehensive Plan, area-wide zoning reclassifications, moratoria, and interim zoning; (3) incorporate recent amendments to the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A) that are relevant and applicable; and (4) improve, reorganize and streamline the text where appropriate.

A summary of the proposed amendments to various sections of TMC 13.02 is as follows (see Exhibit A for details):

13.02.040 Duties and responsibilities:

- Add to the duty of “annual report to the City Council” a provision that the Planning Commission will develop the work program in consultation with the City Council.
- Delete the provision of “report to the State Department of Commerce every five years”, because this requirement of RCW 36.70A.180 was eliminated by the Legislature in the 2012 session.
- Consolidate the provisions pertaining to “review and make recommendations on land use and development matters” and “initiate and review area-wide rezones, moratoria, and interim zoning”.
- Consolidate the provisions pertaining to “periodic planning studies” and “inventory, collection, mapping, research and analysis of data”.

- Add “transportation” and “parks and open space” to the provision pertaining to “pre-annexing planning” as additional subject areas for study.

13.02.043 Definitions

- Change “land use intensity” to “Comprehensive Plan land use designation”, as the current land use designation approach of “Land Use Intensities” is being changed to a more simplified and easily understood classification system. The same change of term is made throughout the document where applicable.

13.02.044 Comprehensive Plan

- Add an introductory statement concerning the Comprehensive Plan and that it must be consistent with applicable State and regional planning mandates.
- Condense the description of the Comprehensive Plan elements mandated by the GMA and make reference to the relevant legislation pertaining to each element.
- Add a provision regarding the “container port element”, which is a new mandatory element of the Comprehensive Plan pursuant to RCW 36.70A.085.
- Delete the provision pertaining to “coordinated and consistent with other entities”, which has been incorporated into the introductory statement.
- Remove the provision pertaining to “capital budget decisions”, which has been consolidated into the introductory statement.
- Delete the provision pertaining to “continuously review and evaluate the Comprehensive Plan”, which is a requirement of RCW 36.70A.130 that has been referenced in Section 13.02.045.

13.02.045 Adoption and amendment procedures

- “Adoption and amendment” – add a provision requiring adoption and amendment be consistent with procedural requirements of RCW 36.70A and applicable case law.
- “When amendments will be adopted” – (1) change the title of the subsection to “Timing for proposed amendments”; and (2) add a notion that the annual amendment cycle begins in July and ends by June of the following year.
- “Who may propose an amendment” – change the title of the subsection to “Applicants of proposed amendments.”
- “Amendment application” – (1) change the title of the subsection to “Application for proposed amendments”; and (2) consolidate the questions included in an application, reducing the number from 12 to 8.
- “Assessment procedure” and “Assessment criteria” – (1) consolidate the two subsections into “Assessment of proposed amendments”; (2) streamline and consolidate the assessment criteria, reducing the number from 7 to 3; and (3) add a provision requiring the Planning Commission to report its determinations on the amendment applications to the City Council, whereas the City Council may decline or alter the Commission’s determinations.
- “Amendment criteria” – (1) change the title of the subsection to “Analysis of proposed amendments”; (2) consolidate and streamline the ten amendment criteria into several criteria that address consistency with applicable statutory provisions, technical errors, changing circumstances, and/or land use compatibility; and (3) add a provision requiring the analysis to

address such additional aspects as public outreach, economic impacts, sustainability impacts, and environmental determination.

- “Review of proposed amendments” – (1) remove the criteria used by the Council to adopt the Commission’s recommendations; the criteria have been incorporated into the previous subsection on “Analysis of proposed amendments”; and (2) remove the provision concerning the Council public hearing, which has been addressed in the subsection on “Public hearing and action.”

13.02.055 Moratoria and interim zoning

- Streamline the process by eliminating the requirement for the Commission to be involved in the Council’s process for justifying the imposition of moratoria or interim zoning. Currently, within 30 days of the Council’s adoption of any moratoria or interim zoning, the Commission is required to formulate findings of fact and a recommendation, through a public hearing process, and forward the recommendation to the Council for its consideration for justifying the imposition.
- Added a procedural requirement for the Commission to forward to the Council those moratoria or interim zoning that are initiated by or petitioned to the Commission, along with a recommendation indicating the need for and duration of such moratoria or interim zoning and whether a permanent solution for what’s at issue can be expected.

Applicable Provisions of the Growth Management Act:

The proposed amendments to TCM 13.02 are consistent with the GMA (RCW 36.70A); for example:

- The proposed deletion of the provision of “report to the State Department of Commerce every five years” in Section 13.02.040 is consistent with RCW 36.70A.180;
- The proposed addition of an introductory statement in Section 13.02.044 concerning the Comprehensive Plan reflects the requirement of GMA;
- The proposed addition of a provision regarding the “container port element” in Section 13.02.44 reflects the new requirement of RCW 36.70A.085; and
- The proposed elimination of the requirement for the Commission to be involved in the Council’s process for justifying the imposition of moratoria or interim zoning, in Section 13.02.055, is consistent with RCW 36.70A.390, which states that “a city governing body shall hold a public hearing on the adopted moratorium [or] interim zoning ordinance at least sixty days of its adoption, whether or not the governing body received a recommendation on the matter from the planning commission

Amendment Criteria:

Applications for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code are subject to review based on the adoption and amendment procedures and the review criteria contained in TMC 13.02.045.G. Proposed amendments are required to be consistent with or achieve consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and meet at least one of the ten review criteria to be considered by the Planning Commission. The following section provides a review of each of these criteria with respect to the proposal. Each of the criteria is provided, followed by staff analysis of the criterion as it relates to this proposal.

1. There exists an obvious technical error in the pertinent Comprehensive Plan or regulatory code provisions.

Staff Analysis: Not applicable.

2. Circumstances related to the proposed amendment have significantly changed, or a lack of change in circumstances has occurred since the area or issue was last considered by the Planning Commission.

Staff Analysis: The proposed deletion of the provision of “report to the State Department of Commerce every five years” in Section 13.02.040 reflects the change in RCW 36.70A.180 enacted by the Legislature in 2012. The proposed addition of a provision regarding the “container port element” reflects the new requirement of RCW 36.70A.085.

3. The needs of the City have changed, which support an amendment.

Staff Analysis: With the current economic situation and the limited resources available, there is a greater need to streamline all applicable City processes for the conduct of business. The primary intent of the proposed amendments to TMC 13.02 is to consolidate and streamline the adoption and amendment procedures for the Comprehensive Plan, area-wide rezones, moratoria, and interim zoning. This intent is being achieved in many proposed amendments, such as the deletion of the provision of “report to the State Department of Commerce every five years” (Section 13.02.040); the consolidation of, respectively, the amendment application questionnaire, the assessment criteria, and the amendment criteria (Section 13.02.045); and the elimination of the requirement for the Planning Commission to be involved in the City Council’s process for justifying the imposition of moratoria or interim zoning (Section 13.02.055).

4. The amendment is compatible with existing or planned land uses and the surrounding development pattern.

5. Growth and development, as envisioned in the Plan, is occurring faster, slower, or is failing to materialize.

6. The capacity to provide adequate services is diminished or increased.

7. Plan objectives are not being met as specified, and/or the assumptions upon which the plan is based are found to be invalid.

8. Transportation and and/or other capital improvements are not being made as expected.

9. For proposed amendments to land use intensity or zoning classification, substantial similarities of conditions and characteristics can be demonstrated on abutting properties that warrant a change in land use intensity or zoning classification.

Staff Analysis: “Not applicable” for Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

10. A question of consistency exists between the Comprehensive Plan and its elements and RCW 36.70A, the County-wide Planning Policies for Pierce County, Multi-County Planning Policies, or development regulations.

Staff Analysis: There is no question of consistency involved in the proposed amendments to TMC 13.02. However, as indicated above, the proposed elimination of the requirement for the Commission to be involved in the Council’s process for justifying the imposition of moratoria or interim zoning would make TMC 13.02.055 more aligned with the provisions in RCW 36.70A.390.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends forwarding the proposed amendments to TMC 13.02 for public review and comment.

Exhibit:

- A. Proposed Amendments to TMC 13.02 (September 19, 2012 Draft)



Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.02

(Draft for the Planning Commission’s Review on September 19, 2012)

* * *

**Chapter 13.02
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Sections:

- 13.02.010 Creation – Appointment.
- 13.02.015 Establishment of advisory committees.
- 13.02.016 *Repealed.*
- 13.02.020 Meetings – Officers – Records.
- 13.02.030 Expenditures – Budget.
- 13.02.040 Duties and responsibilities.
- 13.02.041 Quorum.
- 13.02.043 Definitions.
- 13.02.044 Comprehensive Plan.
- 13.02.045 ~~Plan-a~~Adoption, ~~and~~ amendment, ~~and implementation~~ procedures.
- 13.02.050 *Repealed.*
- 13.02.053 ~~Wide-area~~Area-wide zoning reclassifications.
- 13.02.055 Moratoria and interim zoning.
- 13.02.057 Notice for public hearings.
- 13.02.060 *Repealed.*

13.02.010 Creation – Appointment.

Pursuant to the authority conferred by Article II, Section 11, of the Constitution of the State of Washington, and Section 3.8 of the Tacoma City Charter, there is hereby created a City Planning Commission consisting of nine members, who shall be residents of Tacoma. The members shall be appointed and confirmed by a majority of the City Council. One member shall be appointed by the City Council for each of the five council districts. The Council shall appoint to the four remaining positions an individual from each of the following: (a) the development community; (b) the environmental community; (c) public transportation; and (d) a designee with background of involvement in architecture, historic preservation, and/or urban design.

