

COMPLETE STREETS DESIGN GUIDELINES PROJECT

Public Comments Summary & Recommended Changes (10-07-09)

OVERVIEW: This table summarizes the issues raised through public review of the draft Guidelines. The Mixed-use Centers Guidelines draft was released in December 2008 and the Residential Guidelines in May 2009. Comments were submitted in writing as well as spoken at public meetings. Many are quite detailed and technical in nature, reflecting strong interest in these issues and a high level of participation from individuals with pertinent expertise. Comments received cover a broad range of subjects. The issues are organized by subject and listed alphabetically.

The City received written comments from numerous individuals, as well as the following organizations: Tacoma Area Commission on Disabilities, Alta Planning + Design, Cascade Land Conservancy, the Tacoma Pierce County Health Department, the Master Builders Association, Pierce Transit and Metro Parks Tacoma. Project staff conducted approximately 20 public meetings with a broad range of stakeholders. Public presentations and meetings included the following:

- Environment and Public Works Committee (3 presentations)
- West End Neighborhood Council
- Pierce Transit’s Senior Management Team
- Community Workshops (3)
- City Council Study Session
- Cross District Association
- Master Builders Association
- Tacoma Pierce County Health Department’s Community Walking Audit of MLK Jr Way
- Planning Commission (2 presentations)
- Tacoma Area Commission on Disabilities
- Edison Community Based Services Area Board
- Community Council
- Tacoma Wheelmen
- West Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Association

Public input has been invaluable to this project, and has enabled the City to move forward with a better product for the City Council’s consideration. The public input received was considered by the City’s inter-departmental/inter-agency project work group. Based on their analysis of the issues, the work group formulated a number of recommended changes to the draft Guidelines. Staff recommended changes to the drafts are *written in blue and italicized*.

ABBREVIATIONS: Mixed-Use Centers Complete Streets Design Guidelines – *Mixed-use Centers Guidelines*
 Residential Complete Streets Design Guidelines – *Residential Guidelines*
 Mobility Master Plan 2010 – *MoMaP*

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
1. Adjacent Land Uses	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.2.1 Sidewalk Zone: Add to the end of the section the following sentence: <u>“Private developers are encouraged to provide destination and public gathering space, such as open courtyards and urban parks, along the widened sidewalk to create a pleasant and vibrant pedestrian environment.”</u>	Comment noted. The focus of the Guidelines is on the right of way. Adding comments related to land uses of the abutting property could confuse the reader. However, it would be useful to note the connection with land use regulations. <i>Add note to both Guidelines that they are to be used in conjunction with land use regulations pertaining to the abutting property, which in some cases would affect street designs.</i>
2. Adjacent Land Uses	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.3.1 Sidewalk: Consider adding a new sub-bullet <u>“Provide connectivity and access to urban parks, plazas and open courtyards</u>	Comment noted. See above.
3. Alleys	There does not seem to be much information on the use and development of residential alleys. Our alley system is a greatly underutilized asset and should be the preferred location for vehicular access, utilities and services.	Staff concur. <i>Add a discussion on alleys to both Guidelines, noting that they support provision of many Complete Streets features and should be the preferred method of vehicular access and provision of utilities and services. This should also be noted in the separate discussion of utilities.</i>
4. Amenities	Add language to the <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> indicating that Complete Streets should support the livability of Centers by creating a “park-like environment” and incorporating “urban parks” elements. Specifically: (1.) Section 1.2.1 (3): Support the livability of Mixed-Use Centers by providing transportation choices and integrating <u>urban park elements and</u> amenities that create a safe and inviting pedestrian environment. (2.) 1.2.2 (second bullet): Complete Streets contribute to a <u>linear form of urban park development that supports livable Mixed-Use Centers by providing public open space that integrates amenities such as including street trees, and widened boulevard and landscaping, street and sidewalk lighting, transit facilities, and street furniture, water feature and public art work.</u> (3.) Table 1.1 Supporting Policies (and the corresponding Appendix): Add <u>OS-MUC-8 “Public Streets as Linear Urban Parks”</u> .	Comments noted. These comments make reference to Policy OS-MUC-8 of the recently adopted Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element which calls for Mixed-use Centers streets to incorporate amenities and features that contribute to creating a park-like environment. Creating a safe and inviting environment incorporating features that add to a distinct “sense of place” is a central objective of these Guidelines. On the other hand, staff are uncertain whether the term “park-like” is always the most appropriate in this context—a great street may share features with a park, but is its own thing. Many of the specific changes suggested would seem to flesh out the idea of developing a “sense of place”. Therefore, staff recommend the following: <i>1. Concur – make change as noted.</i> <i>2. Make changes, except for “a linear form of urban park”.</i> <i>3. Concur – add Policy OS-MUC-8 to table.</i> <i>4. Concur – make change as noted.</i> <i>5. Disagree – no change recommended.</i> <i>6. Concur – make change as noted.</i> <i>7. Add “water features” but not “park-like environment”</i> <i>8. Concur – make change as noted but substitute “attractive” for “park-like”</i> <i>9. Disagree – no change recommended.</i>

