



**CITY OF TACOMA  
JOINT BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP  
AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE:** September 26, 2016

**GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dave Cook, Anne James, Susan Reehill, Cassie Head, Dan Hansen, Leon Ettelson, Jennifer Halverson-Kuehn, Janet Higbee

**TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** John Thurlow, Yoshi Kumara, Justin Leighton, Andrew Strobel, Gerrit Nyland, Jacki Skaught, Evette Mason, Jane Moore

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Emily Campbell, Martha Lantz, Josh Diekmann, Joe Rempe, Hannah Miner, Cindan Gizzi, Jennifer Kammerzell

▪ **Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order at 5:35 PM.

Agenda altered to hold Public Comment after Approval of Minutes.

▪ **Roll Call/Introductions**

The Transportation Commission moved to excuse CM Austin, CM Hyman, and CM Lelli for their absence tonight. Vote was taken and carried. The motion was adopted.

▪ **Approval of Minutes**

BPTAG approved their August 22, 2016 minutes with the following changes:

- Page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph should be changed to reflect that the group prefers to see what a bike boulevard would look like, adding a fourth point to the infrastructure options.

TC did not have August minutes for approval.

▪ **Public Comment**

Cindan Gizzi, resident of N 19<sup>th</sup> Street between Stevens and Proctor spoke on the N 21<sup>st</sup> St Project. While crossing N 21<sup>st</sup> Street at a legal crosswalk, her daughter and friend were hit by a

car. The car stopped, waived them forward, and another car went around from behind and hit them. She advocates for reducing the road to two lanes and is concerned that reducing it to three lanes will still be unsafe. She is concerned that drivers' convenience and speed is being cared for before pedestrian safety. Another collision will happen if they don't change the environment there. She is thankful to City for being forthcoming with information. She also encouraged that they think about which project design options would be best for implementing Safe Routes to School programs.

▪ **Open Public Meetings Training – Martha Lantz (Legal)**

Martha presented the Open Meetings, Open Records, and Ethics Training. The content of the presentation has changed recently, so the presentation is important even for those who have received it before.

The Open Public Meetings Act was passed in 1971 and applies to all Committees, Boards and Commissions (CBCs). All meetings must be open to public and conducted in the presence of the public. Meetings include any gatherings of these groups to conduct business where there is a quorum and action. Notice must be given notice prior to meeting, and there must be a published agenda, conversation must follow the agenda, minutes must be taken, and there may be no conditions for public to attend.

TC CM Mason asked if it is an ad hoc/smaller group of Commission, must they notify the public. Yes, if the group has authority to take action, but if the group meets just to come up with ideas, then no.

TC CM Thurlow asked how much notice must be given? The agenda for regular meetings must be online at least 24 hours in advance. Special meetings also need written notice online 24 hours in advance with the time, location and agenda, which should include all items where action will be taken.

Action includes emails exchanged among a quorum of members – best practice is to use staff as an in-between in email communications. This applies to similar forms of communication. Meetings can be held over the phone, but if there is no physical gathering then there must be a room for the public to gather. Violation of Open Public Meetings Act penalty has been raised from \$100 to \$1000 for individual members if a lawsuit is filed for a knowing violation.

The Public Records Act was passed in 1972, and applies to CBCs. People must retain, search, and produce if requested public records, which includes any information or communication relating to conduct of government. This applies to personal phones, records that live at home, etc. If requested, CMs and Group members should notify and present content to their staff person. The City has very tight timeframe for responding to requests. Penalties go to City as a whole. A best practice is to keep files in a designated location.

Records Management is a state law where Cities have an obligation to retain CBC records. The owner of records has this responsibility, and this is usually a City staff person. It is good practice to turn over records to the staff person to simplify the process. Retain if required, and manage records by discarding records when you no longer need them and discard secondary and informational records.

City of Tacoma Code of Ethics applies to CBCs. Some items include no acceptance of gifts because of your position as a Commissioner, except those that are nominal promotional items and awards; should be careful about conflicts of interest when doing other business with City. A complaint triggers a review by Board of Ethics, possible investigation, and sanctions by Board resulting in member removal from CBC.

BPTAG member Hansen asked if it is ok for a small number of people to be empowered by the group to write a letter. It is ok if they are acting under a specific directive by the group where content is agreed upon ahead of time.