At the expiration of each respective three-year term, a successor shall be appointed by the City Council. Vacancies occurring otherwise than through the expiration of term shall be filled for the unexpired terms. Members may be removed by a majority of the Council, after public hearing, for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Upon an appointed member’s missing three unexcused, consecutive regular meetings, the Commission shall afford such member a hearing to determine whether the absences are to be excused. If the Commission determines not to excuse such absences, then the Commission shall determine the question of whether the Commission shall recommend to the City Council that such member should be deemed to have forfeited the office and a new member be appointed to fill the unexpired term. The members shall be selected without respect to political affiliations and they shall serve without compensation. (Ord. 26386 § 28; passed Mar. 23, 1999; Ord. 25318 § 1; passed Jun. 8, 1993; Ord. 24942 § 1; passed Jul. 2, 1991; Ord. 20266 § 1; passed Dec. 17, 1974; Ord. 20183 § 1; passed Aug. 13, 1974; Ord. 18877 § 1; passed Jul. 15, 1969; Ord. 14983 § 1; passed Mar. 1, 1954)

13.02.015 Establishment of advisory committees.

In order to carry out its duties and functions prescribed by this chapter, the Planning Commission may establish advisory committees as it deems appropriate. Advisory committees shall serve at the discretion of the Commission and their duties and scope of responsibilities shall be established by the Planning Commission. The members of such advisory committees shall be appointed and confirmed by a majority of the City Council, except that the Planning Commission, in such instances as it deems appropriate, may designate that the chairperson of an advisory committee

be a regular appointed member of the Planning Commission and shall be selected by a majority vote of the Commission. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize members of such advisory committees to be members of the Planning Commission. (Ord. 25318 § 2; passed Jun. 8, 1993; Ord. 20266 § 2; passed Dec. 17, 1974)

13.02.016 Definitions. *Repealed by Ord. 27172.*

(Ord. 27172 § 3; passed Dec. 16, 2003; Ord. 27079 § 8; passed Apr. 29, 2003; Ord. 25850 § 2; passed Mar. 12, 1996)

13.02.020 Meetings – Officers – Records.

The Commission shall elect its own chairperson and create and fill such other offices as it may determine it requires. All meetings of the Commission or its advisory committees shall be open to the public pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act of 1971. The Commission shall adopt rules for transaction of business. Records of all official Commission proceedings shall be kept by the City Clerk and shall be open to public inspection. The City Manager shall assign to the Commission and its advisory committees a place of meeting in which to meet and transact business. (Ord. 27813 Ex. A; passed Jun. 30, 2009; Ord. 24942 § 2; passed Jul. 2, 1991; Ord. 20266 § 3; passed Dec. 17, 1974; Ord. 14983 § 2; passed Mar. 1, 1954)

13.02.030 Expenditures – Budget.

The expenditures of the Commission shall be limited to appropriations made to the Community and Economic Development Department (“Department”) by the City Council for the planning function of the City. The services and facilities of the ~~Community and Economic Development~~ Department shall be utilized by the Commission in performing its duties. ~~The work program for the coming year will be prepared by the Community and Economic Development Department and submitted to the Commission for approval.~~ (Ord. 27813 Ex. A; passed Jun. 30, 2009; Ord. 27466 § 33; passed Jan. 17, 2006; Ord. 26386 § 29; passed Mar. 23, 1999; Ord. 24942 § 3; passed Jul. 2, 1991; Ord. 20266 § 4; passed Dec. 17, 1974; Ord. 14983 § 3; passed Mar. 1, 1954)

13.02.040 Duties and responsibilities.

The Planning Commission is hereby vested with the following duties and responsibilities:

A. To ~~prepare~~ develop and recommend to the City Council the Comprehensive Plan, pursuant to Revised Code of Washington Chapter 36.70A (the Growth Management Act), that is concerned with protecting the health, welfare, safety, and quality of life of City residents, ~~and to recommend such plan to the City Council. The Comprehensive Plan shall consist of plan elements consistent with the planning goals established by the State in RCW 36.70A, and shall contain descriptive text covering the objectives, principles, or standards used to develop the Plan, map(s), statements of goals, policies, and intents, and may include recommendations for the implementation thereof.~~

B. To review and ~~update~~ make recommendations on proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and its elements as necessary and appropriate, ~~if appropriate, recommend new goals and policies and propose amendments to the City Council.~~

C. To develop and prepare as necessary and appropriate, long- and short-range programs for implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

~~D. To conduct periodic planning studies of homogeneous community units, distinctive geographic areas, or other types of districts having unified interests within the total area of the City which will amplify and augment the Comprehensive Plan.~~

~~ED.~~ To formulate effective and efficient land use and development regulations and processes, as appropriate and necessary, that are consistent with and implement RCW 36.70A and the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan ~~and which provide for the implementation thereof.~~

~~FE.~~ To review and make recommendations on matters concerning land use and development, as necessary and appropriate, including area-wide zoning reclassifications, moratoria, and interim zoning.

~~G. To work with the Landmarks Preservation Commission, pursuant to TMC 13.07, to designate historic special review districts and conservation districts within the City, after public hearing, and to make recommendations to the City Council for establishment of such districts.~~

~~H. To ensure early and continuous public participation in the development, amendment, and implementation processes of the Comprehensive Plan, including all of its elements, and in the development of land use and development regulations and amendments thereto.~~

~~I.F. Through To~~ review ~~of~~ the capital facilities program, ~~to~~ ensure that the capital budgets and expenditures for public facilities and services are in conformity with the Comprehensive Plan.

~~I.G.~~ To review the six-year transportation program for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

~~H. To ensure early and continuous public participation in the development, amendment, and implementation processes of the Comprehensive Plan, including all of its elements, and in the development of land use and development regulations and amendments thereto.~~

~~K.I.~~ To ~~provide for the inventory, collection, mapping, research, and analysis of data describing~~ conduct periodic planning studies concerning land uses, demographics, infrastructure, critical areas, transportation corridors, housing, and other information useful in managing growth and augmenting the Comprehensive Plan, with an emphasis on doing this work through the use of land use and geographic information systems.

~~L. To provide an annual report to the City Council regarding accomplishments and the status of planning efforts undertaken in the previous year.~~

~~M. Beginning on January 1, 1991, to provide a report to the State Department of Commerce on the progress made in implementing Chapter 36.70A RCW. This report shall be submitted annually until January 1, 1995, and shall be submitted every five years thereafter.~~

~~N. To initiate and review, or review, and make recommendations to the City Council for area-wide zoning reclassifications to implement the Comprehensive Plan and its elements; initiate and make recommendations on moratoria and interim zoning; and review and make recommendations on City Council initiated moratoria and interim zoning.~~

~~G.J. To work with the Landmarks Preservation Commission, pursuant to TMC 13.07, to designate historic special review districts and conservation districts within the City, after public hearing, and to make recommendations to the City Council for establishment of such districts.~~

~~O.K.~~ To conduct pre-annexation planning for areas which are within the City's urban growth area and which may be reasonably expected to be annexed to the City. Planning for these areas may include, but not be limited to: land use; ~~intensity designations~~ transportation; public facilities and services; capital facility needs; parks and open space; and zoning classifications and regulations. Areas not included in the Comprehensive Plan and annexed to the City will necessitate a plan amendment.

~~L. To develop the work program for the coming year in consultation with the City Council and provide an annual report to the City Council regarding accomplishments and the status of planning efforts undertaken in the previous year.~~

(Ord. 27813 Ex. A; passed Jun. 30, 2009; Ord. 27172 § 4; passed Dec. 16, 2003; Ord. 27079 § 9; passed Apr. 29, 2003; Ord. 25850 § 3; passed Mar. 12, 1996; Ord. 25696 § 4; passed Apr. 25, 1995; Ord. 24942 § 4; passed Jul. 2, 1991; Ord. 20560 § 1; passed Sept. 30, 1975; Ord. 20266 § 5; passed Dec. 17, 1974; Ord. 14983 § 4; passed Mar. 1, 1954)

13.02.041 Quorum.

A quorum for the transaction of official business of the Planning Commission shall consist of a majority of the members of the Commission, but a smaller number may adjourn, from time to time. (Ord. 27172 § 5; passed Dec. 16, 2003)

13.02.043 Definitions.

For the purpose of this chapter, certain words and terms used herein are defined as follows:

A. An "area-wide zoning reclassification" is a legislative action to change the zoning classification(s) on an area-wide basis in order to implement and maintain the consistency of the Comprehensive Plan. It is comprehensive in nature and deals with homogenous communities, distinctive geographic areas, and other types of districts having unified interests within the City, including those associated with annexation and overlay special review zoning

districts. Area-wide zoning reclassifications, unlike parcel zoning reclassifications, are generally of area-wide significance, usually involving many separate properties under various ownerships, and often utilize several of the City's zoning classifications to implement the City's Comprehensive Plan. An area-wide zoning reclassification consisting of a single ownership but having a broader impact of significance on the community may be considered to be an area-wide reclassification if it is being undertaken in order to maintain consistency of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

B. "Department," as used in this chapter, refers to the Community and Economic Development Department.

C. "Development regulations" are any regulations and regulatory procedures placed on or involving development or land use activities of the City, including, but not limited to, zoning ordinances, critical area ordinances, shoreline master programs, official controls, planned unit development ordinances, subdivision ordinances, and binding site plan ordinances (RCW 36.70A).