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
	<p>(4.) 1.4.2 (second paragraph):Mixed-Use Center streets should provide ample space for retail and commerce, comfortable spaces for people to walk, <u>recreate, gather and linger</u>, and aesthetic features that contribute to the neighborhood’s distinctive character</p> <p>(5.) Add the adjective “park-like” before “amenities” or “pedestrian/amenity zone” etc. when described in the draft guidelines. This will emphasize the urban park ambiance that we would like to create through the complete street design. Examples include, but not limited to, bullets such as “2.2.1 <u>Park-like Sidewalk and Amenity Zone</u>”</p> <p>(6.) <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.2.1 (second bullet): Provide convenient access to local land uses, <u>urban parks and open plazas</u>, and transit.</p> <p>(7.) <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.2.1 Amenity Zone: ...Amenity zones <u>creating a park-like environment</u> help to buffer pedestrian from traffic, and may contain many of the amenity features that contribute to an attractive and vibrant streetscape; including <u>water feature</u>, street furniture.....</p> <p>(8.) <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Table 2.3.1 Under the Objective for Mainstreet, Avenue and Urban Residential: Consider adding “<u>Support park-like pedestrian environment, including widened sidewalks, vegetation, seating, public art</u>”</p> <p>(9.) <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.3.4 Objective (first bullet): Provide livable streets <u>in a park-like setting</u> for residents within Mixed-Use Centers.....</p> <p>(10.) <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.4.3 (first sentence): Street trees are an important component of Complete Streets in that they contribute to a comfortable pedestrian environment <u>in a park-like setting</u> and they effectively calm traffic.</p>	<p>10. Disagree – no change recommended.</p>
5. Background	<p><i>Residential Guidelines</i>: Expand background discussion in Section 1.2. Currently it focuses primarily on street conditions, sidewalks and disabled access ramps. Add a brief discussion of stormwater, street trees, utilities, and other disabled access issues.</p>	<p>Staff concur. Adding an overview of some of the conditions discussed later in the document would improve its overall consistency.</p> <p>Add a brief description of current conditions in residential streets related to stormwater management; street trees; utilities; and, disabled access.</p>
6. Bicycles	<p>I’d like to see a larger palette of options for bicycles beyond those shown in the Complete Streets Guidelines.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Guidelines contain a number of approaches for accommodating bicycles, including bike lanes, sharrows, separated bikeways and parallel bike routes. The approaches described are not intended to be exhaustive, but to provide the range of the most common and appropriate techniques. The Guidelines make clear that other approaches should be considered if they can meet the intent. Finally, the <i>MoMaP</i> will further analyze implementation options for bicycles and will add additional bicycle treatments to the City’s Guidelines.</p>
7. Bicycles	<p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Figure 2.1: Complete Street Zones identifies the function of each zone. Bike parking should be identified as a possible function of the parking zone. In addition, the median could be identified as a refuge for pedestrians crossing the street (particularly at identified mid-block crossings).</p>	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Revise as indicated.</p>
8. Bicycles	<p>The <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> includes bike lanes ranging from 4 to 6 feet. The minimum width should be 5 feet, and the appropriate range should be 5 to 6 feet.</p>	<p>Staff concur. While the draft <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> included 4 foot wide bike lanes in constrained circumstances as a method to fit everything without pushing out the curb line and/or removing existing features, numerous comments from citizens and traffic professionals have indicated that 5 to 6 feet is appropriate. Staff recommend the following changes:</p> <p>Alter the Guidelines to indicate an ideal 6 foot bike lane. Change all notations throughout the documents to indicate that the range is 5 to 6 feet.</p> <p>Revise <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Figure 2.3 (which currently shows 4 foot bike lanes) to remove the parking lane shown, and provide the following new dimensions: Sidewalks: 8 feet, Amenity Zones: 5, Bike Lanes: 6 feet, Outer traffic lanes: 11 feet, Inner traffic lanes: 10 feet. Revise accompanying text as necessary.</p> <p>Add a footnote to <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Figure 2.3 Avenue 80 Foot as follows: Bike Lanes should meet current channelization standards. Currently, standards for bike lanes require a minimum of 13 feet within the parking and bike lanes—in this case the ideal would be 7 feet for parking and 6 for the bike lane. Per current standards, if less than 13 feet</p>

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
9. Bicycles	<p>Shared Lane (Sharrows) <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i>: ‘Where bicycle lanes are not possible due to right-of-way constraints and on-street parking needs, a wide outside lane with painted sharrows is acceptable where travel speeds are 30 mph or less and traffic volumes are in the range of 10,000 – 20,000.’ Comment: The traffic volumes range is rather high. The City of Portland, in their evaluation for streets for sharrow application, start subtracting points from streets once ADT’s go above 10,000. In the San Francisco Shared Lane Marking Study that Alta performed for the City, we defined high ADT as greater than 4000 vehicles/lane, and moderate ADT as between 2000 – 4000 vehicles/lane.</p>	<p><i>is available, the interior bike lane line would not be striped.</i></p> <p>Staff concur. Sharrows can be the most appropriate bicycle treatment in certain situations. However, it should be emphasized that bike lanes are the ideal when space is available and should be used when practicable on Pedestrian Streets within Mixed-use Centers.</p> <p><i>Clarify throughout the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines that separate bike lanes are the ideal approach to accommodating bicycles on higher traffic streets within the Centers.</i></p> <p><i>Change the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines sentence cited to: "Where bicycle lanes are not possible due to right-of-way constraints and on-street parking needs, sharrow pavement markings can help better accommodate bicyclists on the roadway network." In regards to appropriate speeds, add a statement such as "sharrows are most appropriate on facilities where speed differentials between motor vehicles and bicycles are small. Sharrows should not be placed on facilities with vehicle speeds greater than 35 mph."</i></p>
10. Bicycles	<p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.3.1 Mainstreet Under Objective, 5th bullet states, “Bicycles are mixed with vehicles” Comment: This is an unclear statement, and I don’t think that mixing bikes and vehicles should be the objective of a Complete Street. In addition, Table 2.1 notes under the attributes of a Mainstreet – “Bicycles have separate lanes where enough ROW, otherwise sharrows.” The objective should be to provide bike lanes.</p>	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p><i>Clarify language as indicated.</i></p>
11. Bicycles	<p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Figure 2.2 Mainstreet Typology, 2-and 3-lane Comment: Neither of the proposed cross-sections show bike lanes, although Table 2.1 noted this was desired, as does the first bullet under Bicycles on page 27. An example should be provided that shows bicycle lanes on a 2-or 3-lane cross-section. Assuming that the pedestrian and amenity zone widths do not change, this would be a minimum of 54’ @ 7/5/10//10//10/5/7. This should be reflected in the Required Right-of-Way section that follows as well.</p>	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p><i>Add example illustrations showing separate bike lanes. Add a corresponding discussion in the Required Right-of-Way section.</i></p>
12. Bicycles	<p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Parallel Bicycle Routes: Parallel routes should only be considered when all other options have been exhausted; the language in this section should be strengthened to reflect that this is the last, and least desirable option from a Complete Streets viewpoint. It could also be noted that parallel routes – especially bike boulevards – are still desirable facilities even if bicycle facilities have been provided on the primary route.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><i>Clarify the discussion of parallel routes to indicate they may be appropriate and desirable in some cases, but that every effort should be made to safely accommodate bikes in some manner on all Mixed-use Center Streets.</i></p>
13. Bicycles	<p>Other Considerations <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i>: 2nd bullet – “In areas where there are parking lanes that are often empty of parked cars, thus encouraging bicyclists to ride in this lane, adequate signage and pavement markings should be installed to warn bicyclists of bulb-outs so that they know to move left before encountering the bulb-out.” Comment: Bicyclists should never be encouraged to ride in the parking zone. The statement doesn’t say this explicitly, but it does condone this behavior, especially with the recommendation for posting signs and markings, which is not appropriate behavior for bicyclists. If on-street parking is so little used, it should be considered for removal. In addition, if bicyclists feel the need to ride in the parking zone, perhaps the wrong facility type is being used on the roadway.</p>	<p>Staff concur. The issue of bulbouts as a potential hazard to cyclists riding in the parking zone has been identified through public comments. Currently, most streets lack explicit space for bicycles. This will be changing through implementation of Complete Streets. By indicating clearly where bicycles are expected within the right-of-way, the perception that the parking zone is where they should ride will be greatly reduced. This should obviate the need for any signage in the parking zone.</p> <p><i>Revise language to clarify that cycling in the parking lane is never encouraged and that the best approach is to clearly identify where within the street cyclists are expected to ride.</i></p>
14. Bicycles	<p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i>: 2.3.1 Mainstreet – Priority Elements Under Narrow Roadway, 1st bullet states, “Two 13- to 14 foot lanes is preferred. Vehicle speeds controlled by streetscape “friction” and bicycle sharrows.” Comment: Two 13- to 14 foot lanes is not a narrow roadway. Two 10- to 11 foot lanes is a narrow roadway, 12 foot lane is standard, 13+ is a wide lane. In the second part of the bullet, it is incorrect to state that vehicle speeds might be controlled by sharrows. Sharrows serve multiple purposes (Improve position of bicyclists and motorists, potentially reduce aggressive motorist behavior, indicate to bicyclists the correct positioning within the lane), but controlling vehicles speeds is not one of them.</p>	<p>Staff concur. The intent of the quoted language was to refer not to Sharrows alone, but to the various street elements proposed through the Complete Streets Guidelines, which together will tend to create “visual friction” and slow traffic speeds. However, as noted, the meaning should be clarified.</p> <p><i>Clarify language as indicated.</i></p>
15. Bicycles	<p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i>: 2.3.3 Transit Priority – Priority Elements Comment: Bicycles should have their own bullet that acknowledges that the preferred treatment is a bike lane per the Attributes column of Table 2.1. Currently, only shared lane scenarios are discussed, and bikes are not given a separate bullet, which minimizes their legitimacy in this scenario.</p>	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p><i>Add language as indicated.</i></p> <p><i>Add example illustrations showing separate bike lanes. Add a corresponding discussion in the Required Right-of-Way section.</i></p>

