



MINUTES

MEETING: Transportation Commission Meeting
TIME: Wednesday, December 17, 2014 5:30pm
PLACE: 9th Floor Visibility Center, Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402
PRESENT: Justin Leighton, Jane Moore, Andrew Strobel, Kristina Walker, John Thurlow,
Judi Hyman, Jacki Skaught, Gary Hofmann, John Thurlow, Yoshi Kumara
ABSENT: Vance Lelli

1. CALL TO ORDER

Justin Leighton called the meeting to order at 5:30pm. Jacki Skaught arrived at 5:47pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Vance Lelli was absent.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Parking Task Force update should say the new "sandwich signs." Approved as amended.

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN – GOALS AND POLICIES (DAN GRAYUSKI AND JUSTIN RESNICK)

Justin Resnick opened by explaining the contents of the draft document and tracking table provided to the Commissioners. The Commissioners reviewed each section of text in the draft document, including the Vision, Goals, Policy Intent statements, and Policies. The tracking table provided a list of comments submitted by individual Commissioners on each section of text to assist the Commissioners in their review.

Kristina Walker Comment: Health of environment is missing from Vision but shows up later.

Goal 1

Kristina Walker Question: Should the Design Integration Review Team (DIRT) be included here? Add somewhere. Perhaps include infrastructure groups also.

Josh Diekmann Response: Staff will work on the wording for intergovernmental group coordination.

Andrew Strobel Comment: This seems like groups outside of the city itself.

Goal 2

John Thurlow Comment: Replace impact with affect / effect.



Yoshi Kumara Comment: Policy intent should include low-income, limited English proficiency, youth.

2.1

John Thurlow Comment: Mitigate when possible.

Justin Leighton Question: Does this only refer to city projects?

Josh Diekmann Response: Yes.

Judi Hyman Follow-Up: City would still write bids for any of these projects, right?

Josh Diekmann Response: Even if it's a contractor doing the work then they would have to consider mitigations.

Justin Leighton Question: Does this language cover developers in addition to the city?

Jacki Skaught Response: I read it as yes.

Judi Hyman Follow-Up: What about private developers who make changes to transportation?

Andrew Strobel Response: Private developers can be required to provide mitigations by the city.

Josh Diekmann Comment: City required a traffic signal and pedestrian improvements in one particular case.

John Thurlow Question: Would this language guide the process of developing requirements for developers?

Josh Diekmann Response: I think this would strengthen the City's case.

Andrew Strobel Comment: There's a difference between development projects and transportation projects.

Justin Leighton Comment: Would have to add development projects to capture development impacts.

Josh Diekmann Response: The policy intent language of this goal refers to transportation facilities specifically.

John Thurlow Comment: We'll have to come to an agreement with the Planning Commission as well.

Justin Leighton Response: We will likely revisit this policy.

2.3

Jane Moore Question: Do we want an interim goal?

Justin Resnick Response: There aren't enough deaths and serious injuries statewide to form a meaningful number.

Replace "citizens" with "residents."

2.5

Mike Hutchinson Comment: Strike the word "sanctioned" because engineers follow state of the practice.

Goal 3

Kristina Walker Comment: Seems like we should mention the MoMap here.

Justin Resnick Response: MoMap will be updated and abridged as an appendix.

Yoshi Kumara Follow-Up: What's left in MoMap is getting discarded then?

Justin Resnick Response: Yes, the intention is to drop what's not needed from MoMap.

Kristina Walker Comment: Perhaps we should reference the MoMap and BPTAG in the policy intent.

Justin Leighton Comment: Concerned about discarding the award-winning document.

Jane Moore Comment: Concerned about losing the meaning and focus on bike / ped needs.

Andrew Strobel Comment: Sees MoMap as a more specific document that guides facility specifications.

John Thurlow Comment: MoMap could be a guide to implementation, but this material must be kept up to date by BPTAG and could lead to conflict with TC.

Justin Resnick Comment: We want to avoid two competing documents.

Jane Moore Response: Add MoMap supportive language to the Policy Intent and reference the appendix as appropriate. Review in the draft report.

3.1

John Thurlow Comment: “safe, accessible, and clean.”