D. An "emergency" situation is one in which human health or safety is jeopardized and/or public or private property is imminently endangered. For the purposes of this section, an "emergency" situation shall also include one demanding the immediate amendment of the Comprehensive Plan outside of the annual amendment cycle, without which capital facilities concurrency is likely to be compromised and/or levels of service are expected to drop below an acceptable level.

E. "Interim zoning" is an immediate change in existing zoning classifications or regulations where new zoning classifications or regulations are temporarily imposed. Such temporary zoning controls are designed to regulate specific types of development so that, when new plans and/or zoning are adopted, they will not have been rendered moot by intervening development; or are necessary to prevent harm or to preserve the status quo. Interim zoning can be an area-wide reclassification of a temporary nature or modification to specific requirements of a zoning classification.

F. "~~Land Use Intensity~~ Comprehensive Plan land use designation" is a designation for all property that indicates the future development influence based on factors such as size, scale, bulk, nuisance level, density, activity level, amount of open space, and traffic generation. ~~Intensities are classified as high, medium, and low, and~~ Such designations are depicted on the Generalized Land Use Plan map which illustrates the future land use pattern for the City.

G. "Moratorium" (or collectively, "moratoria") is the refusal to accept or process new applications for building, zoning, subdivision (plating), or other types of development to preclude development from occurring for a specified period of time. A moratorium on development may be imposed on all development, on all permit applications, or on specific types of development or permit applications.

H. "Plan amendment" is a proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan and may include adoption of a new plan element; a change to an existing plan element, including goals, policies and narrative text; a change to the objectives, principles, or standards used to develop the Comprehensive Plan; a revision to the Comprehensive Plan land use ~~intensity~~ designation as shown on the Generalized Land Use Plan map; or a change to implementation strategies or programs adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan, including updates to inventories and financial plans. (Ord. 27466 § 34; passed Jan. 17, 2006; Ord. 27172 § 6; passed Dec. 16, 2003)

13.02.044 Comprehensive Plan.

A. The Comprehensive Plan is the City's official statement concerning future growth and development. It sets forth goals, policies, and strategies to protect the health, welfare, and quality of life of Tacoma's residents. The Comprehensive Plan must be consistent with, and advance the goals of, the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A), the Multicounty Planning Policies for the Puget Sound Region ("VISION 2040"), the Regional Transportation Plan for the Puget Sound Region ("Transportation 2040"), the Countywide Planning Policies for Pierce County, and relevant Washington State statutes. The City shall carry out its programs, perform its activities, and make capital budget decisions in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

B. The Comprehensive Plan shall include the following planning elements:

1. A land use element, as required by RCW 36.70A.070, indicating the proposed generalized land use, including the suitability, capability, location, and number of acres of land devoted to such uses as residential, commercial, industrial, recreation, open space, and other uses. ~~The land use element shall include population densities and distribution, estimates of future population growth, building intensities, and areas for potential annexation. The land~~

use element shall also provide for the protection of the quality and quantity of ground water used for public water supplies, as well as for the protection of the quality of water discharged into waters of the state, including Puget Sound.

~~2. A transportation element which implements and is consistent with the land use element, is regionally coordinated, and identifies the need for future transportation facilities and services, including system expansion and management needs. The transportation element shall include the following:~~

~~(a) Land use assumptions used in estimating travel.~~

~~(b) Estimated traffic impacts to state owned transportation facilities from land use assumptions.~~

~~(c) An inventory of existing air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including state owned facilities.~~

~~(d) Level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes that are regionally coordinated, to serve as a gauge to judge performance of transportation systems and specific actions for bringing into compliance the facilities and services which fall below these standards.~~

~~(e) Level of service standards for state owned transportation facilities as prescribed by RCW 47.06 and 47.80 to gauge the performance of the system.~~

~~(f) Identification of state and local system needs to meet current and future demands.~~

~~(g) At least a 10 year forecast of travel levels based upon the adopted Comprehensive Plan to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth.~~

~~(h) An assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions.~~

~~(i) Demand management strategies.~~

~~(j) Finance component including:~~

~~(1) An analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding sources and a multi year financing plan for identified needs, the appropriate parts of which shall serve as the basis for the six year transportation program required by RCW 35.77.010 and which is coordinated with the six year improvement program developed by the State Department of Transportation as required by RCW 47.050.030.~~

~~(2) A discussion of how additional funding will be raised or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure the level of services standards will be met if probable funding falls short.~~

~~(3) 2. A housing element, as required by RCW 36.70A.070, which shall provide providing policies for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, and shall include including an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs. The housing element shall identify sufficient land to meet housing needs, including, but not limited to, low income housing, multi family housing, group homes, and foster care facilities.~~

~~(4) 3. A capital facilities element, , as required by RCW 36.70A.070, including providing an inventory of the location and capacity of existing publicly-owned capital facilities, and a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities, including the expansion of capital facilities, the construction of new facilities, and the maintenance requirements of existing facilities. The capital facilities element shall include at least a six year financing plan identifying projected funding capacity and sources of public money for financing new or expanded capital facilities. The land use and capital facilities elements and the capital facilities financing plan shall be coordinated and consistent. The capital facilities element shall include a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs.~~

~~(5) 4. A utilities element, as required by RCW 36.70A.070, identifying the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines.~~

25. A transportation element, as required by RCW 36.70A.070, which that implements and is consistent with the land use element, is regionally coordinated, and identifies the need for future transportation facilities and services, including system expansion and management needs.

~~26. An economic element, as required by RCW 36.70A.070, providing establishing goals, policies, objectives, and provisions for economic growth and vitality and a high quality of life. The element shall include a summary of the local economy, utilizing standard employment categories and indicating employment levels and trends and other information, as appropriate; a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the local economy and supporting factors such as land use, utilities, transportation, work force, housing, education, natural/cultural resources, and amenities; and an identification of policies, programs, projects, or strategies to foster economic growth.~~

~~47. A recreation and open space element, as required by RCW 36.70A.070, that implements and is consistent with the capital facilities element as it relates to park and recreation facilities. The element should indicating indicate the location and development of areas and public sites for recreation, natural conservations, parks, parkways, beaches, playgrounds, and other recreational and open space areas. The element should include estimates of park and recreation demand, an evaluation of facilities and service needs and identification of intergovernmental coordination opportunities to provide regional approaches for meeting park and recreational demands.~~

~~(6) A shoreline element setting forth policies concerning economic development; public access and circulation; recreation; urban design, conservation, restoration, and natural environment; and historical, cultural, scientific, and educational values.~~

~~(7)8. A process, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.200, for identifying and siting essential public facilities which are typically difficult to site.~~

~~(6)9. A shoreline element, pursuant to RCW 90.58, setting forth policies concerning economic development; public access and circulation; recreation; urban design, conservation, restoration, and natural environment; and historical, cultural, scientific, and educational values.~~

10. A container port element developed collaboratively with the Port of Tacoma, as required by RCW 36.70A.085, establishing policies and programs that (a) define and protect the core areas of port and port-related industrial uses; (b) provide reasonably efficient access to the core area through freight corridors within the city limits; and (c) identify and resolve key land use conflicts along the edge of the core area, and minimize and mitigate, to the extent practicable, incompatible uses along the edge of the core area.

~~B. The Comprehensive Plan must address the following two elements, but only if funds sufficient to cover local costs of including these elements have been appropriated and distributed by the state at least two years before the applicable review and update deadline in RCW 36.70A.130:~~

C. Subject to the provisions of Section 13.02.044, the Comprehensive Plan may include the following planning elements and any additional planning elements which the Commission or Council considers pertinent:

1. A community services and facilities element indicating the general location of all community services and facilities, and indicating the need and appropriate location for such services and facilities.
2. An environmental element indicating environmental conditions and natural processes, including climate, air quality, geology, hydrology, vegetation, wildlife, fisheries, critical areas, mineral resource lands, solar energy, and other natural factors and hazards that affect, or would be affected by, development.
3. A historic and conservation element identifying objects, areas, sites, or structures of historical, archaeological, architectural, or cultural significance.
4. An annexation element setting forth policies to guide orderly urban growth and designating areas for potential annexation for at least 20 years. The annexation element shall identify future land uses and consider development patterns, density, projected population growth, timing, and the provision of capital facilities and services, including capacity, financing, and expansion.
5. An urban design element addressing the design of development through the application of standards, guidelines, and recommendations for project review.
6. Sub-area elements setting forth policies concerning specific geographic areas of the City or concerning specific issues.

