



City of Tacoma
Transportation Commission

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

MINUTES

MEETING: Regular Meeting
TIME: Wednesday, September 3rd, 5:30pm
PLACE: 9th Floor Visibility Center, Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402
PRESENT: Judi Hyman, Jacki Skaught, Andrew Strobel, John Thurlow, Jane Ann Moore,
Kristina Walker, Yoshi Kumara, Gary Hofmann
ABSENT: Justin Leighton, Michael Hutchinson, Vance Lelli

1. CALL TO ORDER

Jane Moore called the meeting to order at 5:30pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Michael Hutchinson, Justin Leighton, and Vance Lelli were absent.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jane Moore Comment: At the bottom of page 4, “but the group seems...”.

John Thurlow Comment: Page 2 – “recounted” or “reviewed” instead of “recanted”.
Minutes were approved with these two changes.

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. ELECTIONS – JANE MOORE

Justin and Jane’s tenure as chairs is expiring so the group must either elect new chairs or re-approve the current chairs. The group motioned and approved Justin and Jane as continuing chairs.

No questions.

B. SIX-YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – JENNIFER KAMMERZELL

Jennifer gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program, which the IPS Committee saw last week. The program is undergoing its update period now and there are 12 new projects currently proposed as well as some possible additional projects coming up.

It’s a capital improvement program – increasing capacity and level of service – rather than maintenance. Projects on this program are also grant eligible. The program is required by state law and must be adopted annually through a public hearing. Represents currently needed



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

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

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

projects and those expected for future needs. First 2 years of projects are usually fully funded and others are partially or unfunded.

There are 18 projects to be removed, which is larger than usual, because staff cleaned out the 6-year list of old projects. Once the new Transportation Element is adopted there will be another round of cleaning. 18 completed projects amounted to \$109 million, while \$42 million unfunded projects were cut. Completed projects include: Sprague Avenue gateway and Alaska Street reconstruction. 12 projects are being consolidated, such as Point Defiance Gateway Phases 1 and 2, Lincoln Avenue, and Port of Tacoma Road. Some of these decisions are based on available grant funding. Train to Mountain high-speed corridor was removed because it has been deemed infeasible. Some of these projects are still viable so staff intends to move these to the Comprehensive Plan Unfunded Project List.

Projects to be added amount to about \$25 million if not already funded and include:

- East 31st and East 32nd St rehabilitation on either side of Portland Avenue. This is a Puyallup Tribe project that would be funded by Bureau of Indian Affairs Allocation. The Tribe would do planning, design, and construction while the City would review the work order.
- LID 8660 Alley Paving: A majority of property owners have approved the project and will tax themselves.

Kristina Walker Question: Where does the \$49,000 come from?

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: Stormwater utility fees.

Andrew Strobel Question: Is the LID cost always split between adjacent residents?

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: Yes, but it also depends on what's being done on your frontage and also your value.

- Pacific Avenue crossing at 17th Street:
- Pedestrian Crossing Improvement Project: \$2.5 million comes from the general fund and includes ADA upgrades, beacons, bulbouts, median refuges, etc. Other departments contributed some additional funding to increase the total budget to \$3.09 million.

Other unfunded projects include: Puyallup River Bridge, Prairie Line Trail Phase 2, 2015 – 2016 Business District Allocation.

Jane Moore Question: What is the gas tax funding line?

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: The City gets a small portion of the motor vehicle fuel tax (MVFT) that goes towards paths and trails. Many times it's used as a matching fund for trails.

Complete Streets Updates

- Citywide Safety Project: this \$1.2 million project included numerous improvements around the City.
- Historic Water Ditch Trail Phase 2 and Signals
- Mildred Street
- Pacific Avenue and South 17th St Crossing
- \$2.5 million Pedestrian Safety Improvements
- Thea Foss Site 11
- Top 4 Bikeways
- Public Works Design Manual Update

Judi Hyman Question: Is this paint different and will it last longer?

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: It's thermal plastic and it's meant to be brighter and last longer.

Josh Diekmann Comment: It's estimated to last 10 times longer than existing paint and it includes glass bead specks to improve reflectivity.

Jacki Skaught Question: What is Thea Foss Site 11?

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: Provided a description of the project.

Kristina Walker Question: What is the Pacific and 17th project?

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: As described before.

Jennifer presented next steps and potential meeting dates.

Diane Wiatr Comment: Top 4 Bikeways Project is having a ribbon-cutting ceremony tomorrow at 5pm meeting at Wright Park with bike rides and a walk led by City officials.

No other questions.

C. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES – JOSH DIEKMANN

Kristina Walker Question: Is Tim planning to adopt the red / yellow / green level of service standards similar to BPTAG?

Dan Grayuski Response: We are bringing local transit service discussion back to the TC at an upcoming meeting and we do hope to determine the level of service performance measures at that meeting. The TC's feedback will be important here.

Jennifer Kammerzell Comment: Judi was curious about BPTAG's involvement and if there will be further opportunities for review. There will be further opportunities.

Josh gave an explanation of how the Planning Commission (PC) and Transportation Commission (TC) interact, including roles and responsibilities as well as the involvement of other groups.

