



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:** Joint Meeting with Planning Commission

**TIME:** Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 5:00pm

**PLACE:** Council Chambers, Tacoma Municipal Building  
747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402

**PRESENT:** Transportation Commission  
Justin Leighton, Jane Moore, Yoshi Kumara, Andrew Strobel, John Thurlow,  
Mike Hutchinson, Kristina Walker, Judi Hyman, Vance Lelli, Jacki Skaught

Planning Commission  
Scott Winship, Chris Beale, Stephen Wamback, Alexandria Teague, Benjamin  
Fields, Donald Erickson, Tina Lee, Erle Thompson

**ABSENT:** Gary Hofmann, Sean Gaffney.

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Winship called the joint meeting to order at 5:30pm.

### 2. ROLL CALL

Gary Hofmann and Sean Gaffney were absent. Jacki Skaught arrived at 6:10pm.

Brian Boudet kicked off the joint meeting by stating the importance of bringing the two commissions together as the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) paves the way for significant efforts as the city updates its Comprehensive Plan.

Josh Diekmann introduced Kendra Breiland from Fehr & Peers to provide an overview of the TMP efforts to date.

### 3. BUSINESS ITEMS

#### A. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN – INTRODUCTION (KENDRA BREILAND)

Kendra explained the Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements for the Transportation Element (TE) of a Comprehensive Plan and which other agencies and bodies are involved. Key principles include: planning for all road users, complete streets / networks, using the full public right-of-way, being sensitive to the context of streets across the city, and building realistic expectations for different users on different streets.

The TMP is about half way through the process and the consultant team is starting to pull all the pieces together for a draft by the end of the year. The TC has been reviewing all of the individual modal networks and will begin laying them together in October as part of the two-stage process.



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>

The plan will bring everything together using the Layered Network concept to form level of service standards and determine system investments.

No questions.

**B. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN – GOALS AND POLICIES (JUSTIN RESNICK)**

Justin looked more specifically at Goals and Policies developed with the TC. Discussion with TC two weeks ago looked at draft goals and policies and received feedback, which was incorporated in the week-out packet. The updated new draft was handed out and reflected any comments received from the week-out packet version. Focus tonight was on Goal #6, which deals with land use.

Six goals are the high-level directives, while the policies focus on more detailed steps for the plan. The focus tonight was primarily on the policies.

*Kristina Walker Question:* With these new policies, are old policies removed?

*Justin Resnick Response:* Meetings with BPTAG specifically focused on bringing in policies / goals from the Mobility Master Plan (MoMaP), which will be updated as part of the TMP. High priorities in MoMaP will be brought into the TMP Goals and Policies, which are then included in the TE.

*Justin Leighton Comment:* Good policies are in MoMaP, so it should come to the commission on what should stay or go. He would like to see what has been removed and not included, in addition to what is being brought in.

*Justin Resnick Response:* We have pulled some policies from MoMaP directly into this document while others have been adapted into other policies, but the consultants will provide a roadmap.

*Jane Moore Question:* Is the Thursday meeting with staff on this topic?

*Justin Resnick Response:* Yes, staff and the consultant team are meeting to determine how to include the MoMaP as part of the TMP.

*Steve Wamback Comment:* Breaking into groups won't allow the meeting to be recorded completely, not comfortable dividing since the public won't see everything.

*Lee Response:* Preferable to not do groups then.

Justin R. highlighted particular policies that the TC would like to discuss in the joint meeting.

**Policy 6.9 and the “Cut” policy**

Justin explained the importance of reviewing policies between PC and TC by using two draft parking policies as examples. People mentioned previously that 6.9 was specifically related to Downtown parking systems. Policy 6.9 came from the existing transportation element, with the last phrase a new addition. The “cut” policy was from the LU element and has conflicting recommendations around parking. This discrepancy highlights why it's important to have this discussion to ensure that no two policies conflict.

This policy focuses parking management on mixed-use centers, aiming to reflect the policy that was cut.

*Justin Leighton Question:* Wouldn't we want to limit parking downtown?

*Justin Resnick Response:* The policy does not specify exactly how parking management will be performed Downtown, but specifies that parking stakeholders should determine how this is done.

*Kristina Walker Comment:* Take the piece "outside of growth centers" out as it makes it seem like we're not trying to limit parking inside MUC.

### **Policy 6.8 on development incentives**

*Erickson Comment:* Redundant of what is already in the LU element.

*Justin Resnick Response:* Just meant to reference that policy in the LU element. We can add a direct reference.

