Planning Commission/
Transportation Commission
Joint Meeting

September 17, 2014
GMA REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION

- Land use assumptions align with travel demand forecasts
- Intergovernmental coordination
- Facility recommendations align with level of service objectives
- Financially constrained
PLANNING FOR EVERYONE

Balance and prioritize design to meet street's purpose

**Automobile Level of Service**
- A: +No delay at intersections.
- C/D: +Drivers wait no more than 1 red light
- F: -Longer delays at intersections.

**Transit Quality of Service**
- A: +More frequent service, stops, and amenities.
- C/D: +Good bus service
- F: -Limited or no service.

**Bicycle Quality of Service**
- A: +Complete system for all types of users.
- C/D: Cyclists of various skill levels are able to bike comfortably to key destinations
- F: -More gaps in system

**Pedestrian Quality of Service**
- A: +Complete system
- C/D: An adequately complete network of decent sidewalks
- F: -Gaps in system.

September 15, 2014
COMPLETE STREETS/NETWORKS

- Modal priority networks establish where modes need to be best accommodated

- Develop LOS policies for following modes:
  - Pedestrian
  - Bike
  - Transit
  - Auto/Freight
KEY PRINCIPLE:
NOT JUST CURB-TO-CURB

Use **all** of the public right-of-way

To relate to private development
KEY PRINCIPLE: CONTEXT SENSITIVE

CONTEXT FACTORS

» Land Use Type
» Development Densities
» Form (e.g. height & setback)
» Corridor Users

CONVENTIONAL
TMP SCOPE OF WORK

- Public Engagement
- Existing Conditions
- Goals and Policies
- Focus Areas:
  - Land Use
  - Roadways
  - Transit
  - Bike/Pedestrian
  - Port Access
- Performance Measures
- Cost Estimation
- Financial Plan
- GMA/Concurrency
- Plan Development
# Tacoma TMP Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions / Planning Context</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Forecasts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals + Policies / Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand Forecasts/Model</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Network</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike + Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Element</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Mode Improvement Options</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Engineering And Cost Estimates</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal Concurrency</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Adoption Process</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Stakeholder Outreach / Transportation Commission</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ☐: Public Workshop
- 1: Transportation Commission Meeting
- 2: Council Study Session
- 3: City Council
- 4: Planning Commission
- 5: Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability

*September 15, 2014*
TWO STAGE PROCESS

- **Initial Input:**
  - Land use and policies
  - Bike/ped modes (BPTAG)
  - Transit
  - Auto/freight

- **More Refined Input**
  - Land use and policies (tonight)
  - Bike/ped modes (August)
  - Transit (August)
  - Auto/freight (tonight)
BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER

- Consider modes together
  - Understand key corridors with priority conflicts
- Understand funding availability
- Understand City’s land use vision
- Develop LOS standards and project list that aligns with all of the above
BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER

Transportation Plan

LAYERED NETWORK

- Identifies priority users on individual streets
- Based on existing travel patterns and input from City staff and community

LEVEL OF SERVICE

- Auto
- Transit
- Pedestrian
- Bicycle
- Freight

TRANSPORTATION PROJECT LIST

- 20 Year List
- 6 Year (Capital Improvement Program)
- Concurrency
- Impact Fee Program

PEDESTRIAN LOS – SIDEWALK REQUIREMENTS

- LOS Within Pedestrian Priority Network
  - Pedestrian facility where indicated in Pedestrian Priority Network, with a buffer
  - Pedestrian facility provided on one side of the street
  - No pedestrian facility

- Crossing Requirements
  - LOS In Downtown or Within a Half Mile of a School
    - Enhanced crossing every 300-600** feet
    - Marked crosswalk present every 600** feet
    - No marked crosswalk present

* Pedestrian facility includes sidewalks and shoulders protected by a raised curb
** Distance may exceed 600 feet where no pedestrian demands are present
Questions?

Dan Grayuski
d.grayuski@fehrandpeers.com

Kendra Breiland
k.breiland@fehrandpeers.com
20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOODS
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SEPTEMBER 17, 2014
PLANNING FOR PEDESTRIANS

Where do people want to walk?

Markets

Parks

School
TIES TO GROWTH

- PSRC growth targets allocated to mixed-use centers
- Subarea Plans depend heavily on non-SOV travel
- Activity centers tend to be oriented toward walking already
EFFORTS IN MOMAP

Policy Language: Prioritize infrastructure improvements within and between 20-minute neighborhoods based around Tacoma’s centers for growth and along identified corridors that connect residential areas to schools, local retail, business, and community services so residents can safely access more of the services they need close to home by walking, biking, transit, and using assistive devices.
20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOODS

The Three D’s

Density
- Population density by housing units per acre

Distance
- Intersection density
- Topography
- Distance to transit

Destinations
- Major employers, schools, parks, libraries, grocery stores
EXISTING 20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOOD POTENTIAL
FUTURE 20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOOD POTENTIAL
20-MINUTE WALKS AND GROWTH

3 Ds Analysis Equally Weighted

- Focus on MUCs since they are the targeted growth areas
- Most MUCs are located at or near a potential 20-minute neighborhood
- What about the MUCs that have less walking potential? Lower priority for projects

Walking Around Mixed Use Centers

- Half mile (10 minutes) and one mile (20 minutes) walking from centroids
- Note street network completeness
- Sidewalk data unavailable
CONNECTING 20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOODS

Connecting Bicycle Facilities

- Some MUCs connected by existing bicycle facilities
- All MUCs connected by fully built out bicycle network
- Consider separated bicycle facilities for important 20-min NBH connections

Connecting Transit Service

- Nearly all MUCs connected by proposed High Capacity Transit Corridors
- Excludes local service currently
- Think about higher quality of transit service along these corridors
ARTERIALS AND COLLECTORS IN 20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOODS
ARTERIALS AND COLLECTORS IN 20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOODS
ARTERIALS AND COLLECTORS IN 20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOODS
ARTERIALS AND COLLECTORS IN 20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOODS
Questions?

Justin Resnick
j.resnick@fehrandpeers.com

Mike Tresidder
miket@altaplanning.com