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
16. Bicycles	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : Figure 2.6 Transit Priority Typology 2- and 3-lane Comment: Neither of the proposed cross-sections show bike lanes, although Table 2.1 noted this was desired. An example should be provided that shows bicycle lanes on a 2- or 3-lane cross-section. In the 2-lane cross-section, the amenity zone could be made slightly smaller, as could the travel lanes, to accommodate bicycle lanes.	Staff concur. Clarify language and graphics as indicated.
17. Bicycles	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : We really support the use of Sharrows on streets in Tacoma. Sharrows are much more economical than street signs and may avoid the “signed route” problem where continued maintenance is required. An alternative would be to use “share the road” and “cyclists on road” signs to alert motorists and to show cyclists preferred roads.	Comments noted. Sharrows are one of the approaches recommended by the Guidelines, to be utilized as appropriate based on the Traffic Engineer’s evaluation.
18. Bicycles	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : I am glad that your report recognizes that supporting multi-modal transportation by connecting MUCs and other residential areas with transit stations is critical. Currently, there are no bikeways leading to the Commerce Street, Tacoma Dome, or TCC Transit Stations.	Comments noted. The <i>MoMaP</i> effort will focus on identifying appropriate routes to be designated and improved as bikeways.
19. Bicycles	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : Correction—the language should indicate bike lanes in the uphill “direction”, not side.	Staff concur. Clarify language as indicated.
20. Bicycles	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : page 2-18 : “Avoid placing bicycle lanes adjacent to angled on-street parking.” This seems contrary to our encouragement of back-in angle parking adjacent to bicycle lanes.	Staff concur. Clarify that bike lanes adjacent to back-in angle parking can be a desirable approach that enhances bicycle safety.
21. Bicycles	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : In the bicycle portion of the intersection discussion, the loop detector comment should be modified to recognize that video detection provides good bicycle detection--offer video detection as alternate (or preferred).	Staff concur. Video bike detection is a state of the art approach for triggering signals to change when bicyclists approach. Add a note to that effect to <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.2.5 where bike loops are discussed.
22. Center Turn Lanes	Eliminate center turn lanes to increase pedestrian and bicycle safety.	Comment noted. Many of the typologies outlined in the Guidelines utilize the space currently allocated to the center turn lane differently—as a planted median and/or pedestrian refuge, or by removing the center turn lane. Such actions may be done as part of a “road diet”.
23. Curb Extensions	Curb extensions (or bulb-outs) sometimes extend too far into the intersection and cause conflicts with bicycle movements. Consideration should be given to limiting the curb extension to the width of the [parked] cars (typically 1 foot less than the parking zone).	Staff concur. This was the intent and is already noted in the Guidelines. However, to clarify this there are additional places it should be noted. Add notes to this effect to <i>Residential Guidelines</i>, page 2-13 and elsewhere that curb extensions are mentioned.
24. Definitions	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Section 3.2 Introduction: states that, “A Complete Street is a road that is designed to be safe for drivers; bicyclists; transit vehicles and users; and pedestrians of all ages and abilities.” This statement does not sufficiently communicate the purpose or reason for Complete Streets. The overall idea of Complete Streets is expressed better later in the document, but as this is in the opening paragraph, this should be a stronger, more holistic statement of why Complete Streets are good, and why they are good for Tacoma.	Staff concur. Revise language to more fully describe Complete Streets goals, as defined by the City of Tacoma through this process.
25. Definitions	The term “Pedestrian Streets” as used in the <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> should be more clearly defined.	Staff concur. Clarify that this refers to MUC Comprehensive Plan designation as Pedestrian Streets. Specifically, this should be noted at <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Section 1.4.2 and Section 1.5, and elsewhere as needed to clarify this.
26. Persons with Disabilities	We recommend that specific language be added to the goals to ensure that safe and comfortable access is provided and maintained for people with disabilities within the Mixed-Use Centers; similar language as was used in the Residential Design Guidelines is appropriate.	Staff concur. The City’s ADA Coordinator and the Tacoma Area Commission on Persons with Disabilities provided timely input into the Complete Streets Project. Based on their input, staff are recommending a number of changes to the Guidelines, including creating a new section on access for persons with disabilities. These additions will support the Complete Streets goal of safely and comfortably accommodating everyone. Add a reference to persons with disabilities to <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Section 1.2.1 Complete Streets Goals, and to 1.2.2 Guiding Principles add the following: “Complete Streets provide safe and comfortable access for people with disabilities”. Add bullet to <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Section 2.2.1 which covers the Sidewalk and Amenity Zone indicating that this zone should also provide safe and comfortable access for persons with disabilities.
27. Persons with Disabilities	The Objectives of Complete Streets should be broadened to provide for the needs of people with a wide variety of different disabilities, such as persons who are blind or have low vision, people who are deaf or hard of hearing, persons with limited use of hands or	Staff concur. Ensure that the discussion in both Guidelines is clear in defining the objective of accommodating people with the full

