

From: luciadill@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2020 6:18 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Statement for 10/06 City Council Meeting by Lucia Dill

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Tacoma City Council Members (and city staff),

I am Lucia Dill, a citizen of Tacoma, in the zip code 98408.

I am writing to comment in regards to the draft budget. I urge the City Council to honor its statements and wishes regarding anti-racism by starting to take actions in this budget for equity. Most of all, I demand the city council begin police divestment and refresh community investment.

Especially in this uncertain economic time that is the ongoing pandemic, let's support businesses, especially child care. Let's work on listening and responding to the houseless population. Let's put money towards communities of color. Let's fund mental health and general healthcare services.

People are scared right now - scared of the police and scared because of the pandemic. I ask that this budget bolster the community, services, education, and continued support during the ongoing pandemic.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lucia Dill
Tacoma, WA 98408

From: Kayla Quinn <kaylala427@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 10:51 AM
To: City Clerk's Office; City Manager
Subject: 10/6 Council Meeting Public Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good morning,

I am writing to submit official public comment for the meeting agenda items for the October 6, 2020 council meeting.

I do not approve of Resolution 40666 to increase the City Manager's salary. During a budget crisis, this increase in spending is only going to contribute to the issue. I understand that this is retroactive in that it was supposed to be reviewed prior to the budget issues arising but I still believe it to be an irresponsible use of funds given the budget state we are in. I urge the Council to vote no on this resolution.

Resolution 40668: I am in full support of using the funds listed for the Fossil Fuel Study so the council can see first-hand how detrimental fossil fuels are to communities and our planet and see this as a very responsible use of funds. I also approve using the funds listed to improve language access and translation services to provide greater accessibility to local government to our community.

Additionally, as part of Resolution 40668, I am against utilizing the council contingency fund for body worn cameras. I absolutely support all of Tacoma Police Department wearing and utilizing body worn cameras, but I believe that the funds for this endeavor should be coming out of the existing police budget. Specifically, the police budget should not be increased whatsoever, but the funds taken from their already over-inflated budget to pay for the body worn cameras. The money in the council contingency fund would be better utilized within the community for social and health services, and to help our unhoused neighbors be better protected and resourced with the additional safety and wellbeing concerns during the COVID-19 pandemic. The Tacoma Police Department does not need more money. They have plenty to pay for the body worn cameras.

Resolution 40668 needs to be amended so that the funds for body worn cameras are not being taken from the council contingency fund, but instead taken directly from the existing TPD budget.

~Kayla Quinn

From: Harding, Melanie
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 1:28 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Fwd: Comments for the Public Record: TEMS at 6th & Orchard Virtual Community Meeting
Attachments: TPCCEH Letter of Support for TEMS at 6th & Orchard.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Maureen Howard <maureenhowardconsulting@gmail.com>
Date: October 6, 2020 at 1:04:28 PM PDT
To: "Harding, Melanie" <melanie.harding@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: **Fwd: Comments for the Public Record: TEMS at 6th & Orchard Virtual Community Meeting**

I can't find a copy in my "sent" file that I actually DID send this to the Mayor and Council...sigh...Linda said they would see that it went forward. Could you just double check? Thanks.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Maureen Howard** <maureenhowardconsulting@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Oct 4, 2020 at 9:58 PM
Subject: Comments for the Public Record: TEMS at 6th & Orchard Virtual Community Meeting
To: Pauli, Elizabeth <elizabeth.pauli@cityoftacoma.org>, Linda Stewart <lstewart@ci.tacoma.wa.us>, Melanie Harding <melanie.harding@ci.tacoma.wa.us>, Griffith, Allyson <AGriffith@cityoftacoma.org>, Azcueta, Erica <eazcueta@cityoftacoma.org>, Robinson, Jeff <jrobinson@ci.tacoma.wa.us>, FMedlen@ci.tacoma.wa.us <FMedlen@ci.tacoma.wa.us>
Cc: <mhoward@pchomeless.org>, Gerrit Nyland <gnyland@pchomeless.org>

Mayor and Council Members,

The Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness rarely takes a public position and I wanted to be sure you saw our letter in support of the new TEMS at 6th & Orchard.

Thank you for your work,

Maureen

--

Maureen Howard

MaureenHowardConsulting
maureenhowardconsulting@gmail.com

Tel: 253-756-8146 (LL)

Cell: 253-255-2200

3320 S. 8th Street

Tacoma, WA 98405

I'm with Angela Davis:

"I'm no longer accepting the things I cannot change.