~~D. The Comprehensive Plan shall be coordinated and consistent with other entities and governmental jurisdictions sharing common borders or related regional issues and with county wide and multi county planning policies.~~

~~E. The City shall carry out its programs, perform its activities, and make capital budget decisions in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.~~

~~F. The City shall continuously review and evaluate the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations that implement the Plan. At least every seven years the City shall take legislative action to review and, if needed, revise the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations to ensure that the Plan and regulations are complying with the requirements of RCW 36.70A. The first review shall be completed no later than December 1, 2004. The review, and any revisions that result from the review, may be conducted in concert with the procedures used to annually amend the Comprehensive Plan.~~ (Ord. 27813 Ex. A; passed Jun. 30, 2009; Ord. 27172 § 7; passed Dec. 16, 2003)

13.02.045 Adoption and amendment procedures.

A. Adoption and amendment. The Comprehensive Plan, including any of its elements, and development regulations shall be adopted and amended by ordinance of the City Council. The procedures identified in this section shall be followed to adopt and amend the City's Comprehensive Plan, including all elements, and to adopt and amend development regulations and regulatory procedures that implement the Comprehensive Plan. Adoption and amendment of the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations must be consistent with the procedural requirements of RCW 36.70A and in compliance with applicable case law.

B. ~~When Timing for proposed Amendments amendments Will Be Adopted.~~ All amendments to the Comprehensive Plan shall be considered ~~concurrently and~~ no more frequently than once each year except that amendments may be considered more frequently under the following circumstances:

1. An emergency exists;
2. The initial adoption of a sub-area plan;
3. The adoption or amendment of a shoreline master program under the procedures set forth in RCW 90.58;
4. The amendment of the capital facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan that occurs concurrently with the adoption or amendment of the City's biennial budget; or
5. To resolve an appeal of ~~a~~ the Comprehensive Plan filed with the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board or a decision of the state or federal courts.

~~The All~~ proposed plan amendments shall be considered concurrently and, as appropriate, along with proposed amendments to development regulations, by the Planning Commission and City Council so that the cumulative effect of the various proposals can be ascertained. Proposed amendments may be considered annually, for which the annual amendment process shall begin in July of the year and be completed, with appropriate actions taken by the City Council in accordance with Sections 13.02.045.G and H, by the end of June of the following year.

Amendments proposed to comply with the update requirements of RCW 36.70.A.130 will occur according to the time frames established therein.

C. ~~Applicants of Who may proposed an amendments.~~ A proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations may be submitted by any private individual, organization, corporation, partnership, or entity of any kind, including any member(s) of the ~~Tacoma~~ City Council or the ~~Tacoma~~ Planning Commission or other governmental Commission or Committee, the City Manager, any neighborhood or community council or other neighborhood or special purpose group, a department or office, agency, or official of the City of Tacoma, or of any other general or special purpose government.

D. ~~Application for proposed Amendment amendments application.~~ Items initiated by the City Council, the Planning Commission, or in the Department's Work Program do not require an application. For all other items, the Department shall prescribe the form and content for applications for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations. Application fees shall be as established by City Council action. The deadline for submitting a complete application to the Planning Commission, and paying any applicable fee, ~~for amendment to the Comprehensive Plan~~ is 5:00 p.m. on the final business day in June of any given year to be considered in the following annual amendment cycle; however, applications will be accepted at any time. ~~Those a~~ Applications to for amending the Comprehensive Plan received after the above established deadline are less likely to be considered ~~by the Commission for possible consideration~~ in the current annual amendment cycle and are more likely to be considered in a subsequent amendment cycle, unless determined otherwise by the Planning Commission. Applications for ~~a change~~ changing to development regulations or ~~a proposal for an~~ area-wide zoning

~~reclassification~~ classifications which are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and do not require an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan can be submitted at any time. The application shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. A description of the proposed amendment, including the existing and proposed amendatory language, if applicable;
2. The current and proposed Comprehensive Plan land use ~~intensity~~ designation ~~as shown on the Generalized Land Use Plan map~~, and zoning classification for the affected area;
- ~~3. The desired land use intensity designation and/or zoning classification, if applicable;~~
- ~~4.3.~~ The reason the amendment is needed ~~and being proposed~~;
- ~~5.4.~~ A description of the affected area and the surrounding areas, with a map if applicable, including identification of affected ~~identifying such information as~~ parcels, ownership, current land uses, ~~and~~ site characteristics, ~~such as~~ ~~topography~~ and natural features;
- ~~6. A description of the land uses surrounding the proposed amendment area;~~
- ~~7.5.~~ A description of how the proposed amendment enhances the applicable ~~portion of the~~ neighborhood ~~element of the Comprehensive Plan~~;
- ~~8.6.~~ A description of any community outreach and response to the proposed amendment;
- ~~9.7.~~ A demonstration ~~by the applicant~~ of consistency with the applicable policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and the criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations;
- ~~10. Proposed amendatory language, if applicable;~~
- ~~11. A map of the affected area, if applicable; and~~
- ~~12.8.~~ Additional ~~application~~ information ~~may be~~ requested by the Department, which may include, but is not limited to, completion of an environmental checklist, wetland delineation study, visual analysis, or other studies.

The applicant is responsible for providing complete and accurate information. A meeting between the Department staff and the applicant to discuss the application submittal requirements before submitting an application is strongly advised.

E. Assessment procedure of proposed amendments. The Department shall docket all amendment requests upon receipt to ensure that all requests receive due consideration and are available for review by the public. The Department will provide an assessment of all proposed amendment applications, based on, at a minimum, the following criteria:

1. Whether the amendment request is legislative and properly subject to Planning Commission review (Quasi-judicial matters are not properly subject to Commission review);
2. Whether there have been recent studies of the same area or issue, or there are active or planned projects that the amendment request can be incorporated into (If so, the Commission may decline further review of the request or incorporate it into other studies as appropriate); and
3. Whether the amount of analysis necessary is expected to be reasonably manageable given the workloads and resources of the Department and the Planning Commission (If a large-scale study is required, an application may be scaled down, studied in phases, delayed until a future amendment cycle, or declined).

~~and forward proposed amendment applications to the Planning Commission. This assessment shall include, but not be limited to, the assessment criteria contained herein.~~ The Planning Commission will review this assessment and make its decision as to: (1) whether or not the application is complete, and if not, ~~or~~ what information is needed to make the application complete; (2) whether or not the scope of the application should be modified, and if so, what alternative scope(s) should be considered; which amendment application(s) will be considered and in which amendment cycle; and (3) whether or not the application will be considered and in which amendment cycle, whether or not to prepare alternative proposed amendment(s) that either expand or contract the scope of the original proposed amendment. The Planning Commission shall make determinations concerning proposed amendments within 120 days of receiving an application.

~~F. Assessment criteria. Criteria for assessing plan amendment applications will include:~~

- ~~1. Determining if the amendment request is legislative, and properly subject to Commission review, or quasi-judicial, and not properly subject to Commission review;~~
- ~~2. Determining if the request is site specific (i.e., a land use intensity or a zoning change for a specific parcel(s) likely to be under one ownership);~~
- ~~3. Receipt by the application deadline, if applicable (a large volume of requests before the deadline may necessitate that some requests be reviewed in a subsequent amendment cycle);~~
- ~~4. Order of receipt;~~
- ~~5. Recent study of the same area or issue (this may be cause for the Commission to decline further review);~~
- ~~6. Amount of analysis necessary (if a large scale study is required, an application may have to be delayed until a future amendment cycle due to work loads, staffing levels, etc.); and~~
- ~~7. Available incorporation into planned or active projects.~~

~~G. Amendment criteria.~~ F. Analysis of proposed amendments. ~~Beyond being consistent or achieving consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, proposed amendments must meet at least one of the following criteria to be considered by the Planning Commission: Once accepted by the Planning Commission, the amendment application will be evaluated by the Department through appropriate analysis to determine if the proposed amendment will benefit the City as a whole, will not adversely affect the City's public facilities and services, and bears a reasonable relationship to the public health, safety, and welfare. Specifically, the analysis shall include consideration of, at a minimum, the following criteria:~~

1. Whether the proposed amendment conforms to applicable provisions of State statutes, case law, regional policies, and the Comprehensive Plan; and

2. Whether the proposed amendment achieves at least one of the following objectives:

~~1a. There exists an obvious~~ Address technical errors or concerns of consistency in the pertinent Comprehensive Plan or regulatory code provisions;

~~2b. Circumstances related to the proposed amendment have significantly changed, or a lack of change in circumstances has occurred since the area or issue was last considered by the Planning Commission~~ Respond to changes in growth and development patterns, goals and policies of the City, the needs of the City, the capacity to provide adequate services, or other pertinent circumstances relevant to the proposed amendment; or

~~3. The needs of the City have changed, which support an amendment;~~

~~4c. The amendment is compatible~~ Attain compatibility with existing or planned land uses and the surrounding development pattern.;

~~5. Growth and development, as envisioned in the Plan, is occurring faster, slower, or is failing to materialize;~~

~~6. The capacity to provide adequate services is diminished or increased;~~

~~7. Plan objectives are not being met as specified, and/or the assumptions upon which the Plan is based are found to be invalid;~~

~~8. Transportation and/or other capital improvements are not being made as expected;~~

~~9. For proposed amendments to land use intensity or zoning classification; substantial similarities of conditions and characteristics can be demonstrated on abutting properties that warrant a change in land use intensity or zoning classification; or~~

~~10. A question of consistency exists between the Comprehensive Plan and its elements and RCW 36.70A, the County-wide Planning Policies for Pierce County, Multi-County Planning Policies, or development regulations.~~

In addition, the analysis of the amendment application should also document, as appropriate and necessary, public outreach and public comments, analytical data and research, economic impacts, sustainability impacts, an environmental determination, and other pertinent background information associated with the proposed amendments.