▪ **North 21<sup>st</sup> Street Project** – Josh Diekmann (Public Works), Joe Rempé (Tacoma Power)

during construction, the towers on the end only have wire on one side, and thus do not have tension from the other direction to balance the load placed on the tower. For this reason, the end towers must be larger to accommodate larger lateral construction loads.

With Tacoma Power presented on TPU's Pole Replacement Project involving the N 21<sup>st</sup> St corridor. The towers (poles) along the N 21<sup>st</sup> St corridor are the original, very old towers. Plans to take out 20 towers, install 12 new towers, and retire the Cushman substation building and the equipment outside the building will no longer be needed, though for no reason building itself will remain in place. The new towers are 20'x20' and will be monopole mostly 6.5' in diameter except for the one full dead-end which will be 8' in diameter. The towers will move back from the end to the middle of the blocks, and will change frequency from every block to every other block (spaced 660' apart, and 100-120' tall with wire above ground).

old towers are 20x20. New towers will be monopole....

BPTAG member Susan got clarification that the existing towers are 72' tall.

TC Co-Chair Moore asked for clarification on "dead end" poles. Joe explained that they must withstand special tension. Jane also asked about the new wire height, and learned that the new wire will be a different material than the old.

Joe explained that it would cost significantly more (5-10 times more) to run wires underground, they wouldn't last as long and would thus require more maintenance.

TC Co-Chair Leighton asked about the historical status of the building, and learned that it is a historical building.

Tacoma Power is receiving direction from Public Works on best place to put the towers.

Josh then presented on the Public Works (PW) design options for N 21<sup>st</sup> Street, which does not yet have funding (unlike the Power project). He would like consensus from BPTAG and TC so he can form the staff recommendation that they will take to IPS this Wednesday so TPU can move forward with their work.

Josh explained that N 21<sup>st</sup> is a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) priority corridor for automobiles, transit and bicycles. PW considered several options for the design and did a traffic analysis to determine constraints and needs. He displayed graph of directional auto volumes showing more prolonged traffic in afternoon heading out of town compared to in town (east). The difference in evening versus morning peak is why the lanes are currently unbalanced east versus west.

Total volumes on the corridor are currently about 10,000 vehicles per day.

TC Co-Chair Leighton asked what determines the peak? It usually corresponds to the 4-6pm period when a large proportion of overall daily traffic volume is on the road, and also relates to lane carrying capacity. The peak is currently about 10,000 vehicles per day.

Josh presented cross-section design options 1-4, which were previously presented to the community. Important notes included that capacity of lanes and safety goes up when adding

center turn lanes, and that TP poles are.

TC Co-Chair Leighton speed is 30mph, and

, which would provide poles on the sides of the street instead of the middle, and could require more work... Option 2 also assumed that the pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be located in the median, which would require more frequent road crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Design Option 2 would require TPU to do more work such as tree trimming. This option was not advanced by staff.

Option 3 has merit including bike facilities in both directions. Staff considered having a strip on the roadside of the bike lane, but it would add other complications such as road needed for emergency vehicles.

I said at some point--I don't know if it was here or not--that the dimensions shown are generally flexible, and would be refined during the design process.

BPTAG member Hansen asked why it is necessary that emergency vehicles have on this corridor when the street grid is very well connected. It is a primary east arterial thus is a designated response route by emergency vehicles.

BPTAG member Halverson-Kuehn asked if the bike lane width in this option is expects this scenario could make lanes wider.

Option 4 makes for narrow sidewalks and very few landscaping opportunities and would be considered overbuilding. There was not much community support for this.

TC Co-Chair Leighton asked if people asked for 4 lanes of traffic? Staff would be overbuilding, though adding a turn lane would add capacity.

Current lane widths are 10' wide. Each option would attempt to provide approximately 11' for through lanes.

BPTAG member James asked about current lane widths. In this option narrow 10' wide.

A travel mode survey showed a high drive alone rate for this corridor, but also high walking and bike rates. The survey didn't specify which corridor it was about, but it was implied by context of discussions.

Josh shared representative comments from community members. More than 60% preferred design Option 1, which motivated staff to create a hybrid option 3 that would allow a buffered bike lane.

BPTAG member Cook asked about alignment for lanes would allow the road to meander for traffic calming purposes. There is likely not sufficient width, and the desire is for the towers to stay in line.

TC CM Skaught complemented staff on doing a good job of capturing community response and responding to community wants.