I'm changing the things I cannot accept."

And with John Lewis:

"Never, ever be afraid to make some noise and get in good trouble, necessary trouble."

--

Maureen Howard

MaureenHowardConsulting
maureenhowardconsulting@gmail.com

Tel: 253-756-8146 (LL)

Cell: 253-255-2200

3320 S. 8th Street

Tacoma, WA 98405

I'm with Angela Davis:

"I'm no longer accepting the things I cannot change.

I'm changing the things I cannot accept."

And with John Lewis:

"Never, ever be afraid to make some noise and get in good trouble, necessary trouble."



October 4, 2020

To: Neighborhood and Community Services, City of Tacoma

From: Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness

Support for TEMS at 6th and Orchard

Who We Are:

The Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness is a loose network of individuals, non-profit organizations, government agencies, and community businesses working together to serve people experiencing homelessness. Each week, 50-100 coalition participants meet and more than 500 people are on the Coalition's email distribution list.

Why This Letter:

We are writing in support of the TEMS project at 6th and Orchard. Pierce County continues to lack adequate shelter, and this project is one of the many types of shelter the Coalition strongly supports, most recently in the May 18th, 2020 COVID-19 funding recommendations (<https://pchomeless.org/Home/COVID19>).

These shelter beds will become available at a critical time. Our Coalition is working hard to ensure that at least 400 Winter Shelter beds are created before the weather sets in. While this shelter will not come on-line until the end of December 2020, the fact that it is funded through July 2023 secures those beds well into the future. Every unit, every bed, every type of safe shelter will help people survive the coming winter. Participants in our Coalition stand ready to help the people experiencing homelessness who will reside in this TEMS end their homelessness and move to permanent housing.

We especially applaud the siting of this shelter. People experiencing homelessness come from all parts of Tacoma. The closer someone stays to their support structure, the easier it is for them to exit homelessness. The neighborhood around 6th and Orchard currently provides no nearby services to people experiencing homelessness. During the past year, over 200 people experiencing homelessness identified their last permanent residence in the 98406 zip code – 100 of them utilizing emergency shelter. This site gives the 98406 neighborhood the opportunity to better serve their neighbors who become homeless.

We want you to know that the Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness voted formally to support this new TEMS.

Contacts for the Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness:

Gerrit Nyland, gnyland@pchomeless.org 253-304-5105

Maureen Howard, mhoward@pchomeless.org 253-255-2200

From: rebeccastith.lasr <rebeccastith.lasr@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 2:56 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Thoms, Robert; Woodards, Victoria; rstithlaw@gmail.com
Subject: Comment re Resolutions 40667 (addressing systemic racism) and 40668 (body-worn cameras)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mayor Woodards and Councilmembers:

As a Tacoma resident (District 2) and member of Lawyers Against Systemic Racism (LASR), I am writing in support of Resolutions 40667 and 40668, items 15 and 16, respectively, on tonight's Council meeting agenda.

As you may be aware, LASR'S mission is to end systemic racial discrimination in the Pierce County legal system and beyond including in both courts and law enforcement. LASR seeks to collaborate with individuals and organizations to identify specific areas of systemic racial discrimination and develop concrete ways to address and eradicate such discrimination. One of those areas includes restructuring the Community's Police Advisory Committee (CPAC) as a Community's Police Review Committee with real oversight authority of the Tacoma Police Department (TPD), which CPAC recently recommended to the Council and for which there was strong support expressed by my Councilmember, Robert Thoms and several other Councilmembers.

Resolution 40667 would provide \$75,000 to support the Core Coordinating Team (CCT), which would work in conjunction with its own appointed Transformation Teams (TTs), in order to "address all institutions, systems, policies, practices, and contracts impacted by systemic racism, with initial priority being given to policing in the City of Tacoma," with specific attention given to "priority areas defined by community members of color." This focus aligns fully with the LASR's mission and, as a LASR member, I look forward to supporting and collaborating in this vital effort.

I also write in support of Resolution 40668, which would provide \$282,000 to, among other things, purchase body-worn cameras (BWC) for TPD personnel. While there are arguments for and against BWC, on balance, when properly maintained, used, and activated, they serve as an extraordinarily valuable tool in uncovering and uprooting systemic racism within policing and in fostering a path toward racial equity and fairness justice in our criminal justice system.

Thank you for your commitment to addressing and eradicating systemic racism in Tacoma.