HG. Review of proposed amendments. ~~Under the review and direction of the Planning Commission, the Department will evaluate the amendment application, collect necessary data, and conduct the appropriate analysis and make an environmental determination. The Department will present the proposed amendments along with analysis conducted pursuant to Section 13.02.045.F to the Planning Commission for review and direction. The Department will.~~ The Commission will conduct public meetings and hearings, and solicit comments from the general public, organizations and agencies, other governmental departments and agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions as appropriate. ~~Electronic mail will be routinely used to contact organizations, agencies, and jurisdictions.~~ For land use intensity designation changes, area-wide zoning reclassifications, and interim zoning of an area-wide nature, the Department shall ensure that a **special notice** of the acceptance of the application by the Planning Commission for consideration in the current amendment cycle is mailed to all property taxpayers, as indicated in the records of the Pierce County Assessor, within, and within 400 feet of, the subject area. This special notice will inform property taxpayers that an application has been filed, identify where the application and background information may be reviewed, describe in general terms the review and public comment process, establish a time and place for an informational meeting with City staff, and solicit preliminary comments.

~~The Department will analyze, and make a recommendation on, each proposed amendment. Then, after~~ After a ~~Public-public Hearing~~ hearing(s), the Department will prepare a report summarizing the public hearing comments, provide a response to comments and make further recommendations, if appropriate, and forward the report and all comments to the Planning Commission for consideration. ~~The Department will present the proposed amendments to the Planning Commission, which will conduct public meetings and hearings, and make recommendations to the City Council.~~

~~1. Adoption or amendment of the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations shall be enacted only after public notice and public hearings by both the Planning Commission and City Council.~~

~~2. Based on the analysis against the criteria as contained in Section 13.02.045.F and public comment received, The~~ the Planning Commission may recommend, and the City Council may adopt, or adopt with modifications, the Comprehensive Plan, development regulations, regulatory procedures, and amendments thereto. ~~if:~~

~~a. The adoption or amendment merits approval because it will benefit the City as a whole, will not adversely affect the City's public facilities and services, and bears a reasonable relationship to the public health, safety, and welfare; and~~

~~b. The adoption or amendment conforms to state statutes, including RCW 36.70A.~~

IH. Public hearing and action.

~~1. The Planning Commission may formulate and recommend to the City Council adoption or amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, or adoption or amendment of development regulations or regulatory procedures that implement the Comprehensive Plan.~~ In formulating its recommendations to the City Council concerning adoption or amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, or adoption or amendment of development regulations or regulatory procedures that implement the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Commission shall provide public notice and conduct at least one public hearing. Advisory committees established in accordance with Section 13.02.015 may also conduct one or more public hearings prior to making recommendations to the Planning Commission. Planning Commission public hearings for adoption or amendment of development regulations and processes, moratoria, or interim zoning may be, but are not required to be, held at the same time as and in conjunction with the public hearing(s) for adoption or amendment of the Comprehensive Plan.

2. At least one City Council public hearing on adoption or amendment of the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations shall be held prior to final action by the City Council; prior to making a substantial change to the proposal recommended by the Planning Commission, the City Council shall hold an additional hearing or hearings, with the City Clerk giving notice pursuant to Section 13.02.057.

3. Consistent with RCW 36.70A, the Department must notify the Washington State Department of Commerce and other required state agencies of the City's intention to adopt or amend the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations prior to adoption by the City Council, and must transmit copies of the adopted plan or development regulation and any amendment after City Council action.

II. Amendments considered under emergency situation. The Planning Commission and the City Council may consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan at any time as a result of an emergency situation. Emergency situations include situations involving official, legal, or administrative actions, such as those to immediately avoid

an imminent danger to public health and safety, prevent imminent danger to public or private property, prevent an imminent threat of serious environmental degradation, or address the absence of adequate and available public facilities or services as provided for in Chapter 13.16 of the Tacoma Municipal Code, decisions by the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board or the State or Federal Courts, or actions of a State Agency or Office or the State Legislature, affecting Tacoma will be reviewed by the Planning Commission with advice from the City Attorney's Office to determine if an appropriate "emergency" exists, necessitating an emergency Comprehensive Plan amendment. Capital projects which are fully funded by non-City revenue (i.e., an outside grant or other "windfall") are not considered emergencies and, therefore, amendment of the Comprehensive Plan is not necessary; however, such projects shall be added to the Capital Facilities Program at the next amendment cycle. (Ord. 27813 Ex. A; passed Jun. 30, 2009; Ord. 27172 § 8; passed Dec. 16, 2003; Ord. 26899 § 1; passed Dec. 11, 2001; Ord. 26386 § 30; passed Mar. 23, 1999; Ord. 25850 § 4; passed Mar. 12, 1996; Ord. 25696 § 5; passed Apr. 25, 1995; Ord. 25360 § 1; passed Aug. 31, 1993; Ord. 24942 § 5; passed Jul. 2, 1991; Ord. 21883 § 1; passed Nov. 13, 1979; Ord. 20266 § 6; passed Dec. 17, 1974)

13.02.050 Quorum. *Repealed by Ord. 27172.*

(Ord. 27172 § 9; passed Dec. 16, 2003; Ord. 25318 § 3; passed Jun. 8, 1993; Ord. 20266 § 7; passed Dec. 17, 1974; Ord. 20183 § 2; passed Aug. 13, 1974; Ord. 14983 § 5; passed Mar. 1, 1954)

13.02.053 Area-wide zoning reclassifications.

The Planning Commission may also consider the need for area-wide zoning reclassifications, in association with or independently of Comprehensive Plan amendments, including those associated with an annexation or which are necessary to maintain the zoning classification's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. The procedures for consideration of area-wide zoning reclassifications shall be as follows:

1. ~~Who may request an area-wide zoning reclassification, and how.~~—The means of submitting a request for an area-wide zoning reclassification and those empowered to submit such a request shall be the same as in Section 13.02.045.
2. ~~Process for area-wide zoning reclassification.~~—An area-wide zoning reclassification implementing the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan will be conducted by the Planning Commission, consistent with RCW 42.36.010, with recommendation to the City Council. Area-wide zoning reclassifications which are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan shall be proposed for adoption at the same time as and in conjunction with the Plan's amendment. Area-wide zoning reclassifications which are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and do not require plan modification may be considered at any time.
3. ~~Public Hearing and Recommendation for an Area-Wide Zoning Reclassification.~~—The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing to consider an area-wide zoning reclassification and to determine the consistency of the reclassification with the Comprehensive Plan and its elements and RCW 36.70A. In making its recommendation to the City Council, the Planning Commission shall make findings and conclusions to demonstrate the manner in which the area-wide reclassification carries out and helps implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. If a reclassification is recommended, it shall be based on, but not limited to, the following circumstances:
 - a. substantial evidence is presented demonstrating that growth and development is occurring in a different manner than presented in the Comprehensive Plan;
 - b. the proposed area-wide reclassification is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Generalized Land Use Plan map;
 - c. the reclassification is needed to further implement the Comprehensive Plan;
 - d. the proposed reclassification is needed to maintain consistency with proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan;
 - e. there is substantial evidence presented showing inconsistency between the ~~designated~~ land use ~~intensity~~ designation in the subject area and the existing zoning; or
 - f. the subject property is suitable for development in general conformance with the zoning standards under the recommended rezone classification.

4. At least one public hearing on a proposed area-wide zoning reclassification shall be held prior to final action by the City Council.