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
	arms, individuals with a mobility disability who use a cane, crutches, braces, or a walker, in addition to persons who use wheelchairs.	<p>range of disabilities. Add references to PROWAG and ADA standards.</p> <p>Add a new Mixed-use Centers Guidelines Section addressing Access for Persons with Disabilities (the Residential Guidelines already contains such guidance in Section 2.3.1 Pedestrians and Persons with Disabilities).</p> <p>Add the following to the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines Table 2.1 Objectives- Mainstreet – Accessible features are to be systematically distributed Transit – Balance safety and accessibility on and crossing transit Urban Residential – Incorporate accessibility standards in designs</p>
28. Persons with Disabilities	Careful planning will be required to ensure that the proposed streetcar system and loading platforms are accessible to all people and to prevent the streetcar tracks themselves from becoming barriers to crossing movements by people with disabilities.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Add a note to that effect to the new Mixed-use Centers Guidelines Section on Access for Persons with Disabilities.</p> <p>Add the following bullet to the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines page 2-22, which refers to transit: Provide accessible load zones for people with disabilities that utilize accessible transportation. Paratransit and other accessible transit companies do not use bus stops.</p>
29. Persons with Disabilities	The City's ADA Coordinator should be added as a member of the Complete Streets Cross-Functional Team to ensure that the needs of people with disabilities are addressed.	<p>Comment noted. The City's ADA Coordinator is a member of the Cross-Functional Team.</p>
30. Persons with Disabilities	We would recommend that people with disabilities be included in the illustrations to send a reminder that Complete Streets are intended to serve the needs of a very broad range of users.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Revise some graphics to depict people with disabilities.</p>
31. Persons with Disabilities	Providing sidewalks on only one side of the street would impact on access for persons with disabilities.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Sidewalks are required on both sides in most cases, with the potential exception of some Green Streets designs. Such designs would need to provide safe and adequate access for people with disabilities.</p>
32. Persons with Disabilities	A number of specific items were identified pertaining to ensuring safe and convenient access for persons with disabilities.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Within the sections of both Guidelines addressing access for persons with disabilities, add the following specific guidance. Note—this is in addition to the guidance already contained within the Guidelines:</p> <p>Add language as needed, including to Mixed-use Centers Guidelines Section 2.2.2 Parking Zone, indicating that designated Handicapped spaces must meet ADA standards.</p> <p>Include guidelines to minimize vibration and slipping in intersections in Section 2.3.1 of the Residential Guidelines.</p> <p>Include guidelines to minimize vibration and slipping in 2.3.1 of the Residential Guidelines.</p> <p>Crosswalks are to be designed to minimize vibration and to have slip resistant utility plates, as is the case for sidewalks.</p> <p>Define and call for the installation of Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) features.</p> <p>Use audio crossing warnings or similar devices to help people with visual disabilities at intersections in the Mixed-use Centers as well as residential arterial street intersections.</p> <p>Install pedestrian push buttons that are audible or vibrate for those that are visually impaired to find.</p> <p>The preference in the Guidelines should be to cite current accessibility guidelines contained in PROWAG. Even though numbers, the preference is to include them anyway, such as cross slopes 0-2%.</p> <p>Provide handrails and landings along steep grades.</p> <p>Provide adequate tread height and length for stairways.</p> <p>Differentiate the amenity zone from the sidewalk path for the visually impaired. This will also help to keep landscaping clear of the minimum 5 ft. walking path.</p> <p>Provide benches for persons with disabilities to rest.</p>

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
		<i>Install curb ramps at all street crossings.</i>
33. Driver education	Driver education will be an essential strategy in improving bicycle and pedestrian safety.	Comment noted. Both the Complete Streets Guidelines project and the Mobility Master Plan are part of the City's efforts to begin to educate all stakeholders on these issues. Arguably the best method to educate drivers is by building Complete Streets elements in Tacoma, which will increase everyone's familiarity and understanding of these issues. These should be accompanied by ongoing education and outreach efforts.
34. Driveways	Driveways and parking areas should be designed to enhance the function of the street in terms of Complete Streets principles.	Staff concur. <i>Add language to both Guidelines indicating that the City's driveway and parking standards and regulations should be reviewed to determine opportunities to incorporate Complete Streets principles.</i>
35. Electric Carts	Please Include eventual provision of electric carts as an alternative transportation option.	Comment noted. Electric carts have not been a focus of this effort. They do not typically feature in Complete Streets guidelines. To our knowledge, few if any cities with similar characteristics to Tacoma are currently working to accommodate electric carts on a widespread basis. However, they may be further explored as part of the <i>MoMaP</i> effort.
36. Equity	How will Tacoma Complete Streets efforts impact poorer populations?	The City will strive to ensure that street improvements are distributed equitably throughout the City and will serve all members of the community. One of the primary objectives of the Residential portion of the project was to improve conditions in neighborhoods by adding sidewalks, curb and full street sections that can help to improve the appearance, safety and function of streets and thus improve the neighborhood. <i>Add a statement to both Guidelines indicating that the City will seek to distribute street improvements equitably and to serve all members of the community.</i>
37. Green Features	More emphasis and strong direction is needed on green features including Low Impact Development stormwater approaches. Green features should be required as the standard rather than just one of the options.	Comments noted. Green features are supported by the Comprehensive Plan and other City policies. Complete streets may also provide an excellent opportunity to fulfill an important element of the City's Stormwater Management Program by retrofitting structural stormwater controls in the public storm system to reduce flows and improve water quality of stormwater discharging to our waterways. Natural drainage systems and low impact development features such as bioretention cells, rain gardens and pervious pavement or other standard stormwater quality and flow control devices could be added to a complete streets design to retrofit a street with structural stormwater controls. Section 2.4.2 of the <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> indicates that LID stormwater approaches should be implemented when appropriate, reasonably feasible, effective and economical. However, through the public review process several opportunities to clarify this in the Guidelines have been identified. Staff recommend the following: <i>Add language to both Guidelines indicating that the opportunity to reduce environmental impacts by incorporating green features should be routinely considered for every project. Project designers should base their decision process on their expertise, community input, cost-benefits analysis of various potential approaches and other pertinent factors. They should document the decision process, and show their work demonstrating why the specific design was selected.</i> <i>Add a new paragraph and discussion to Mixed-use Centers Guidelines 2.2.1 Sidewalk and Amenity Zone, discussing Green Stormwater Features, and referring to full discussion at 2.4.2. Note that the City should always look for opportunities to reduce environmental impacts through incorporating green stormwater features when practicable.</i> <i>Residential Guidelines: Revise Section 2.4 Typologies to make the "Standard With Green Stormwater Features" the first typology in the section, and indicate that it should be the default for residential streets. The City of Tacoma's NPDES Permit directs the City to seek opportunities to increase stormwater infiltration incrementally, and projects within the public right-of-way are a promising method to do so. Making it the default would indicate that this typology is to be considered first, not that it would be required.</i> <i>Remove the following sentence from the current Section on Standard Streets: "The elements of this typology are likely to be applied to the majority of projects, at least in the near term". Residential Guidelines: Add a bullet to 2.4.1 Objective of Standard Typology that is should be employed when it is not practicable, cost-effective, desired by the neighborhood and/or judged inappropriate for site specific or functional reasons to incorporate green stormwater features.</i>
38. Green Features	Rain gardens and other similar green features could interfere with underground utilities.	Comment noted. The Guidelines indicate that green stormwater projects would need to be selected and designed to avoid conflicts. Some locations may not be appropriate due to conflicts with utilities or other issues.
39. Green Features	Currently traffic circles (at least in our neighborhood) are created without removing the underlying asphalt. The circle is built on top of the asphalt and then filled with dirt. This is not a great plant growing situation or much help with water percolation.	Staff concur. <i>Add a note to both Guidelines clarifying that cutting into the pavement should be the standard approach, in order to maximize stormwater benefits and tree and landscaping health.</i>