*Justin Leighton Follow-Up:* Are their policies in the LU element that reference something of this nature?

*Beale Comment:* Yes.

### **Policy 6.7**

Calling out the Mixed Use Centers (MUCs), was not in the TE, brought in from the MUC Complete Street Design Guide.

### **Policy 6.6**

Came from the existing element.

### **Policy 6.5**

This policy refers to how the city will act and employ their powers over street rights of way, such as the situation when the city needs to take land. The city will attempt to get that process moving as early as possible while minimizing impacts on landowners.

*Beale Question:* What about other purposes than transportation or recreation for trees or other elements? Are trees infrastructure? Specify that this policy can include planter strips for example. Recreational purposes doesn't directly specify this.

*Kristina Walker Question:* Had a discussion on parklets last Friday, and would parklets be covered under this policy? I understand that City of Olympia prohibited "business transactions" which kept it under a public realm.

*Steve Wamback Comment:* Actual policy is buried in the first implementation step. Policies should clearly be policing something, and if there is an action, make sure it is clearly defined. "Establish procedures" is an implementation step. First step is actually the policy of "preserving ROW", state that first.

### **Policy 6.4**

Using the term growth centers, which refers to MUC and neighborhood districts. Keeps it flexible.

*Fields Question:* Do we define growth centers somewhere?

*Justin Resnick Response:* No we don't, so we should define the term.

*Beale Comment:* Put in a definition section to clarify many of these terms (i.e., 20-minute neighborhood).

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* We should define terms and specify what we mean by growth centers vs what the PSRC or city may mean by growth centers.

### **6.3, 20-min neighborhoods**

*Erickson Comment:* Synonymous with neighborhood centers? Artificial distances that can be covered in 20-minutes, especially with Stadium District, there are many older people that are not at the average speed.

*Justin Resnick Response:* Well-taken point. Took a broader size of 20-minute to err towards being inclusive, in order to keep the shed as expanded as possible. May look at the core first of the 20-min neighborhoods. Didn't want to cut off the edges arbitrarily.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* There is value in identifying the neighborhoods, as is it helps prioritize projects that are clearly within a walkshed given terrain constraints.

*Beale Question:* Outlining the 3-Ds is good. Overarching thought: do we have a policy on street grid layout, such as discouraging cul-de-sacs, etc.?

*Jane Moore Response:* Policy 3.3 provides the language "strongly discourages cul-de-sacs".

*Beale Comment:* Good.

### **Policy 6.2**

Jobs / housing piece was brought up by TC at the last meeting.

*Kristina Walker Comment:* Would like to have this called out and highlighted. Be more specific about opportunities to live near the workplace because jobs-housing balance can still require a lot of travel if jobs and housing for individuals are not located in the same place.

### **Policy 6.1**

Builds on a comment from the TC at the last meeting. When development will have an effect on the transportation system, this will go into concurrency. We aren't there yet on how to handle concurrency, but that is where it will be discussed.

*Erickson Question:* Through the Downtown Subarea plans, didn't we decide that there's no concurrency plan? So the last sentence speaks to impact fees that may be in conflict with the Subarea plans.

*Josh Diekmann Response:* The city may have to look at impact fees to pay for the growth if the subarea plan growth is realized. Even if we rely on other modes, we'll have to make improvements to the other modes to accommodate growth.

*Erickson Comment:* Thought that first 10 years, there wouldn't be impact fees.

*Josh Diekmann Response:* Certain quantity of development that can be accommodated for now, once thresholds are reached, Impact fees/improvements may be needed

*Steve Wamback Comment:* We're looking at 30 million square feet of new development, 30k jobs and 60k people for the 3 subarea plans. That will happen before we start to look at improvements. This will be part of a programmatic environmental review system, where new development will not have to pay for growth as it falls within the original 30 million square feet of development

*Erickson Follow-Up:* Was it 30 million in south downtown, 30 million north downtown and 30 million hilltop?

*Steve Wambach Response:* Yes, public wanted that development. But we are giving up the last sentence in policy 6.1, so we must be clear that we're creating a controversy artificially.

Justin Resnick requested any additional comments on these in the next 2 weeks. We will skip the LOS policies for tonight because they are still in draft form and in the interest of time.

*Jane Moore Question:* Was decision made on whether to do red-yellow-green or ABCDEF for LOS standards?

*Justin Resnick Response:* Transit may be four levels, but that decision has not been made. Overall, we are leaning towards something that is digestible.

*Kendra Breiland Comment:* Red-yellow-green works, but nothing says that all modes must be parallel, so we want something that will be easy to implement.