5. Area-wide reclassifications adopted by the City Council supersede any previous reclassifications and any conditions of approval associated with such previous reclassifications. (Ord. 27995 Ex. A; passed Jun. 14, 2011; Ord. 27172 § 10; passed Dec. 16, 2003)

13.02.055 Moratoria and interim zoning.

A. ~~Moratoria and/or interim zoning controls adopted by the City Council by ordinances may be considered either as a result of an emergency situation or as a temporary protective measure to prevent vesting of rights under existing zoning and development regulations. Who may request moratoria or interim zoning, and how.~~ Those empowered to submit a request for a moratorium or interim zoning shall be the same as in Section 13.02.045.C. Those empowered may petition the City Council or Planning Commission, in writing, to request moratoria or interim zoning, including the specific geographic location and describing what circumstances contribute to an emergency situation or the need for protective measures.

B. ~~Process for moratoria and interim zoning. A moratorium and/or interim zoning controls may be considered either as a result of an emergency situation or as a temporary protective measure to prevent vesting of rights under existing zoning and development regulations.~~ Moratoria or interim zoning may be initiated by either the Planning Commission or the City Council by means of determination at a public meeting that such action may be warranted. Where an emergency exists, prior public notice may be limited to the information contained in the public meeting agenda. In the case of For City Council-initiated moratoria or interim zoning, the City Council shall hold a public hearing within at least 60 days of adopting any such moratoria or interim zoning, as provided by RCW 36.70A.390. The City Council shall adopt findings of fact justifying the adoption of moratoria before, or immediately after, it holds a public hearing. For moratoria or interim zoning initiated by or petitioned to the Planning Commission, the Commission shall formulate a recommendation to the City Council that indicates (1) an emergency exists necessitating the immediate imposition of a moratorium or interim zoning, or temporary measures are needed to protect the status quo; (2) an appropriate duration for the moratorium or interim zoning controls; and (3) whether a study, either underway or proposed, is expected to develop a permanent solution and the time period by which that study would be concluded.

~~City Council-initiated moratoria or interim zoning shall be referred to the Planning Commission for findings of fact and a recommendation prior to action; provided, that where an emergency is found to exist by the City Council, it may act immediately and prior to the formulation of Planning Commission findings of fact and recommendation. At its next available meeting immediately following the City Council's referral or action, the Planning Commission shall consider the measure and, if it finds evidence that an emergency exists necessitating the immediate imposition of a moratorium or interim zoning, or that temporary measures are needed to protect the status quo, it shall recommend adoption to the City Council. The Planning Commission shall respond with its findings of fact and recommendation to the Council within 30 days of the date of the Commission meeting at which it is first made aware of the Council's request. In emergency situations where the City Council has first enacted a moratorium or interim zoning, but where the Planning Commission's findings of fact and recommendation do not support the action, the City Council shall reconsider, but shall not be bound to reversing, its action.~~

~~C. Public hearing and action. The Planning Commission will hold at least one public hearing prior to formulating its recommendation to the City Council. The public hearing may be, but it is not required to, be held at the same time and in conjunction with the amendment of the Comprehensive Plan. Where an emergency exists, public hearings regarding moratoria or interim zoning may be held after the Planning Commission forwards its findings of fact and recommendation to the City Council, and after action has been taken by the City Council.~~

~~In the case of moratoria or interim zoning, the City Council shall hold a public hearing within at least 60 days of adopting any moratoria or interim zoning, as provided by RCW 36.70A.390. The City Council shall adopt findings of fact justifying the adoption of moratoria before, or immediately after, it holds a public hearing.~~

~~D. Duration of Moratorium or Interim Zoning. As part of its findings of fact and recommendation, the Planning Commission shall recommend to the City Council a duration for the moratorium or interim zoning controls and note if a study, either underway or proposed, is expected to develop a permanent solution and the time period by which that study would be concluded. Moratoria or interim zoning may be effective for a period of not longer than six months, but may be effective for up to one year if a work plan is developed for related studies requiring such longer period. Moratoria or interim zoning may be renewed for an unlimited number of six-month intervals following their~~

imposition; provided, that prior to each renewal, a public hearing is held by the City Council and findings of fact are made which support the renewal. (Ord. 27813 Ex. A; passed Jun. 30, 2009; Ord. 27172 § 11; passed Dec. 16, 2003)

13.02.057 Notice for public hearings.

A. The Department shall give public/legal notice of the subject, time and place of the Planning Commission, or its advisory committee, public hearings in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Tacoma prior to the hearing date. The Department shall provide notice of Commission public hearings on proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations to adjacent jurisdictions, other local and state government agencies, Puyallup Tribal Nation, the applicable current neighborhood council board members pursuant to City Ordinance No. 25966, and other individuals or organizations identified by the Department as either affected or likely to be interested. For [Comprehensive Plan](#) land use ~~intensity-designation~~ changes, area-wide zoning reclassifications, and interim zoning of an area-wide nature, the Department shall ensure that a **special notice** of public hearing is mailed to all property taxpayers, as indicated in the records of the Pierce County Assessor, within, and within 400 feet of, the subject area.

B. The Department shall require that for a [Comprehensive Plan](#) land use ~~intensity-designation~~ change or an area-wide zoning classification change a public information sign(s), provided by the Department, is posted on the affected site or sites at least 14 calendar days prior to the Planning Commission public hearing.

C. The sign shall be erected at a location or locations as determined by the Department, and shall remain on site until final decision is made by the City Council on the [Comprehensive Plan](#) land use ~~intensity-designation~~ change or area-wide zoning classification; applicants shall check the sign(s) periodically in order to make sure that the sign(s) remains up and in a readable condition.

D. The sign shall contain, at a minimum, the name of the applicant, a description and location of the proposed amendment, and where additional information may be obtained.

E. The City Clerk shall give public notice of the subject, time and place of public hearings for actions by the City Council in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Tacoma prior to the hearing date. (Ord. 27813 Ex. A; passed Jun. 30, 2009; Ord. 27172 § 12; passed Dec. 16, 2003)

13.02.060 Reports. *Repealed by Ord. 24942.*

(Ord. 24942; passed Jul. 2, 1991; Ord. 20266 § 8; passed Dec. 17, 1974; Ord. 14983 § 6; passed Mar. 1, 1954)

CONVERSATIONS RE: TACOMA

2012 LECTURE SERIES

1 EXTREME MAKE-OVER: FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Thursday, September 27, 2012; 6:30-8:00 pm;
New Frontier Lounge, 301 East 25th Street
after-event at also at New Frontier Lounge

Speakers:

Jim Nicholls, senior lecturer, Department of Architecture, UW Seattle
Odette D'Aniello, owner, Celebrity Cake Studio
Nick Fedaiy, 6th Avenue Business District Association
Sharon Winters, Historic Tacoma
Aaron Winston, architectural designer, BLRB Architects

Moderator:

Kala Dralle, Program Development Specialist, City of Tacoma

2 VISUAL CLUTTER: HOW TO GET OUTDOOR ADVERTISING RIGHT

Thursday, October 11, 2012, 6:30-8:00 pm;
Trinity Presbyterian Church, Sanctuary, 1615 Sixth Avenue;
after-event at Cork, 606 North State Street (6th & State)

Speakers:

Paula Rees, Maestri Design
Rusty George, Principal, Rusty George Creative
Trevor Boddy, architecture critic

Moderator:

Eric Jacobsen, Congress for the New Urbanism

3 BE HEARD: HOW NEIGHBORHOODS CAN ENGAGE IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

Thursday, November 8, 2012, 6:30-8pm;
Tacoma School of the Arts (SOTA) Theatre,
1118 Commerce St;
after-event at Varsity Grill, 1114 Broadway

Speakers:

Donald Erickson, AICP, Chair, Tacoma Planning Commission
Randy Cook, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Principal, TCF Architecture
Jori Adkins, retired landscape architect/urban designer and neighborhood activist

Moderator:

Ian Munce, Acting Division Manager, Long-Range Planning, City of Tacoma

TICKETING INFORMATION:

Individual pre-paid tickets are \$7.50 each
or \$20 for all three

Tickets at the door are \$10 (if available)

Students are admitted free with school ID

**Ticket information and ordering
at www.ReTacoma.com**

WWW.RETACOMA.COM
RETHINK • REDEFINE • REINVENT





Tacoma City of Tacoma
Community and Economic Development Department

September 12, 2012

Dale Cope
7539 S. Hegra Road
Tacoma, WA 98465

RE: Electronic Signs

Dear Mr. Cope,

Thank you for your letters regarding electronic signs. The issues you commented on in your letters are being discussed by staff and the Planning Commission as a part of our 2013 Annual Amendment, which includes potential sign code amendments addressing on-premises digital signs.

The Planning Commission will begin to hold meetings and discussing potential sign code amendments in October/November, 2012. A Planning Commission Public Hearing will be held for the 2013 Annual Amendment in early March, 2013. Code amendments will be developed between October and March. We would like to offer to include you on the interested-parties mailing list for the 2013 Annual Amendment so you can receive notification(s) for future sign code related public meetings. Please let us know if you do not wish to be added to our mailing list.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions about electronic signage or the code amendment process addressing on-premises digital signs. You will also be able to find information on the Planning Website at www.cityoftacoma.org/planning (click on "2013 Annual Amendment"). Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lucas Shadduck". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Lucas Shadduck,
Planner, Long-range Planning Division
(253) 594-7975 or lshadduc@cityoftacoma.org.

cc Planning Commission



City of Tacoma

Memorandum

TO: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

FROM: Ricardo Noguera, Director, Community & Economic Development Department

SUBJECT: **Planning Commission Accomplishments & Work Activities**

DATE: September 11, 2012



For the City Council's information, and pursuant to Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.02, I am forwarding the Planning Commission's annual report of accomplishments for the period of July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 (see Attachment A).