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
40. Green Features	What about rain water harvesting? Could it be incorporated somehow?	Comment noted. While rain water harvesting is a promising water conservation method, it would typically be applicable on a site developed with a building, rather than within the right-of-way.
41. Green Features	<i>Residential Guidelines</i> : Move mid 2 nd paragraph to beginning of paragraph – Furthermore, storm water flow (add control) and water quality requirements vary in different parts of the city, and will also vary depending (on) what is being done to a street i.e, widening, resurfacing, etc (2.4.2)	Staff concur. <i>Change wording as indicated.</i>
42. Green Features	<i>Residential Guidelines</i> : Instead of The benefits derived from low – The Applicability of some (2.4.2)	Staff concur. <i>Change wording as indicated.</i>
43. Health	Connect Complete Streets to health benefits – increasing outdoor opportunities in addition to improving pedestrian safety	Comment noted. Improving public health is an important objective of the Complete Streets movement, and is noted in the Guidelines as a primary goal. The Tacoma Pierce County Health Department has worked closely with the City on this project, and Complete Streets is identified as a priority by the Health Department’s strategic plan.
44. Implementation	How and when should the Guidelines be utilized to guide specific design projects? Are they directive or optional? What specific actions “trigger” the required elements? How should the choice between the typologies be made for specific projects?	Comments noted. Now that the Guidelines are being finalized, it is timely to clarify how they will be implemented through project design. Staff note that, in addition to guiding project design the Guidelines will also be used to update City code, standards and processes. <i>Add a new discussion to both Guidelines titled—“Applying These Guidelines” (or similar) (added to Section 2.1 of each). The section would provide a framework for City staff, and the public, to understand how and when to put the Guidelines into practice on specific design projects.</i> The new section would provide the following guidance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Guidelines’ stated objectives and intent are to be the drivers (innovation is welcome) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidelines are to be considered the default approaches/starting position ○ They should be applied and/or modified using professional judgment and community input tailored to the specific objectives of the project ○ If other approaches are identified that better meet the intent, they should be implemented ○ If departing from Guidelines, project designers must “show their work”—demonstrate why the alternative approach is more effective to meet the Complete Streets objectives/intent ○ Over time, the Guidelines are intended to be updated • The Guidelines set a baseline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Guidelines outline the essential features and characteristics of each street typology ○ Other features are optional when desired by the community and resources are available • When to apply the Guidelines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New and substantially rebuilt streets or street sections, whether built by the City or as part of private development, are to follow the Guidelines, as applicable (this threshold is to be applied in conjunction with thresholds built into City code and procedures). ○ Maintenance and minor alterations to the right-of-way do not require full implementation. However, such actions must not make conditions worse (depart further from Guidelines), and should incorporate incremental improvements as practicable. • How to determine which typologies/sections of the Guidelines to apply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Guidelines contain direction organized by subject, as well as by typology. Both are to be applied together, as appropriate to the project scope and objectives. ○ The Guidelines provide general direction for when to apply each typology. ○ Additional policy guidance is contained in the Comprehensive Plan and other City policies. ○ Project design will be guided by community input and City Council direction
45. Implementation	Promote interdepartmental coordination.	Comment noted. Interdepartmental coordination is one of the primary objectives, and outcomes, of this project. The <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> implementation discussion (Chapter 3) highlights this and includes specific recommendations to build more interdepartmental coordination. Cooperation will continue through implementation. A Cross-Functional Team has been convened, including members of various City departments as well as partner agencies.
46. Implementation	Determine a funding mechanism to finance improvements. Prioritize projects based on established criteria; and apply to both retrofit and new construction.	Comment noted. The <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> contains a funding analysis for implementing the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines intended as a resource for the City Council as they consider implementation options and costs. See above for staff’s recommendations for how the Guidelines should apply to new and retrofit construction.
47. Implementation	Create a Complete Streets typology for “connector streets” or key bicycle/pedestrian corridors; that link the mixed-use Centers, parks, and schools.	Comment noted. The current proposed Guidelines apply only to certain areas of the City. Additional design guidelines will be created through the