*Lee Comment:* We wanted to add LOS and don't want it to conflict with other elements of the plan or other EIS documents. The A through F scheme is the standard most commonly known, so may be unclear if there is a new standard.

No other questions.

### **C. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN – 20-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOODS (JANE MOORE & JUSTIN RESNICK)**

Jane gave an overview on 20-minute neighborhoods, and the work with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Advisory Group (BPTAG). BPTAG picked the 20-minute neighborhood concept to help develop the pedestrian network. It helps capture all of the activities that people walk to within MUCs, parks, etc. It's based on the 3-Ds, to be explained by Justin.

Justin summarized the factors that were used for the 20-minute neighborhood analysis, which is based on research from cities such as Portland. The factors include population density, destinations that are attractive for walking, and friction of distance for walking. Justin broke down each of the factors into its component parts as well.

The existing map shows how suitable areas of Tacoma are for walking today. Moving to the future, it allocates all of the 2040 land use growth, which is primarily to the MUCs. This has been reviewed by BPTAG and the TC to check for reasonableness.

Jane acknowledged that not everyone can walk a mile in 20 minutes, but it's a good conservative standard that expands the area that is analyzed, rather than restricting it.

*Teague Question:* For the MUCs that have no development and are stagnant, will the areas that are red and within MUCs be the focus regardless of how the MUC actually is developing?

*Justin Resnick Response:* Input on potential removal of MUCs from accepting certain levels of growth can be accounted for and shifted.

*Andrew Strobel Question:* What about the Point Ruston MUC?

*Stephen Atkinson Response:* The Point Ruston MUC was recently approved so that will be updated. The 20-minute neighborhoods analysis is an analytical tool that Makers can use as part of the land use element update. This work will help with marketing the city to identify

neighborhoods that are walkable and vibrant. It also helps point out where there are growth deficiencies (TCC is a good example) so this will help inform the MUC review.

*Steve Wamback Question:* What is happening to the neighborhoods that have high potential now, but not in the future? SW corner of the city is a good example near Narrows Marina and there are a few other sections.

*Justin Leighton Comment:* Looks like it may just be a coding issue in GIS.

*Justin Resnick Response:* The model may be sensitive to areas where there aren't businesses now, but retail moves in and it shifts the intensity dot. Certainly the check of these is needed.

*Stephen Atkinson Comment:* The factors were all weighted evenly, and perhaps some calibration may help to adjust weights.

*Justin Resnick Comment:* This analysis is only used for guidance and isn't the end-all-be-all method for prioritization.

*Erickson Question:* Does the analysis account for the current LU growth figures?

*Stephen Atkinson Response:* It has incorporated the buildable lands analysis, the subarea plans, and the transportation modeling. A lot of the red in those centers shows that more density has been planned for.

*Erickson Comment:* There are some "high potential" areas that are outside of the MUC, so is the zoning set to accommodate that demand?

*Justin Resnick Response:* We will check on whether those areas are zoned for that level of LU growth.

*Vance Lelli Question:* What about the area that has high red on the east side of the waterway? Are we trying to make that a 20-minute neighborhood?

*Justin Resnick Response:* The areas we are focused on, which are not all of the areas that are red, appear in the next slides where we highlighted the arterials and collectors that will be focused on within the 20-minute neighborhoods.

*Steve Wamback Comment:* The 20-min neighborhood concept is appealing and works well with the MUC policy discussion they are having as a PC. Hoping that both staffs can work together on this. 20-minute neighborhoods are really a land use planning element, even more than transportation. Appreciative of work done, but let's make sure nothing is being repeated.

*Andrew Strobel Question:* How will the timing of the MUC update work with the TMP update and the 20-minute neighborhoods?

*Stephen Atkinson Response:* The scope of work with Makers includes a look at the MUCs, in that they have grown in number, so prioritization is key. The intent over the next 6 months is to develop the analytical work to answer whether zoning or boundaries need to be changed for the MUCs to prioritize resources. There is crossover from the transportation side and the LU side.

*Andrew Strobel Follow-Up:* Does any mapping done in the TMP need to be reviewed after being adopted to fit with the MUC update process.

*Stephen Atkinson Response:* That is something that can be revisited.

*Justin Leighton Comment:* Land use should drive the transportation network, so communication should continue between PC / TC / etc. to ensure consistency.

Kendra closed by saying that 20-minute neighborhoods were used to prioritize where pedestrian improvements should go. We'll also be looking at transit / bike / auto priority as well and the 20-minute neighborhoods as a tool as part of that prioritization. The maps will have language to convey that. The 20-minute neighborhoods will not be the only driver of the pedestrian network.