During the past 12 months, the Commission has made recommendations to the City Council on a number of significant issues, such as the Shoreline Master Program Update, the Moratorium on Medical Cannabis, the Moratorium on Large Scale Retail Development, the Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance Update, the Downtown Off-Street Parking Requirements, the incorporation of affordable housing policy principles in the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the regulatory streamlining efforts concerning SEPA thresholds, Live-Work/Work-Live regulations and parking requirements. The Commission has also begun the review process for such important projects such as the MLK and South Downtown subarea plans and Transfer of Development Rights (TDR).

I am also forwarding two relevant documents of importance and interest to the City Council, i.e., a summary of the 2013 Annual Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Land use Regulatory Code (Attachment B) and a summary of planning activities anticipated to be accomplished in the next 12-18 months (Attachment C). These documents combined represent the work program for the Planning Commission and the Comprehensive Planning Division. The work program is subject to change, due to changes in circumstances (e.g., City's priorities, City Council's directives, community's desire, and the availability of resources).

If you or the City Council has any questions about any of the information provided, please contact Ian Munce, Acting Manager, Comprehensive Planning Division, at 573-2478 or imunce@cityoftacoma.org.

RN:lw

Attachments (3)



Planning Commission Accomplishments (July 2011 – June 2012)

August 29, 2012

This document highlights the Planning Commission's major accomplishments during July 2011 through June 2012 and is prepared pursuant to Tacoma Municipal Code Section 13.02.040.L as the 2012 Annual Report to the City Council. For those ongoing projects that have been carried beyond the end of the reporting timeframe, appropriate information as of the date of the report is provided. (This report is also posted at www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Planning Commission".)

A. Projects Reviewed and Recommended to the City Council:

- **Code Streamlining 2012**

This code amendment is intended to help reduce barriers to infill development and the reuse of existing commercial buildings. It is comprised of three proposals: (1) expanding the "home occupation" use in the Downtown and Mixed-Use Districts to include Live-Work/Work-Live regulations; (2) adopting increased thresholds for Environmental (SEPA) review; and (3) adding a parking exemption for existing buildings in Commercial Districts outside of the Downtown and Mixed-Use Districts. The Commission began the review in May-June 2012, conducted a public hearing on July 18, and forwarded its recommendations to the City Council on August 1, 2012. The Council conducted a study session and a public hearing on August 28, and is scheduled to consider adoption of the Commission's recommendations by the end of September 2012.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Code Streamlining 2012")

- **2012 Annual Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code:**

The Annual Amendment Package initially included seven applications, concerning (1) Container Port Element, (2) Housing Element, (3) Transportation Element, (4) Sign Code Revisions, (5) Platting and Subdivision Code Revisions, (6) Urban Forestry Code Revisions, and (7) Minor Amendments & Refinements. All applications were reviewed by the Commission during August 2011 through February 2012, while four of them (#1, #4, #5, and #6 above) were later separated from the annual amendment process due to staffing changes, reprioritization and/or the need for further outreach and coordination. The Commission continued to review the remaining three (#2, #3, and #7), conducted a public hearing on March 7, and made its recommendations to the City Council on April 18, 2012. The Council conducted a public hearing on May 22, and adopted the proposed amendments on June 12, 2012.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Annual Amendments")

- **Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update**

The SMP update also included the development of the Shoreline Restoration Plan, Public Access Alternatives Plan, and Thea Foss Waterway Design Guidelines. The SMP update had been under review since 2006. The Commission conducted a public hearing on June 1, 2011, and forwarded its recommendations to the City Council on August 17, 2011. The Council conducted a joint study session with the Commission on September 27, held a public hearing on September 27, and adopted the Commission's recommendations, with modifications, on November 29, 2011. The updated SMP package has been submitted to, and is currently under review by, the Department of Ecology.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Shoreline Master Program Update")

- **Downtown Off-Street Parking Requirements**

This land use code amendment was proposed to reduce the off-street parking requirements for new development in downtown. The Commission reviewed the proposal in May-November 2011, conducted a public hearing on September 21, and recommended to the City Council on November 2, 2011. The Council held a public hearing on January 24, 2012, and adopted the Commission's recommendations, with modifications, on February 21, 2012.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Downtown Code Update – Off-Street Parking Requirements")

- **Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance (CAPO) Update**

The primary focus of this code amendment included voluntary restoration and enhancement, small development project permit processes, wetland buffer refinement, mitigation options, including mitigation banks and in-lieu fee programs, and general code reorganization and clean-up. The Commission's review began in September 2010 and was completed a year later with a public hearing held on September 21, 2011 and its recommendations forwarded to the City Council on February 15, 2012. The Council held a public hearing on April 17, and adopted the Commission's recommendations on May 8, 2012.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Critical Areas Preservation Code Update (2012)")

- **Medical Cannabis Moratorium**

The City Council enacted a 6-month moratorium on August 2, 2011, prohibiting the acceptance of applications for the establishment, location, operation, licensing, permitting, maintenance, or continuation of medical cannabis collective gardens or medical cannabis dispensaries within the City. The Commission reviewed the matter in August-September 2011, conducted a public hearing on September 7, and recommended on September 7 that the moratorium be extended to 12-months. The Council conducted a public hearing on September 27, and decided on October 4 to extend the moratorium through August 1, 2012. The Commission worked September 2011 through May 2012 to develop revisions to the Land Use Code, conducted a public hearing on May 16, 2012, and recommended such to the Council on June 6, 2012. The Council conducted a public hearing on June 26, but did not adopt the Commission's recommendations; instead, the Council adopted revisions to the Nuisance Code on July 31, 2012.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Medical Cannabis Moratorium")

- **Large-Scale Retail Moratorium**

The City Council enacted a 6-month moratorium on August 30, 2011, prohibiting the filing or acceptance of applications for land use, building or other development permits associated with the establishment, location, or permitting of retail sales establishments with a floor area greater than 65,000 square feet within the City. The Commission reviewed the matter in September-October 2011, conducted a public hearing on October 5, and recommended on October 19 that the moratorium be extended to 12-months. The Council conducted a study session and a public hearing on October 25 and decided on November 1, 2011 to retain the moratorium for 6-months. The Commission reviewed the issue over the next two months and developed corresponding revisions to the Land Use Code, conducted a public hearing on December 7, and forwarded its recommendations to the Council on January 4, 2012. The Council conducted a study session and a public hearing on January 31, and adopted the Commission's recommendations, with modifications, on February 14, 2012.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Large Scale Retail Moratorium")

- **Billboard Moratorium and Billboard Regulations**

These matters had been through the Commission's review process in the previous reporting period (i.e., 2010-2011), but the Council's actions occurred during this reporting period (2011-2012). The Council adopted the Commission's recommendations concerning the Billboard Moratorium on July 19, 2011, and adopted the Commission's recommendations concerning the Billboard Regulations, with modifications, on August 9, 2011.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Billboard Moratorium" or "Billboard Regulations")

B. Projects Reviewed and Discussed:

- **Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)**

The City is in the process of developing a TDR Program that addresses sending and receiving areas, exchange commodities and rates, and market analysis. The Commission reviewed the subject in September 2011 and May 2012, and will continue to review in 2012-2013.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)")

- **MLK Subarea Plan and EIS**

The City is working with residents, businesses and property owners to prepare a Subarea Plan and EIS intended to encourage development and economic revitalization in the MLK District. The Commission reviewed the subject in January, March and May of 2012, and will continue to review in 2012-2013, with expected recommendation in early 2013.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "MLK Subarea Plan & EIS")

- **South Downtown Subarea Plan and EIS**

The City is also working with residents, businesses and property owners to prepare a Subarea Plan and EIS intended to encourage development and economic revitalization in the southern portion of Downtown Tacoma, including the Dome District, the Brewery District, the Thea Foss Waterway, and the University of Washington Tacoma campus. The Commission reviewed the subject in October 2011, March and May of 2012, and will continue to review through 2012-2013.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "South Downtown Subarea Plan & EIS")

- **Development and Permitting Activities Reports**

The Commission received updates on development permits and emerging trends in permit activity from Building and Land Use Services; the Commission reviewed such information in August 2011, February 2012, and July 2012.

- **Port of Tacoma Public Access Plan**

The Commission reviewed the scope of work and public outreach efforts for this project in March 2012, in relation with the City's efforts toward implementation of the Shoreline Master Program. A joint City Council/Port Commission Committee is currently being formed to work on this issue.

- **Urban Forestry Code Revisions**

This project was separated from the 2012 Annual Amendment package in February 2012, due to the need for further outreach and coordination. The Commission reviewed the matter in August-December of 2011 and March-May of 2012, and conducted a public hearing on May 2, 2012. The Commission will continue its review in 2012-2013, with expected recommendation in early 2013.