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
		<i>MoMaP</i> process in 2009-2010. Ultimately, staff are working toward assembling a single comprehensive set of street design guidelines for the whole City.
48. Implementation	Property owners need to retain control over the design of the streets abutting their property. Public participation should be improved.	Comments noted. Public Works will continue to seek to engage with and be guided by citizens and stakeholders in every project. Staff concur that public input must inform every street design. This is especially important as the City considers installing elements such as green stormwater features, traffic calming features and more street trees, which will require some amount of flexibility on the part of property owners (for example, a rain garden may eliminate parking in front of someone's property), and participation by property owners in maintenance activities. At the same time these Guidelines provide a broader range of options which can be tailored to specific project objectives and neighborhood interests. Finally, the Guidelines are intended to function as a communication tool to facilitate a broad participation in discussions of project designs.
49. Implementation	There should be a linking of Complete Streets guidelines to Mixed-use center land use permits – where a permit might trigger contributions to the 'complete streets' of a particular Center.	Comment noted. The <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> would apply to project requirements placed on developments within the Mixed-use Centers. The threshold for when a project will trigger street improvements is contained in the City Building and Zoning Codes.
50. Miscellaneous	Various minor corrections and formatting changes were recommended.	Staff concur. <i>Remove word Background under Acknowledgements page in both documents.</i> <i>Add notation below illustrations indicating that they are for illustrative purposes.</i> <i>Fix title Figure 2.4 should be 100 Foot, not 80.</i> <i>Mixed-use Guidelines Ch. 3.2 Pierce Transit should be listed as a Cross Functional Team Member.</i> <i>Add notations along the outer margin to aid in finding specific sections.</i> <i>Add a line for the adopting Resolution number.</i> Other corrections and minor edits will be made as needed as the final version is prepared.
51. Mobility Master Plan	Make sure Complete Streets are well coordinated and consistent with the Mobility Master Plan, so as to avoid potential conflicts. Consider the entire street network in strategic planning.	Comments noted. This has been a high priority for the project teams working on the <i>MoMaP</i> and the Complete Streets Project. The project teams are working together closely. There is a good deal of overlap between the projects, and a high need for coordination. At the same time, each project contains components that are unique. For example, the Complete Streets Project focuses on numerous issues in addition to mobility, including stormwater features, utilities and trees. The <i>MoMaP</i> focuses on system-level planning for citywide mobility networks. Where the two projects overlap is on mobility-related features at the block-level. Alta Planning + Design, the City's consultant on the <i>MoMaP</i> , has reviewed and provided extensive input into the Complete Streets Guidelines in order to work toward consistency. It should be noted that the <i>MoMaP</i> effort will be developing additional guidelines, especially for pedestrian and bicycle features, which will be added to the City's street guidelines. In addition, the Complete Streets Guidelines may be updated if changes are identified as necessary through the <i>MoMaP</i> process.
52. Mobility Master Plan	Priorities should be set at the policy level to indicate when and which streets will become green streets or non-motorized transportation corridors.	Comments noted. The Complete Streets Guidelines are intended primarily to develop standardized approaches which can apply Complete Streets principles on a case by case basis. They are not intended to designate transportation corridors—this will be a primary focus of the <i>MoMaP</i> effort. However, the Guidelines do contain direction on when each typology would typically apply to a given street. In regards to designating green streets, as has been done in other communities, this was not within the project scope. This could be the focus of a future implementation effort. At this time, development of a Green Street would need to be done as a pilot project, and active neighborhood support and advocacy would be required.
53. Mobility Master Plan	Tacoma's Municipal Code bans cyclists from sidewalks in the business districts. This law needs to be changed.	Comments noted. This issue falls within the scope of the <i>MoMaP</i> .
54. Mobility Master Plan	Numerous comments were received regarding specific streets and corridors.	Comments noted. Designation of specific transportation corridors, and potentially treatments for specific locations, will be considered through the <i>MoMaP</i> process.
55. Parking	All angled parking should be back-in angled parking (with the exception of angled parking on steep slopes where the car needs to back into the curb).	Staff concur. Significant comments from citizens and professionals were received indicating that back-in angle parking is safer than front-in angle parking, especially for bicyclists. Front-in angle parking was frequently cited as being over-utilized in Tacoma, detracting from the City's overall bicycle safety. Front-in angle parking is typically not appropriate adjacent to bike lanes. <i>Add language indicating that angled parking should typically be avoided on high traffic streets and on transit streets.</i> <i>Where angled parking is used, it should be back-in in most cases, with exception of angled parking on a steeply sloped</i>

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
		<p><i>street (which should be angled downhill).</i></p> <p><i>Indicate that back-in angle parking, on the other hand, can be a very appropriate treatment next to bike lanes since drivers can readily see oncoming cyclists.</i></p> <p><i>Alter illustrations and text where angled parking is discussed to indicate back-in angle parking.</i></p>
56. Parking	We need parking meters and enforcement.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This issue was not a focus of the Complete Streets project. However, it has been discussed through other City efforts.</p>
57. Parking	The <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Parking Zone can be an opportunity to add trees and landscaping as well as bicycle parking. Look at extra room within the amenity zone and parking zones as an opportunity to add in bicycle parking, trees and landscaping and/or green stormwater features.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p><i>Add trees and landscaping to the list of potentially appropriate features in the Parking Zone.</i></p> <p><i>Add a discussion to the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines indicating that “left over space” within the parking zone should be considered for bicycle parking, landscaping and trees and/or green features as opportunities arise.</i></p>
58. Planting area	Several property owners in our neighborhood have paved their parking strips. This is currently, I believe, illegal. However, those existing before a certain date are grandfathered. It seems then that the plan needs to address this problem.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>While the Guidelines set the direction for future street projects, they do not address enforcement. Future implementation steps could include a variety of funding and enforcement tools.</p>
59. Process	The newly formed Sustainable Tacoma Commission should be informed of the project.	Staff will make a presentation to the Sustainable Tacoma Commission in early November.
60. Process	How is the City of Tacoma coordinating its efforts with Pierce Transit?	Pierce Transit has worked closely with the City on this project, and will continue to do so through participation on the Complete Streets Multi-functional Team.
61. Process	We (the Master Builders Association) recently received the Residential Complete Streets Guidelines and would like to request more time to meet with staff to review the guidelines before a public hearing date is scheduled.	City staff will make a second presentation on the project to the Master Builders Association on October 8 th .
62. Road Diets	Do Road Diets – too many roads have more capacity than they need. Narrow down 4 lane to 2, etc.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Numerous comments were received indicating that Tacoma has many streets with more traffic capacity and space devoted to cars than is necessary, and that this detracts from safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Road diets are an effective tool used in many communities to reallocate space within the right-of-way more effectively. Road diets are discussed in the <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i>, but this discussion should be strengthened to indicate that road diets may in some cases be a vital step to achieving Complete Streets goals.</p> <p><i>Add detail to the discussion of road diets in the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines. Add a similar discussion to the Residential Guidelines. Indicate that the City should analyze street capacity throughout the City in light of the Guidelines and identify opportunities to implement road diets.</i></p>
63. Roundabouts	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : Roundabouts - while I am familiar with the accessibility discussion, I recommend removing the statement that "roundabouts can be barriers if intersecting rights-of-way have more than one lane in each direction." This over-simplifies the issue.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Roundabouts can be an appropriate intersection treatment that accomplishes many Complete Streets objectives in the right circumstances.</p> <p><i>Replace with something similar to the following: "roundabouts decrease vehicular speeds, and decrease pedestrian crossing distances. Roundabouts have been shown to improve intersection safety, and can they can help improve pedestrian safety and mobility. Roundabouts with more than one circulating lane, however, may need special attention to ensure adequate accommodation of pedestrians."</i></p>
64. Signage	The guidelines don't discuss or reference the city's new street signage program. Signage, both way finding and traffic, is a critical aspect of any overall street design.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>The MoMaP will likely explore options for pedestrian and bicycle signage.</p> <p><i>Add note to both Guidelines indicating that signage is an essential component and that AASHTO, City standards and Business District standards must be incorporated as appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines Section 2.2.5 Intersections already indicates: “Enhanced pavement/markings”; and, “enough illumination to light all four corners”. However, signage is not mentioned. Add “signage” to that discussion.</i></p>
65. Street Crossings	Retime Signals to account for slower walking speed.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Section 2.2.5 Intersections already indicates: “Provide adequate time for slower moving pedestrians (children, elderly, disabled)). The walk phase should be calibrated to 3.5 ft. per second or longer.</p> <p><i>Change the last sentence above to indicate instead that the walk phase should meet ADA standards.</i></p>
66. Street Crossings	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : Construct median refuges or sidewalk bulb-outs to shorten crossing distances	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Both are currently discussed in the <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i>. However, the following would further clarify that they are appropriate:</p>