Rebecca Stith

Member, Lawyers Against Systemic Racism

From: Jan F. Brazzell <Brazzell@harbornet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 2:57 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Harding, Melanie
Subject: Support for Resolution 40667

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Doris,

Please share with Mayor Woodards, Deputy Mayor Blocker, Council Members Hines, Thoms, Ushka, Beale, Hunter, McCarthy, and Walker, and City Manager Pauli my wholehearted support for Resolution #40667 authorizing the one-time use of \$75,000 to stand-up a community-led, multi-sector, antiracist systems transformation effort in our community. I deeply appreciate the creative, comprehensive, and visionary thinking that's behind this resolution, as well as the dedicated efforts of City leaders to get us to this point and beyond.

Gratefully,

Jan F. Brazzell
98407

From: Sherry Martin <sherry.grosvenor@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 10:13 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Homeless Micro Housing on 6th and Orchard

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To Whom it May Concern,

I live just off of 6th and Orchard with my children. I would not feel safe with a homeless encampment as a neighbor. These type of camps or micro housing units bring crime. I do not want to send my kids out to ride their bikes or play basketball with neighbors if the city puts a junkie camp at the head of our street. I won't even feel safe walking our dog to the park. This is a good neighborhood and bringing in homelessness and the ailments associated with the homeless population will jeopardize the safety of the neighborhood and all of its occupants. I am fearful for our property and our children's safety if you ignore the complaints of the constituents and place a homeless micro housing unit on 6th and Orchard.

As a local citizen, I strongly object to having homeless micro housing placed in Central Tacoma.

If this area starts to get overrun with homeless, we will move rather than raise our children here.

Thank you,

Sherry Grosvenor
206.251.3052

Sent from my iPhone

From: Ben Grosvenor <omak.eighty@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 10:18 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Homeless Camp on 6th & Orchard

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

For the City Council's information:

I stopped at the 7-11 on 6th and Orchard earlier this evening and was approached by a homeless young man in his late teens/early 20s in the parking lot on my way into the store. He propositioned me to buy him a pack of Swisher Sweet cigars. When I declined, he accused me of ignoring him and threatened to knock me out. I told him no again. When I told the nice gentleman that runs the 7-11 what just took place, he went outside and asked him to please leave. The young man refused. The owner explained to me that things like this have been happening all day everyday since the homeless started congregating nearby and that the police currently aren't able to do enough about these incidents - often taking 40 minutes to respond.

The young man did not appear to be intoxicated Or behaving in a disoriented manner. He was just very angry that I wouldn't buckle to his request and illegally purchase him cigars.

My family will no longer be frequenting the businesses at 6th and orchard as it is no longer safe especially with a newborn baby, and we now consider it a part of the city not worth going to.

Threats of violence from a homeless person are just as real as a threat of violence from anyone else. Letting such things go unpoliced does not help anyone, hurts businesses, and diminishes the people that live in this city's overall sense of safety.

Ben Grosvenor, Tacoma resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: James McCue <jmikemccue@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 12:11 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Proposed Homeless Shelter at 6th and Orchard, North Tacoma

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Residents of North Tacoma and this neighborhood are adamantly AGAINST this proposed shelter. This will bring untold numbers of the mentally ill, drug abusers, and many other wandering vagrants to the area. In college I interviewed homeless individuals who specifically stated they made their way to Tacoma because of word of mouth that it is homeless friendly here. I work w/ homeless people now in my current job. I know what these shelters bring into areas where they are established. This will significantly devalue an area that has slowly been improving for decades. North Tacoma has become one of the most desired real estate markets in the country. The proposed homeless shelter will not contribute positively to the area, esp w/ regards to the behaviors this population exhibits. A significant % of homeless people are mentally ill, engage in drug use, and some are even sexual predators. Another location for a shelter of this type is imperative for the above reasons already mentioned.

J. Mike McCue, RN
253 355 2950

Sent from my iPhone

From: Andrew Strobel <Andrew.Strobel@PuyallupTribe-nsn.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2020 9:30 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Atkinson, Stephen
Subject: Interim Regs Letter
Attachments: PTOI-COT Interim Regs Letter.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thanks you for allowing the Puyallup Tribe to comment on the Interim Regs.