TC CM Mason asked if option 1 and hybrid option 3 are equally safe for bikes and pedestrians in collision situations. For the most part they would be equivalent.

TC Co-Chair Leighton asked if there are any sustainability options for impervious concrete? Yes, hybrid option 3 would allow additional landscaped area that could be used to leverage funding in regards to stormwater.

BPTAG member Hansen stated that hybrid option 3 looks like poles are shifted to the side preserving the future addition of a westbound lane. He is not convinced that studies make a case for requiring an extra westbound lane since the road is below capacity and it would be harder for pedestrians to cross. He believes more options are preserved with centered poles. Other utility right of ways became trails such a Flume Line Trail, and this could be used for another high quality trail.

Josh would like to hear consensus before moving forward to IPS.

BPTAG member Reehill likes hybrid option 3 with the bike lane buffer.

BPTAG member Halverson-Kuehn likes option 1, including the wider sidewalks.

TC CM Skaught likes option 1.

TC CM Mason likes hybrid option 3 and wider road for emergency vehicles.  
BPTAG member Ettelson likes option 1, and wants to see protected bike lanes.  
TC CM Nyland likes option 1 with the bike lane buffer, making the bike lane more usable.

TC CM Strobel likes option 1 and wants a protected bike lane, which would be innovative and attractive for grants if it becomes a demonstration project.

BPTAG member Head likes option 1 with a protected bike lane.

TC Co-Chair Moore likes new hybrid on option 1 with bike lanes.

TC CM Kumara likes a hybrid option 1 also.

TC CM Thurlow likes hybrid option 1 with bike lanes.

BPTAG member Cook likes option 1 because it is narrower for pedestrian crossing.

TC Co-Chair Leighton likes hybrid option 3, and would like the 2' protection changed to planters (Vancouver model) to slow traffic and add sense of safety, and would like staff to work on option 1, also asking where extra space for protected bike lane would come from in option 1.

The general consensus is a hybrid option 1 with a buffer for bike lanes, and alternatively the hybrid option 3.

Additional discussion included the following:

BPTAG member Head asked if there will be transit pull-outs or will transit go into bike lanes. There are challenges regarding transit, but this is a proposed transit priority street.

BPTAG member Reehill asked if the 5' planting area has to be that size. It can be smaller.

BPTAG member Head asked if there is a way to project increased transit use also in these designs.

- **Safe Routes to School Implementation Plan** – Jennifer Kammerzell (Public Works), Hannah Miner (Puyallup Watershed Initiative, Active Transportation Community of Interest)

Jennifer presented a quick status update of the Safe Routes to School Implementation Plan. As a result of recent crashes involving youth ages 18 and under, the City Manager and Puyallup Watershed Initiative committed to funding a Safe Routes to School Implementation Plan. The City selected Alta Planning to help with the development and community outreach of the plan. The scope of work for the project includes the formation of a stakeholder committee that will guide the development of the plan, encourage community outreach, and champion the implementation of the plan. The stakeholder committee of about 20 representatives, includes Tacoma School District, Major Taylor, Kidical Mass, VeloFemmes, local PTA, Metro Parks, Tacoma Pierce County Health Department, Tacoma Police Department, Alchemy Skateboarding, 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle, Safe Streets, Boys & Girls Club, Downtown on the Go, youth representatives, BPTAG, and Transportation Commission. Jennifer asked if there were any members/Commissioners interested in being a representative. Stakeholders would meet 3 times throughout the project, plus one optional Open House.

BPTAG member Ettelson volunteered and BPTAG member Halverson-Kuehn agreed to be his back-up.

TC CM Nyland volunteered and TC CM Mason agreed to be his back-up.

The project will hold a community Open House on November 16<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 p.m. at Lincoln High School. There will be stations to identify barriers to walking and bicycling, as well as programs

that would encourage more walking and bicycling. A school survey for principals, teachers, and administration will be developed. A parent/community survey will also be developed and available in 6 languages. Laptops will be available at the open house for attendees to complete. Staff hopes that the Commission and BPTAG will help to spread the word to attend or complete the survey.

TC Co-Chair Leighton suggested including a THA representative, such as Josh Jorgenson.

- **Other Business/Updates**  
There was no other business or updates.
- **Staff Reports**  
There were no staff reports.
- **Meeting Adjourned at 7:30 p.m.**