



CITY OF TACOMA BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY GROUP MEETING MINUTES

DATE: June 15, 2015

GROUP MEMBERS

PRESENT: Brandi Riddle, Janet Higbee Jennifer Halverson-Kuehn, Matt Stevens

OTHERS PRESENT: Jennifer Kammerzell, Hannah Miner, Jane Moore, Diane Wiatr

- **Meeting called to order at 5:35 PM**
- **Introductions and icebreaker**
- **Updated MoMap Appendix Discussion–** Jennifer Kammerzell

The meeting did not have a quorum and it was decided at the beginning that this group would act as a subcommittee that would report back to the larger group during the regular meeting the following week. At that meeting, the group would vote on a formal recommendation.

Jennifer Kammerzell spoke about the update of the update to the Mobility Master Plan (MoMap) and its move to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Appendix. The most recent draft of the Transportation Master Plan was approved to move onto the IPS and it was presented to IPS last week.

The Transportation Commission (TC) is currently working on the project lists and will be learning more about impact fees as a possible way of creating revenue for funding the TMP. The next Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) draft is going to be released on July 15th and the next draft of the TMP will go out for comments at the same time. The feedback from these meetings will be available to the TC in the fall and that feedback will be taken into account for the final draft of the TMP.

As discussed in the previous BPTAG regular meeting, all of the policies were taken out of the body of MoMap and embedded in the TMP. All goals and policies in the TMP are grouped together. The maps and project lists have also been taken out of the MoMap and placed in the TMP.

The Comp Plan has to have a project list. The TMP currently has a 500+ item project list, including every project in the Transportation Element, bike/ped projects from the Mobility Master Plan, capital facilities programs, and all new projects. The project list needs tiers, a version of short, medium, and long-term designations. There are 11 different criteria, titled Infrastructure Project Evaluation Criteria (T-4) to help weigh projects to determine their priority—including system preservation, horizon timeline (which will replace short, medium, and long from MoMap). Horizon timeline takes distance, magnitude of project, stakeholders, etc. into account.

These 11 Criteria will apply to all future MoMap projects. The project lists from MoMap have been transferred as they were arranged, having been weighted using the existing MoMap criteria. This means that while the criteria “Closing the Gap” is not in the list of 11 criteria in the TMP, it is still considered for the existing bike/ped projects.

As we have discussed before, the bike portion of the plan is very strong. The TMP must address implementation strategies just as comprehensive for walking, transit, streetcar, auto, etc. as those in place for biking. The implementation strategies tie in with the goals and policies in the body of the TMP.

For the first time ever, Equity is being considered criteria. In order to help determine how to distribute projects more equitably, the Equity a Human Rights Office provided maps of underserved communities based on ethnicities, median income levels, crime, etc. These maps overlap quite a bit and this will help inform where to prioritize projects.

During the presentation to IPS, one Council Member was pleased to see Equity is one of the prioritization criteria. Another Council Member noted that geographical equality (spreading projects evenly across districts) was no longer included in the criteria.

Jennifer Halverson-Kuehn suggested that the crash data, specifically the maps where pedestrian and bicycle collisions have taken place, be considered with these maps as well.

The Puyallup Watershed Initiative’s Active Transportation Community of Interest has maps from WSDOT of Pierce County that delve deeper into different health problems, like diabetes and heart problems, this information is compared to sites lacking safe sidewalks and intersections.

Jennifer Kammerzell then explained that in an effort to take geographical equality into account, the TC is exploring if this should be implemented by neighborhood council instead of by district. Matt was skeptical of this approach because neighborhood councils are not representative of population. The districts boundaries are drawn by the number of people living in the districts while neighborhood councils are not created around population.

Brandi was interested in learning more about the concept of 20-minute neighborhoods and if this will be included in the TMP. Seattle’s Transit Oriented Development (TOD) was set up by neighborhood. When BTPAG was presented with this idea many months ago, it wasn’t perfect. Some obvious places were left out of this, including Proctor and Central Tacoma. Not all neighborhoods have center; this impacts how projects are prioritized.

Jennifer Kammerzell reminded us that when developing these criteria the group needs to be conscious of all projects, not what will help certain, existing projects creep up. that adding criteria. The emphasis on disadvantaged communities will not go away but there are opportunities to add another layer.

Brandi spoke about how she sees equity and geographical equality as mutually exclusive and asked if it was possible to include them both but assign them different point values. Is it also possible to split the criteria by mode?

The group then returned to the conversation of updating the BPTAG criteria. “Listed in order of importance” needs to be removed from the language above the criteria. The group also spoke about if the Short Term Bicycle Project Priority List needs to be updated and it was determined that the focus needs to be on the TMP and this can be revisited later in the year. We will add equity to the MoMap criteria and move things around at a later date.

It was suggested that an asterisk be added to the bottom with language reading “will be used moving forward from Summer 2015 by staff to evaluate projects.”

Janet asked that in order to understand how to look at the city with an equity lens, that the group be provided with maps—the maps from WSDOT, the maps used by Pierce Transit when they

discontinue a route to determine what populations they will no longer be serving, and maps from Charles Wright.

Jennifer Kammerzell also pointed out that the TC had pulled projects out of Subarea plans that were forth-coming when MoMap was last updated. Salishan and Dometop were mentioned as other areas to consider when looking for areas that were a bit more confounding for people walking and bicycling. The connections across S 56th were mentioned and Jennifer Kammerzell explained that a new project has been designated, “conflicted corridor studies” to help gather information about the best way to proceed on corridors that many modes use.

The group also decided to recommend the following changes to the language of the document:

- Change “non-motorized” to “pedestrian and bicycle” (T-8 and elsewhere in the document)
- Under “Goals,” enhance the five E’s and add a sixth “e” for Equity
- Change “safe and comfortable” to “safe and low stress” throughout the document

The group did not come to a decision about how or if it was necessary to expand upon the language describing “Equity” in the Guiding Principles. One member suggested making changes to include language about a history of under-service, disadvantaged communities and also to include language about collisions. Another member said that “modal-equity” captured everything she would want to see—people can use whatever mode they want to get across Tacoma. Everyone has access, especially those who need more support and greater resources are allocated to those lower on the “ladder.”

Matt then asked if “Safe Routes to School” was possibly too specific and if it narrowed the scope of projects that can be created for schools. Diane explained that this is a national program that is very broad and can be applied to many different types of schools, districts, and cities.

In the final minutes of the meeting, Diane asked if the MoMap Plan Integration Chart on T-1 was necessary and should be included. If it remains, it needs to be updated. The group decided that it did still serve a purpose because it helps to operationalize the words being used.

Additional notes from email conversations following the meeting

Brandi:

EQUITY - Establish (or ensure) equal distribution of modes across all geographic and economic areas???

With this definition (or something like it) you get:

- a hint of the meaning behind equity that most people expect (in regards to -isms)
- its in a language people understand
- its in a language the majority can get behind because it doesn't call out or bring in race
- AND it still includes the original meaning.
- PLUS it pulls in Janet’s want for something on income.

And just emphasize that it could potentially add clarity and another level of meaning.

I'd also suggest adding children to the Access guideline definition (not just disabled people) and food access as an additional point in ACCESS or CONNECTIVITY? I don't remember the names of the guidelines off the top of my head. But just so the wording is there since it seems PSRC is trying to get that into policy documents.

Janet:

5.2.3 Install many secure (if possible; visible, covered and/or caged) bike racks.