(www.cityoftacoma.org/planning > "Urban Forestry Landscaping Code Update")

C. Meetings Conducted / Attended:

The Commission meets every first and third Wednesdays of the month. From July 2011 to June 2012, the Commission held 23 meetings and canceled one in January 2012. Included in the 23 regular meetings were 8 public hearings, as listed below:

1. Moratorium – Medical Cannabis (September 7, 2011)
2. Code Amendment – Downtown Off-Street Parking (September 21, 2011)
3. Code Amendment – Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance (September 21, 2011)
4. Moratorium – Large-Scale Retail Establishments (October 5, 2011)
5. Code Amendment – Large Scale Retail Establishments (December 7, 2011)
6. Plan and Code Amendments – 2012 Annual Amendment (March 7, 2012)
7. Code Amendment – Urban Forestry Landscaping Code (May 2, 2012)
8. Code Amendment – Medical Cannabis Land Use Regulations (May 16, 2012)

Individual Commissioners have also participated in various community workshops and special functions, such as (list not exhaustive):

1. "Conversation RE: Tacoma" Urban Design Lecture Series (September 15, October 20 and November 17, 2011)
2. "Revising the Foss" Workshop Series by Foss Waterway Development Authority (September 27-29, 2011)
3. MLK Subarea Plan and EIS Community Workshops (January 5, 2012; February 9, 2012; March 22, 2012; May 24, 2012)
4. South Downtown Subarea Plan and EIS Working Group Meetings (March 21, 2012)
5. Port of Tacoma Public Access Plan Open House (March 6, 2012)
6. "May is Bike Month!" (May 2012)

D. Special Note:

The Mobility Master Plan (reviewed and recommended by the Commission in 2010, and subsequently adopted by the Council into the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan) received the 2011 VISION 2040 Award from the Puget Sound Regional Council, in September 2011, for its innovative projects, programs and strategies for pedestrian and bicycle improvements that will help achieve the goals of sustainable transportation and active living.

E. Membership Change (July 2011 – August 2012):

District / Expertise Areas	Commissioner	Notes
District 1	Peter Elswick	Served through August 2011 (term expiration)
	Scott Winship	Appointed in September 2011
District 2	Sean Gaffney	Vice-Chair since March 2012
District 3	Chris Beale	Served through March 2012, and moved out of the City
	Benjamin Fields	Appointed in July 2012
District 4	Matthew Nutsch	
District 5	Jeremy Doty	Served through March 2012, as Chair, and moved out of the City
	Mark Lawlis	Appointed in August 2012
Development Community	Tom O'Connor	Term expired August 2011
	Erle Thompson	Appointed in August 2011
Environmental Community	Ian Morrison	Resigned in April 2012
	Theresa Dusek	Appointed in May 2012
Public Transportation	Scott Morris	Served through July 2011 (term expiration)
	Tina Lee	Appointed in August 2011
Architecture, Historic Preservation, and/or Urban Design	Donald Erickson	Vice-Chair from July 2011 to March 2012, and Chair since March 2012



2013 ANNUAL AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND LAND USE REGULATORY CODE

SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS

July 24, 2012

APPLICATION	APPLICANT	PLAN OR CODE AMENDMENT?	DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT
1. Drive-Through Regulations	Jori Adkins, Dome District	Code Amendment	Amending various sections of the Land Use Regulatory Code to prohibit drive-throughs in Downtown and Mixed-Use Centers (where pedestrian priority and multimodal uses are greatly encouraged).
2. Countywide Planning Policies	Community & Economic Development Department (CED)	Plan Amendment	Amending various elements of the Comprehensive Plan to incorporate, as appropriate, the 2012 Updates to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) for Pierce County and to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan continues to be consistent with the CPPs and the regional growth plan, VISION 2040.
3. Container Port Element	CED	Plan Amendment	Adding a new Container Port Element to the Comprehensive Plan to: (1) define and protect the core area(s) of container port industrial uses; (2) identify and resolve key land use conflicts at the edges of the core area(s); and, (3) ensure access to freight corridors that serve container port industrial uses and recommend necessary transportation improvements. This work is mandated by a 2009 addition to the Growth Management Act relating to land use and transportation planning for marine ports in Seattle and Tacoma, and will be accomplished in collaboration with the Port of Tacoma.
4. Transportation Element	CED and Public Works Department	Plan Amendment	Annual update to the various transportation improvement project lists as contained in Section II – Mobility Master Plan and Section III – General Plan Implementation. This work may result in modifications to certain policies and implementation strategies where appropriate.

APPLICATION	APPLICANT	PLAN OR CODE AMENDMENT?	DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT
5. Shoreline Related Elements	CED	Plan Amendment	Rescinding three shoreline related elements of the Comprehensive Plan, i.e., the Thea Foss Waterway Design and Development Plan, the Ruston Way Plan, and the Shoreline Trails Plan. The policy principles of these documents were incorporated into the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) in 2011 and critical design elements from these three plans will be identified and incorporated into the Shoreline Design Guidelines, and/or the Comprehensive Plan, and/or development regulations.
6. Development Intensity Designations	CED	Plan & Code Amendment	Amending various elements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code to revise and update the Plan's land use designation approach, from the current Land Use Intensities to a more simplified and easily understood classification system. This work may be accomplished in multiple phases, starting with the mixed-use centers.
7. Adoption and Amendment Procedures	CED	Code Amendment	Amending TMC 13.02 to enhance the reporting and working relationships between the Planning Commission and the City Council, and to streamline and clarify the adoption and amendment procedures for the Comprehensive Plan, area-wide rezones, moratoria, and interim zoning.
8. Platting and Subdivision Regulations	CED	Code Amendment	Amending TMC 13.04 to address the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the maximum short plat size from four to nine lots, together with potential modifications to public notice and the associated bonding/improvement construction process • Evaluate and update access and connectivity provisions (vehicular and pedestrian/bike) • Reevaluate the existing recreational space requirement/fee
9. Sign Regulations	CED	Code Amendment	Amending various sections of the Land Use Regulatory Code to address specific issues associated with on-site digital signage (as requested by the Planning Commission).

APPLICATION	APPLICANT	PLAN OR CODE AMENDMENT?	DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT
10. Affordable Housing Regulations	CED	Code Amendment	<p>Amending various sections of the Land Use Regulatory Code to incorporate additional provisions that support the development of affordable housing in accordance with the following recommendations of the Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group (pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 38489, May 15, 2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 3.2.1 – Voluntary Housing Incentive Program • Recommendation 3.2.2 – Inclusionary Requirements for Voluntary Residential Rezones • Recommendation 3.2.3 – Limited Mandatory Affordable Housing Bonus Program for City Initiated Upzones • Recommendation 3.3 – Regulatory Assistance to Developers of Affordable Housing • Recommendation 3.5.1 – Affordable Housing Design Practices for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)
11. Trail-Friendly Regulations	CED	Code Amendment	<p>Amending various sections of the Land Use Regulatory Code to incorporate development regulations that would help create and enhance the relationship and connection between pedestrian and bicycle trails and the private developments along such trails.</p>
12. Plan and Code Cleanup	CED	Plan & Code Amendment	<p>Amending various sections of the Land Use Regulatory Code and the Comprehensive Plan to address inconsistencies, correct minor errors, provide additional clarity, and improve administrative efficiency.</p>

Capital Projects	Source (see Color Key below)	2012				2013			
		1 st Qtr	2 nd Qtr	3 rd Qtr	4 th Qtr	1 st Qtr	2 nd Qtr	3 rd Qtr	4 th Qtr
Bayside Trails (planning process)	Grant (Land and Water Conservation Fund)								
Prairie Line Trail	City Council								
Schuster Corridor Multi-Use Trail	City Council								
Chinese Reconciliation Park Phase III	City Council / Grant / Staff								
Historic Preservation Plan Implementation & Code Enforcement	City Council / Staff								
Conservation Districts (TMC 13.07)	Staff								
Environmental Policy Element Update	Staff								
Narrows Marina Expansion (Interlocal Agreement w/ University Place)	City Council / Staff								
Mobility Master Plan (MoMaP) Implementation	City Council / Staff								
Open Space Planning and Acquisitions	City Council / Staff								
Schuster Slope Open Space Short-Term Maintenance (on-going)	Community / Staff								
Wapato Hills	Community / Staff								
Julia's Gulch	Community / Staff								
First Creek	City Council / Community / Staff								
<p>* Note: Affordable Housing Planning Work Program (as set forth in Resolution No. 38489, May 15, 2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task 1: Comprehensive plan Policy (2012 Annual Amendment) Task 2: Incentive, Bonus, and Inclusionary Programs (2013 Annual Amendment) Task 3: Rezones (2013 Annual Amendment) Task 4: Affordable Housing Infill Development (2014 Annual Amendment) 		<p>KEY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green State and Regional Mandates Blue Grant Obligations Tan City Council Mandates Yellow Planning Commission Requests Pink Staff Initiates or Private Applications 							