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
		<p>Add “median refuges” to the first bullet in Mixed-use Centers Guidelines Section 2.2.5 Intersections (which already includes bulb-outs). Typically, median refuges are appropriate when you have wider roads (3 lanes or more) with higher volumes of traffic and speed, site distance issues.</p>
67. Street Crossings	<p><i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines:</i> Pedestrian portion of intersection discussion - suggest recommending pedestrian countdown heads, and recommending that where appropriate, signals incorporate audible pedestrian signals and vibrotactile push buttons.</p>	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Add this point to the Intersection discussion of the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines.</p>
68. Street Dimensions	<p>Retrofit of 24-28 foot wide, or narrower, residential streets should be allowed to rebuild to their current width if deemed acceptable by Traffic Engineer and neighborhood support is there.</p>	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>There is already a discussion to this effect regarding streets of 24-28 foot width.</p> <p>Clarify that even narrower streets may be appropriate, so long as the Traffic Engineer approves.</p>
69. Street Dimensions	<p>Wider residential streets are preferable for emergency services such as police. The wider the better.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>One of the main Complete Streets strategies is to strike a better balance between space for vehicles and accommodation for pedestrians and bicyclists. By narrowing streets in some cases this balance can be improved over current practices, while realizing environmental and cost savings. The Guidelines provide ample analysis of street width and the widths indicated accommodate emergency services in a manner appropriate to the type of street. Tacoma Fire, Police and other departments have reviewed the proposed widths and indicated they are acceptable.</p>
70. Street Dimensions	<p>Residential cul de sac width – Favor retaining 45 feet as the standard radius for cul de sacs (with or without a median in the center).</p> <p>Environmental Services Transmission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Vactor (sp?) trucks have a 45' turning radius 2) What about doing utility turnouts, such as those on Ruston? Easy for utilities to access and does not require closing a street or interrupting traffic. 	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>The draft <i>Residential Guidelines</i> contains a discussion of potentially narrowing the radius of cul de sacs from the City’s current 45 foot standard. However, feedback from various City departments has indicated that the 45 foot width should be maintained. All departments concurred that a landscaped island (potentially designed as a green stormwater feature) would be acceptable. Therefore, staff recommend the following changes:</p> <p>The typical cul de sac design will incorporate a planted center island (potentially designed as a rain garden).</p> <p>Remove discussion of narrowing the cul de sac width.</p> <p>Add note that cul de sacs should when practicable provide through connection for bicycles and pedestrians.</p> <p>Add note to consider utility turnouts as an option when feasible and appropriate.</p>
71. Support for Complete Streets	<p>The City received numerous expressions of support for Tacoma’s implementation of Complete Streets principles.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
72. Surface Water	<p><i>Residential Guidelines:</i> 2.3.5 The City of Tacoma surface water management manual (SWMM) provides guidance on surface and stormwater management features that are typically acceptable in Tacoma.</p>	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>The SWMM is the City’s guidance document for stormwater.</p> <p>Include note as indicated.</p>
73. Terminology	<p>Should the City utilize Complete Streets or a different term to describe the street design guidelines?</p>	<p>At two public meetings, questions have been raised whether “Complete Streets” is the best title for these Guidelines. Staff will be requesting that the Environment and Public Works Committee settle this question as the Guidelines move into the final phase.</p> <p>Whatever title the Environment and Public Works Committee chooses, staff recommend adding a discussion to the introduction of both documents placing the chosen title within the context of similar terms used by other communities.</p> <p>Two issues have been raised regarding the term. The first is that in some communities, Complete Streets is more narrowly defined, referring primarily to accommodating all travel modes—rather than to the other objectives that have been defined through this process (such as developing a sense of place or incorporating green features). However, in other communities the term Complete Streets is used more broadly. Through Tacoma’s adopted Complete Streets policy, and through these Guidelines, Tacoma has defined the term to reflect community priorities that go beyond strictly accommodating all types of travel modes.</p> <p>Another issue raised is that the term “Complete Streets” may be misconstrued to imply that every street has every type of street feature. This is a misconception of the term as it is intended and typically used. While each street design would incorporate Complete Streets principles, those principles would be applied as appropriate to the type of street, travel demand, community objectives and other factors. A local residential Complete Street is very different from a Mixed-use Center Pedestrian Street.</p> <p>The title of a policy document is an important communication tool. It should make sense to the community and help to communicate the fundamental principles. At the same time, there may not be a single universally preferred title. Any title the City Council chooses that represents the principles underlying this project would serve its purpose.</p>

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
		<p>There are several established terms used for similar concepts. The most widespread and recognized does seem to be “Complete Streets”. “Livable Streets” is also frequently used. Other less commonly used terms include “Living Streets” and “Balanced Streets”. There may be other established terms, or Tacoma could develop its own.</p> <p>The term “Complete Streets” has notable advantages. It has been in use for over a year and is associated with this project. It is used in several adopted City policies, including the Complete Streets policy adopted last year in the Transportation Element, the City’s Climate Action Plan, and other City policies. It is recognized and widely used by other organizations (such as the Tacoma Pierce County Health Department) and jurisdictions in our region. It is relatively well-known and recognized by the general public.</p>
74. Trails	The Guidelines do not mention unimproved surfaces (dirt paths). Dirt paths can be used by pedestrians and cyclists.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Trails are outside the scope of the current project, but could be a focus of the <i>MoMaP</i> or other future efforts.</p>
75. Transit	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : Section 2.2.1: A 5’ x 8’ boarding area is ADA minimum for a bus stop.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Add a note to that effect (page 2-15).</p>
76. Transit	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> : Page 2-27 says “stops no less than ¼ mile apart”. Density and destinations are really the driving factors with bus stop spacing. Currently in downtown areas we have bus stops as frequently as every block, which could be as little as 600’ apart. Instead of restricting bus stop spacing with a specific distance, maybe it would be better to say “bus stops where practical based on density and demand”. Just a suggestion. But saying “no less than ¼ mile apart is, based on current standards, too far apart in an urban setting.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Revise the <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> as indicated.</p>
77. Transit	Intersections must be designed for transit. “Autoturn” should be used, at a minimum, to determine intersection configurations. It’s imperative to also consider lane striping, parking, traffic flow direction and the bus route through the intersection.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>Autoturn is a computer program that is used to determine whether a vehicle of a specific size can safely turn given a proposed intersection design. The City will work with Pierce Transit through the Complete Streets Cross-Functional Team to ensure this issue is addressed.</p> <p>Add a note in <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Section 2.2.5 Intersections that conflicts with busses and other large vehicles must be minimized and the design must ensure safe turns for busses and other large vehicles. Indicate that bulb outs and other features should be designed specifically to avoid conflicts with busses and other large vehicles.</p>
78. Trees	Trees are a critical element of the Complete Streets program, and should receive more focus and attention in the Guidelines. The Guidelines need to address how they will work with the City’s Urban Forest Policy. The Guidelines need to show larger and a broader variety of trees.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p>The Guidelines were developed with input from the City Forester. However, since the draft Guidelines were prepared, additional work has been done on the Urban Forestry Policy, identifying opportunities to improve the Guidelines. Staff recommend the following changes reflecting the importance of trees to Complete Streets objectives; the desirability of a diverse community of trees; and, the need for additional space for trees, and less impervious surface, within the right-of-way. These recommendations were developed in consultation with the City Forester:</p> <p>Add a note to <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Section 1.3.3 and to <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.4.3 Street Trees and Landscaping, referencing the Urban Forestry Policy and Program.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph and discussion to <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> 2.2.1 Sidewalk and Amenity Zone, discussing Street Trees, and referring to the full discussion at Section 2.4.3. Indicate that street trees are an essential component of every streetscape and should be included in all projects. Refer to Urban Forestry Policy and Program.</p> <p>Add photos showing additional tree examples, including the following: tree located in the Parking Zone; mature residential trees; coniferous trees in commercial area; a tree trench; an appropriate tree located underneath power lines.</p> <p>Indicate that trees need larger tree pits to thrive. Add a note to <i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines</i> Figure 2.2: if smaller tree pits are necessary, preferably the pervious area should be enlarged using pervious pavement or other methods.</p> <p>Add a bullet to 3.2 Cross-Functional Team: Urban Forestry Policy and Program – The Team should work to implement the Urban Forestry Policy through providing input on tree and landscaping guidelines, and coordinating trees and landscaping with other activities within the right-of-way.</p> <p>Revise tree illustrations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make trees in cross-sections bigger in both Guidelines and on the covers of both documents. • MUC - Make tree holes larger in Figures 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 (overhead view). • MUC - Add some variety to trees in Figures 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 (overhead view). Variation could be color, outline