No other questions.

#### **4. CALL TO ORDER**

#### **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Judy's name was misspelled on page 4. Minutes were approved with this correction.

#### **6. BUSINESS ITEMS**

##### **A. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN – FREIGHT & AUTO MODE (AARON GOOZE)**

Aaron introduced preliminary transportation model results, objectives for improving the auto and freight networks, and initial discussion of auto / freight LOS standards.

*Kristina Walker Question:* What about conflicts?

*Aaron Gooze Response:* We will work through these conflict areas in future meetings. This draft is considering the freight and auto networks absent from interaction with other modes.

*Yoshi Kumara Question:* What is an auto priority corridor? Do these lines drop off because the streets no longer become auto corridors?

*Kendra Breiland Response:* Priority auto corridors are streets where we want to provide good mobility for automobiles.

*Justin Leighton Follow-Up:* Are we thinking of these as arterials?

*Kendra Breiland Response:* Yes, generally.

*Kristina Walker Question:* Ruston looks unconnected, why is that?

*Justin Leighton Comment:* Pacific Ave to Parkland ends at 84<sup>th</sup>, should it? 56<sup>th</sup> to UP should also be a priority auto street.

*John Thurlow Comment:* There's an inconsistency between freight and auto on some state facilities. Even though they're not under our jurisdiction we should still denote them appropriately.

*Justin Leighton Comment:* Once they leave a state facility, vehicles are under Tacoma's jurisdiction.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* The city also holds the ability to coordinate with the state and other jurisdictions.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* Connect Ruston Way to Baltimore St.

*Kristina Walker Comment:* Right now this looks like there's nowhere to get around in a car.

*Josh Diekmann Response:* When these lines end, it doesn't mean that cars can no longer drive here, it just means that the prioritization for autos ends.

*Justin Leighton Question:* How is auto prioritization done?

*Aaron Gooze Response:* We're not at the point of discussing implementation strategies yet but we'll get there.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* The TC's effort at identifying priority auto corridors was a fairly quick exercise so the consultant team should complete them to the extent they deem it necessary.

*Jacki Skaught Comment:* Agrees that we should continue to refine the network.

*Kristina Walker Comment:* We should be careful during public outreach with how we present these maps. Add I-5 and SR-16.

*Jennifer Kammerzell Comment on behalf of Judi Hyman:* 9<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, and 21<sup>st</sup> should be included since they are freeway connections.

Aaron next presented the freight priority corridors for review.

*Kristina Walker Question:* Heavy haul is a designation in code or policy but is freight priority the same? Shouldn't the heavy haul corridors be part of the freight priority?

*Aaron Gooze Response:* We can update them as such.

*Justin Leighton Question:* We thought mainly about manufacturing and industrial centers but what about big box retail?

*Kendra Breiland Response:* If there isn't a huge share of trucks then the auto network generally covers these deliveries.

*Jacki Skaught Comment:* Pearl is an interesting example due to the ferry connection to Vashon and along 30<sup>th</sup> to avoid 6<sup>th</sup>.

*Vance Lelli Comment:* Dealing with trucks involves timing of signals and damage to roads.

Calling Pearl a heavy haul street seems out of place even though some trucks use it currently.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* We want to set routes that make sense.

*Vance Lelli Comment:* The Port is designed really well for circulating trucks but the closing of 11<sup>th</sup> St has made that really difficult because all the trucks must now get onto SR-509.

*Justin Leighton Response:* We are designing these networks in an aspirational way. We do hope the 11<sup>th</sup> St Bridge could be included and reopened.

*Justin Leighton Question:* Are the pieces adjacent to 72<sup>nd</sup> for big box retail access?

*Andrew Strobel Follow-Up:* Where does the responsibility for freight streets start and end? Adjacent to freeway off-ramps or further along?

*Justin Leighton Question:* So are the trucks all going to the big box retail or are we simply unconcerned? This seems inconsistent with leaving some other streets off the freight network. We should stay consistent.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* We should look at the percentage of trucks and how far out the corridors they go.

*Yoshi Kumara Comment:* We should get rid of the wings off I-5 because big box retail deliveries don't compare to the frequency of trucks in the Port area.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* Trucks use some other corridors though and we need to decide how to reflect these.

*Josh Diekmann Comment:* This is consistent with completing the corridors.



*Kristina Walker Comment:* Would be worth finding data on how many trucks go to the ferry to make a determination on Pearl.