3.3

Jane Moore Question: Do we have mode split numbers yet?

Justin Resnick Response: Not yet, we want to make sure we get these right since we’re splitting it so many ways.

3.4

Justin Leighton Question: Concern with level of service – does this capture the spirit of system completeness?

Jane Moore Comment: Doesn’t think this is specific enough.

Justin Leighton Follow-Up: What’s the trigger? What if traffic grows despite no development? Perhaps we need more language here.

Justin Resnick Response: This is where performance metrics come in.

Jane Moore Comment: We should address these here in the language.

John Thurlow Question: What about existing deficiencies?

Justin Leighton Follow-Up: Would city staff no longer follow level of service? Let’s come back to this when we discuss performance metrics.

Kristina Walker Comment: We don’t acknowledge gaps currently.

3.7

Justin Resnick Question: Is this policy focusing on physical needs or general disadvantage needs?

Justin Leighton Response: Yes, this language is aimed at persons with disabilities.

Jane Moore Comment: Focus this policy on physical needs and add an additional policy for underserved populations.

Kristina Walker Follow-Up: Agreed, add an underserved populations policy.

3.8

Kristina Walker Comment: Remove “at a bare minimum.”

Jane Moore Follow-Up: And add “work to.”

John Thurlow Comment: Context-sensitive designs provides the flexibility we need.

3.9

John Thurlow Question: What does “comfortable bicycling” mean?

Jane Moore Response: A bicycle rider should feel comfortable.

Yoshi Kumara Comment: Perhaps “comfortable” isn’t quite the right word because I feel safe when I ride but not necessarily comfortable given the actions of drivers.

Jacki Skaught Question: Do we need the specifics on the League of American Bicyclists?

Justin Leighton Comment: This sounds like a performance metric.

Kristina Walker Response: It’s valuable to have here, perhaps add “or equivalent.”

3.10

“All areas” rather than “underserved areas.”

Justin Leighton Comment: Perhaps we should be focusing on the trail network and then get to the users.

Jane Moore Comment: Add MoMap reference to 3.8 and 3.9.

3.11

Jacki Skaught Comment: Efficient and safe don’t seem to read properly. Innovative seems like the wrong word here.

Justin Leighton Comment: Provided examples of transit supportive elements.

Will bring this back for re-wording.

Kristina Walker Comment: We talk about the safety of peds and bikes but not the safety of transit riders. Add this here on 3.8.

3.12

Justin Leighton Question: Does this need to focus on employment centers?

Judi Hyman Comment: It also says we’ll do outreach to employers.

Justin Leighton Comment: We could add stop safety here.

Re-wording here.

Jennifer Kammerzell Comment: The original wording was specific to MICs.

3.13

Judi Hyman Question: Can we add something about talking to the people and businesses at a particular intersection?

Jane Moore Response: This is covered in 1.2.

3.15

Josh Diekmann Question: Does this language preclude us from increasing physical capacity when we want to?

Andrew Strobel Response: Physical capacity isn’t ITS.

Jane Moore Comment: Remove the “without…” phrase.

Justin Leighton Comment: My original wording was a little different and is focusing on ITS technologies.

3.16

Add no more concrete idea.

Goal 4

Drop “tailpipe” from policy intent.

4.1

Mike Hutchinson Question: Should we have Context-Sensitive Solutions in here specifically? Adapt CSS definition.

4.3

Justin Leighton Comment: Just say water pollution.

4.5

Mike Hutchinson Comment: Has a problem with using a business as a title for a policy. Rename the policy “environmental stewardship.” State Greenroads or equivalent rating system.

4.6

Jane Moore Comment: Add “throughout the city.”

4.8

Jane Moore Question: Should we add bike and ped specifics?

Justin Resnick Response: They’re now included in level of service so perhaps unnecessary.

Josh Diekmann Comment: It is worth having a discussion over general transportation vs bike and ped.

Justin Leighton Comment: This is specific to development-based growth. Which are we focusing on? Saying too much here.

Yoshi Kumara Comment: We also have 4.10 and 4.11 that talk about current deficiencies. 4.8 sounds like not wanting to grow our existing deficit.

Dan Grayuski Question: Do we want to add opportunities that we’re not currently using?