The TC's responsibilities include:

- Advise on transportation related matters
- Design and implementation
- Planning – local, state, and federal
- Council requested actions

The resolution that creates the TC is very open-ended compared to the PC. The PC's responsibilities help shape the TC's responsibilities as well because they advise the PC. PC takes the lead on items specifically listed in state law and the city ordinance.

How do we address areas of overlap? TC is the lead on the TMP but it gets adopted into the Comp Plan, which the PC leads. We hope that the two commissions agree but if they do not then we intend to have had advanced and open discussions on any of these matters. Hopefully both bodies could give a unified recommendation to IPS.

Josh presented a chart of which groups take lead or advisory roles on different efforts. The TC takes the lead on the TMP, for example. For parking, however, several bodies take the lead depending on the aspect of parking.

Josh explained the TMP schedule over the coming weeks and months and how the TC should coordinate with the PC regarding document preparation so that the TMP can roll into the TE easily. Josh asked TC members to prepare themselves with any questions they may have about their role before the upcoming joint meeting.

Kristina Walker Comment: This information is helpful, especially since roles with multiple leads can be confusing.

Judy Hyman Comment: This chart was helpful and parking is a good example.

Andrew Strobel Comment: It would be helpful to know if we are out of sync with any of the other bodies and how staff digests these issues to come to a recommendation.

Jane Ann Moore Question: Do you have an example of how leadership would be shared between PC and TC on the 6-year program and CFP?

Josh Diekmann Comment: That is a good point and the Parking group may also be involved in some aspects. PC must ensure that the 6-year program is consistent with the Comp Plan and adopt it but the TC will get into more detail on the individual projects.

Jennifer Kammerzell Response: 6-year program is directly tied to CFP so all 6-yr projects go into CFP automatically. PC usually sees TIP and CFP at the same time to make sure that all projects are consistent with GMA and the Comp Plan.

No other questions.

D. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES – JUSTIN RESNICK

Justin explained that this draft of the TMP goals and policies builds on the Commission's previous work putting together the Vision Statement, Guiding Principles, and Goals. The Commission suggested potential policies for each goal in a previous meeting and reviewed draft land use policies in a follow up. This draft adds to that previous work by assembling policies from the existing Transportation Element, Mobility Master Plan, Subarea Plans, recent City Council adoptions, and other identified policy priorities.

Justin sought feedback on whether the draft document misses any important policies or is unclear on any topics. He also asked the Commission to specifically consider policies that they would like to discuss with the Planning Commission at the September 17th joint meeting to ensure agreement.

Dan Grayuski clarified that the Commission did not have the existing Transportation Element or Mobility Master Plan policies in front of them because this draft is meant to be a distillation of those documents. He also mentioned that the draft doesn't explicitly call out pedestrians and bicyclists in the policy titles but rather mentions them throughout several policies and the Commission may prefer to be more explicit.

The Commission members broke up into two groups to review the policies. Group 1 reviewed goals 1, 2, and 5. Group 2 reviewed goals 3 and 4. Both groups reviewed goal 6. Feedback included the following, listed for each goal:

- 1.2) Businesses = citizens
- 2.3) Add “businesses”
 - Non-motorized category
 - Motorized category
- 3.5) LOS standards should be discussed w/ PC
- 3.7) “Trails” – not “Connectivity”
- 3.9) Skateboarding called out specifically, but not included in active transportation – either define active transportation with all intended modes or say non-motorized / motorized.
- 4.4) “Slow the increase” not strong enough, consider using decrease.
- 4.5) “Consider” – it’s already been approved
- 4.6) Electric bikes? Define EV
 - Electric vehicle stations
- 4.8) Mode split targets are specific – be more specific or general
 - Define mode
- 4.9) Street maintenance & rehabilitation – overweight vehicles are own category
- 4.10) Delete “to the extent feasible”
- 5.1) Covers a lot, too large
- 5.7) Car-sharing sounds in the moment (Uber), avoid language going out of date. Make it more general about reducing car ownership.
- 6) Language to eliminate agency names – generalize
- 6.1) Design considerations for land use
- 6.2) Add “Addressing living close to work”
 - Connectivity is used twice – intermodal & business district/locations (more like 3.7, but not trails...citywide)
- 6.4) Change from economic bases to employment centers
- 6.5) What inconveniences affected property owners? Eminent domain
- 6.10-6.11) Deleted language & reword
 - Parking – higher level
 - Mention Parking Technical Advisory Group specifically

General Comments

- We should consider the effects of developments on the transportation system and have standards for this.
- Some of these policies vary in level of specificity, should smoothen them out.
- Consider categorizing by mode and referencing all modes specifically.
- Might not want to mention organizations / efforts by name as they may age the document.

No other questions.

5. Other Business

BPTAG hasn’t met since the last TC meeting but they’re planning to gather at the upcoming Greendrinks social at the Tap Room.

Parking TAG update: Ruston Point project is an agenda item for the September 18th meeting from 4:30 – 6:30 at UPS.

6. STAFF REPORTS

Joint meeting with Planning Commission on September 17th at 5pm in Room 16. PC will start at 4 and convene as a joint session at 5, followed by the TC reconvening at 6.

PC has two vacancies: environmental community and public transportation. Meet twice a month from 4-6pm.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

8. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 7:24pm.