*Josh Diekmann Comment:* Design criteria become crucial when we prioritize large truck movements so we should be purposeful when prioritizing freight versus other modes.

*Justin Leighton Comment:* Maybe we want to exclude Portland Ave off of D St. Pull McKinley. Add SR-99 to Portland. We also want to get freight out of South Downtown and the Dome without using Puyallup.

*Evette Mason Response:* Pac Hwy over the Puyallup River Bridge can't happen currently but may in the future.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* We should also look to the Port for guidance on potential expansion of the heavy haul corridors.

*Evette Mason Response:* Connection to Center from SR-16 along Union is a steep grade. We should be careful about how this would mix with Mall traffic.

Aaron next moved onto the 2040 model runs, which include 2040 land use and the current street network. The hotspots on the map refer to roadway links that perform worse than level of service E based on volume to capacity ratio.

*Justin Leighton Question:* Are we saying that downtown has no bad congestion?

*Kendra Breiland Response:* We pulled off the state routes since they're outside of city jurisdiction.

*Andrew Strobel Follow-Up:* So aren't dense traffic areas downtown today already hotspots?

*Kendra Breiland Response:* Downtown has a very dense grid network so the model can miss this. Downtown is also much more walkable so it will generate fewer trips than areas outside of downtown Tacoma.

*Justin Leighton Question:* How does the 2014 baseline look in terms of hotspots? It would be good to know if certain areas get worse in comparison.

*Aaron Gooze Response:* The existing hotspots show less in the southeast portion of the city but the ramp terminals are still an issue.

The following map added projects that are currently on the books to see if they address initial need. Generally we are seeing projects that may help address these potential issues.

The Commission next discussed ways to address future congestion. Aaron asked commissioners for their feelings on the list of roadway treatments, where they might be applied, and whether the city is willing to accept higher levels of congestion.

*Jane Moore Question:* What is ITS?

*Aaron Gooze Response:* Intelligent Transportation Systems include adaptive signal control, variable message signs.

*Justin Leighton Question:* Not ok with added lane capacity because the city is built out. Roundabouts can work well. How do road diets serve as congestion relief?

*Aaron Gooze Response:* These strategies are not entirely about congestion relief. Perhaps volumes on some corridors don't warrant the number of existing travel lanes.

*Vance Lelli Comment:* Caution against roundabouts for emergency access issues. Neighborhood traffic circles are fine but bigger ones are an issue.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* Add one-way street couplets as a potential treatment.

*Justin Leighton Question:* Does the at-grade train crossing around 30<sup>th</sup> have anything to do with the congestion on 30<sup>th</sup> St hill to Schuster Parkway?

*Jennifer Kammerzell Response:* The city does not get many complaints about the railroad crossing. Congestion seems mainly due to going up the hill.

*Mike Hutchinson Question:* What growth is happening on the north end to drive this hotspot?

*Justin Leighton Response:* High-rise development by Proctor.

*Jane Moore Comment:* Channelized right turn lanes should only go from one auto priority street to another to protect pedestrian safety.

*Justin Leighton Comment:* Some congestion is acceptable and encourages people to take other modes. Is congestion on 30<sup>th</sup> only for one hour a day and adding 5 minutes to the commute?

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* Given the need for this plan to be fiscally feasible we need to be discerning with where we try to address congestion.

Aaron presented an example from the city of Kent of how expensive it can be to aim for a better level of service standard. Going from E to D in Kent would cost an additional \$7M in existing deficiencies. Tacoma's current level of service standards look at lane-miles of street and at what LOS grade they function. Going forward, we should consider different methods of calculating level of service, some of which are more goal-oriented and less about measuring specific values.

*Andrew Strobel Comment:* Having an LOS standard is a good thing because it sets targets and holds developers responsible when they affect the transportation system.

*Justin Leighton Question:* What comes next for the TMP?

*Kendra Breiland Response:* We will refine the auto network and coordinate with the Port. The next meeting will include laying the networks together.

## **7. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. PARKING TASK FORCE**

The next meeting is tomorrow at UPS.

## **8. STAFF REPORTS**

None.

## **9. PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Strategic Planning Committee is holding another meeting on infrastructure and built environment so Commissioners may wish to attend.

Ribbon cutting for the Prairie Line Trail at UW-T includes walking and bike rides on Thursday the 25<sup>th</sup>.

Downtown to Defiance is next Sunday, the 28<sup>th</sup>.

This Friday is Park(ing) Day downtown from 10-2.

No public comment.

#### **10. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45pm.