Justin Leighton Response: Yes. To Yoshi’s point, 4.8 should be more general.

Yoshi Kumara Comment: 4.10 gets at funding for rehabilitation.

We will edit this policy.

4.9

Justin Leighton Comment: Title seems inappropriate, especially since this focuses on grants.

Andrew Strobel Follow-Up: Grants typically don’t fund maintenance.

Dan Grayuski Response: Finance sub-consultant to review these and bring back.

4.8-11 will be revised and brought back.

Goal 5

Jacki Skaught Question: Can we reduce the amount of wording here?

5.6

Justin Leighton Comment: Would like to see Downtown on the Go included as the city’s agent for TDM.

Mike Hutchinson Comment: Add “or equivalent.”

5.7

Kristina Walker Question: Should we be focusing on car-sharing?

Andrew Strobel Response: The real problem seems to be SOVs, not necessarily car ownership.

Yoshi Kumara Follow-Up: Zipcar can still be an SOV, is this more about ownership?

Josh Diekmann Follow-Up: Car-sharing companies are mentioned. Do you want to take this policy further to specify other transportation options?

Kristina Walker Comment: Anyone can carpool but these other options require some sort of public-private partnership.

John Thurlow Comment: Zipcar can be desirable but it still produces SOV trips.

Justin Leighton Comment: Trying to promote transportation facilities other than driving. Zipcar has a place here.

Andrew Strobel Comment: Two issues here: ridesharing and SOVs. Don't mean to change the intent of the original policy.

Keep original language and add a policy on reducing SOV trips.

Goal 6

Policy Intent

Add transit-supportive in second paragraph.

6.2

Jane Moore Question: What is community access?

Justin Resnick Response: Drop "community."

6.3

Justin Leighton Comment: Add 20min NBH to glossary.

6.7

Kristina Walker Comment: There are no minimums or maximums in downtown. It's scary to have no maximum outside of downtown.

Andrew Strobel Comment: Bonuses are based on parking.

Judi Hyman Response: Could we say "update parking requirements?"

Andrew Strobel Comment: This is specified as an incentive.

Justin Leighton Comment: Perhaps add something to parking management.

We may revisit this wording.

6.8

Jacki Skaught Question: What does "accurately and dynamically priced" mean?

Judi Hyman Comment: The issue is whether it's sustainable.

Jacki Skaught Follow-Up: The sentence just isn't clear. I think we're saying that people who manage parking should charge fair prices and they may be reflective of demand. The current phrasing doesn't get there to me.

Judi Hyman Response: PTAG manages parking in the city and it has a lot to do with budgeting, usage, and what is needed for the city. Dynamic pricing won't be adopted in this city anytime soon from a parking perspective.

Josh Diekmann Comment: Perhaps "manage parking pricing to seek balance."

Revisit exact wording.

Goal 7

Judi Hyman Question: Do we use “streetcar” for a reason? Should we be identifying only one technology?

Jane Moore Response: Propose to review these policies again at a later date.

Justin Leighton Question: Should the streetcar element be a separate element of the plan or integrated throughout?

Jacki Skaught Follow-Up: Is this part of the modal layering discussion?

Kristina Walker Comment: The streetcar section should be reduced into a few policies under Goal 3.

Justin Leighton Comment: TC decided to create a subgroup to design a streetcar network and that’s why this work was completed.

John Thurlow Comment: The existing document refers to transit generally so perhaps we should simply define what “transit” includes earlier on.

Josh Diekmann Comment: Suggests that as the committee re-writes the streetcar policies they might consider using “fixed-route transit” or other appropriate terminology.

Dan Grayuski Comment: Mentioning streetcar in the definition of HCT would be clearer.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

A. PARKING TASK FORCE

Residential parking efforts are still moving forward.

B. BILLBOARD TASK FORCE

John told the task force he would bring the most recent map updates.

C. BPTAG

BPTAG recommended supporting Portland Avenue as a bike facility and Justin is concerned that it was city staff that originally supported freight and now is supporting bikes instead.

6. STAFF REPORTS

No comments.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Meredith Neal from Planning Commission attended as the Transportation representative.

8. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04pm.