SUBJECT	COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDED CHANGES
		<p>or size.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>MUC - Figure 2.4: put a conifer in the center median on 100 ft Avenue (cross section and overhead views).</i> • <i>MUC - Figure 2.8 :Vary tree types on the Urban Residential typology (overhead view) – every other tree different in some way (size, color, edge).</i> • <i>RES – Figure 1.3 Existing Conditions: (Cross section view) Put in conifer on one side, add power pole on other side. (Overhead view): Add powerlines. Add one conifer. Make one tree bigger/different, show one tree missing.</i> • <i>RES – Fig 2.3: show berm at base of tree which is located in rain garden (like the one in the Urban Res Typology illustration)</i> • <i>RES – Figs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4: In cross section: Make one larger and the other a conifer, same in overhead view.</i> <p><i>Edit last bullet in Residential Guidelines Section 2.2: Support multiple City policy priorities: Replace GRTF with “Climate Action Plan”, add, “Urban Forestry Policy and Program,...”</i></p> <p><i>Residential Guidelines: Give Street Trees and Landscaping own bullet – move current 2.3.6 to become 2.3.3. Street trees should be integrated into every street design irrespective of which typology chosen. Note that designs should follow the Urban Forestry Policy and Program.</i></p>
79. Trees	<i>Mixed-use Centers Guidelines:</i> Plantings “14’ at maturity” sounds like there could be a clearance issue until the plantings reach maturity. We don’t want to damage our CNG tanks or the trees. Ch. 2.2.4 8’ min. tree height in the Median is not high enough.	<p>Staff concur.</p> <p><i>Add note to section 2.4.3 Street Trees and Landscaping, indicating that tree selection and maintenance must ensure safety and minimize conflicts with larger vehicles such as busses. Trees should be 14 feet at maturity over the vehicle zone. The right trees should be chosen to minimize conflicts with infrastructure and property owners.</i></p>
80. Undeveloped Streets	How do we treat undeveloped residential streets? Currently, when someone builds next to an undeveloped right-of-way, the City typically requires them to build the street. In some cases, it is unclear this is necessary or the best thing for the neighborhood. How can we consider alternative treatments, such as requiring only a pedestrian/bicycle connection?	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In residential areas that are already mostly built out, where streets were never connected through or built to be narrow, there should be flexibility in how to apply street improvement conditions.</p> <p><i>Add a discussion of Undeveloped Rights-of-way to the Residential Guidelines. Indicate that while the default requirement would be to develop a full street and sidewalk(s), this may not be necessary and/or desirable to the neighborhood. The need for this should be assessed by the Traffic Engineer, in consultation with other departments and the neighborhood. If there is not a clear traffic circulation, safety or other need for a full street, the Engineer may determine that a partial (skinny) street section is appropriate, that only a pedestrian/bicycle pathway or low-impact trail is appropriate, or that no improvements are necessary. Typically, an improved bicycle and pedestrian connection should still be provided. However, no improvements will be required when critical areas and/or habitat functions will be impacted, where topography is inappropriate and/or when there is no logical connection to be made.</i></p>
81. Utilities	<p>There is one large element missing from the guidelines – both in written and graphic form – and that is the situation regarding the overhead power lines. To make Complete Streets successful, the overhead lines need to be buried underground. If they are going to stay while the streets are improved the graphics need to show them staying (otherwise it gives a false impression of where we are now and where we are proposing to go).</p> <p>It is imperative that the Tacoma Public Utility Board be presented this Complete Streets Project Update as well. The Utility Board needs to be on board with the implementation and funding of a Complete Streets approach.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Project staff met with Tacoma Public Utilities staff to discuss the issues, and worked together on the following recommendations (staff note too that TPU staff have participated all along as part of the project team). Undergrounding utilities comes at a significant cost, and ultimately poses a policy question for the City Council and Public Utilities Board to consider. The Guidelines do clearly indicate that underground utilities are strongly favored over overhead facilities in Complete Streets designs.</p> <p>New residential streets are built with underground power, per Tacoma Municipal Code requirements. However, in the case of retrofits of existing streets, while undergrounding should be considered in each case, staff do not propose adding a requirement that relocating overhead power be required as part of every street project. Rather, staff would recommend that a proactive approach involving identifying a funding strategy would be the most effective method to address the issue. Staff propose the following changes to the Guidelines to better address this issue:</p> <p><i>Revise the discussion of overhead power lines in the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines to add further background and analysis of the issue. Additional discussion should cover cost issues, space limitations, conflicting needs and other pertinent factors, and should indicate how and when existing overhead facilities would be relocated underground.</i></p> <p><i>Add detail to Chapter 3 of the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines regarding the cost of relocating overhead utilities to underground locations.</i></p> <p><i>Add a discussion of utilities to the Residential Guidelines, summarizing the issues laid out in the Mixed-use Centers Guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>Revise illustrations in the Residential Guidelines to show power poles and overhead lines in the existing conditions illustration and potentially in other illustrations or graphics.</i></p>