Andrew Strobel
Director of Planning and Land Use
Puyallup Tribe of Indians
3700 Pacific Hwy E #407, Fife, WA 98424
253-573-7879



The Honorable Mayor Victoria Woodards and City Council
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Suite 1200
Tacoma, WA 98402

RE: Tacoma Tideflats Interim Regulations

Honorable Mayor Woodards and Tacoma City Council Members,

The recent fires and smoke across our State have impacted our communities greatly and are a constant reminder that we must adapt to the climate crisis before us. Only through our collective actions can we rise to the challenge of addressing climate change and avoid its catastrophic impacts. We continue to work with your staff on these issues and look forward to attending the City's first Climate Adaptation Strategy meeting next month where we can reaffirm our commitment to working together on the Climate Emergency that we both declared last year. Additionally, we are hopeful as we continue to work on regional planning issues like the Tideflats Subarea Plan so we can identify how we can take steps to not exacerbate this crisis further.

Today, the Puyallup Tribe of Indians again urge the City of Tacoma to address high-risk facilities by adopting regulations to limit new facilities and existing facilities from expanding. After discussing this issue at length through the Tideflats Subarea Steering Committee, Mayor Woodards suggested the City of Tacoma may take action on this issue sooner than the planning efforts occurring in the Tideflats Subarea Plan. The Tribe applauded this decision as concerns for the expansion of existing high-risk facilities during the Subarea Planning process remained an upmost concern of the Tribe.

Unfortunately, the fears of a facility possibly expanding were realized this summer when we were notified that SeaPort Sound Terminal applied for permits for expansion of bulk storage fuels along the Hylebos Waterway near Marine View Drive. While we cannot ignore applying a climate lens to these projects, we also cannot ignore safety and surrounding land use compatibility issues related with their siting. The mere designation of calling facilities "high-risk" should warrant an analysis of how they are permitted near population centers and critical natural resources in the Tacoma Tideflats.

With safety being a preeminent concern, it is important to note that the Tacoma Tideflats are predominantly composed of soils that are liquefaction prone. Expansion of these facilities compounds the risk that any of these facilities could fail under a large seismic event and expose waterways, fish, and orca to irreparable harm. High-risk facilities remain to have gaps

in how they are regulated federally and we urge the City of Tacoma to look at communities like Whatcom County that have instituted insurance and bonding provisions to protect their community and to prevent operators of these facilities from walking away from their cleanup responsibilities. We urge the City of Tacoma to analyze safety and precautionary measures as part of any exercise to adopt permanent regulations.

Additionally, under NOAA Sea Level Rise probability scenarios, the expected level of rise of the median high-high water mark (MHHW) is expected to be 13 inches in 2050. It is at this point of sea level rise that we begin to see high-risk facilities inundated at king tide cycles exposing Commencement Bay to increased spill risk and shoreline erosion. Large investments in shoreline armoring will need to be made or decommissioning sites will need to take place in order to avoid contamination. We have the foresight to limit the risk of these developments now by incorporating sea level rise modelling analysis that is already available.

Finally, the unrestrained expansion of existing high-risk facilities challenges our regional planning efforts for affordable housing like in the South Sound Housing Affordability Partners (SSHAP) group. High-risk facilities can restrict areas where affordable housing can be funded by Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Any HUD funded project without proper mitigating measures will be prohibited from funding within the Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) of existing and planned above ground storage tanks that contain explosive or hazardous liquids identified under 24 CFR § 51. We believe several HUD funding projects are within ASD distances throughout the City of Tacoma including the Puyallup Tribe's "Place of Circling Waters" housing development. We urge the City of Tacoma to conduct a compatibility analysis on high-risk facilities so we can avoid impacting funding opportunities for affordable housing.

We thank you Mayor and Tacoma City Council for another opportunity to comment on high-risk facilities and Interim Regulations. We remain committed to working with the City of Tacoma in adopting a comprehensive regulatory scheme to address high-risk facilities permanently.

Sincerely,



Chairman Bill Sterud

Puyallup Tribe of Indians

From: Paul Landry <landrylaw@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2020 12:16 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Homeless 6th Avenue & Orchard

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

The City indicates that the vast majority of homeless are mentally ill and / or chemically addicted. The proposed housing at 6th and Orchard is within 1000 feet of Wilson High and within 1000 feet of Remann Hall. What could possibly go wrong?

Paul Landry

Sent from Windows Mail

From: Amanda DeShazo <amanda@affordablehousingconsortium.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 4:55 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comments re: Infill Pilot Program
Attachments: 2020_10_06 - TPCAHC Comments on Infill Pilot Program.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

My apologies my comments are late. I hope they are still able to be part of the public record. They are attached.

--

Amanda DeShazo, MPA (she/her)

Executive Director

Tacoma-Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium

621 Tacoma Ave. S., Ste. 313, Tacoma, WA 98402

253-627-0949 | www.affordablehousingconsortium.org



621 Tacoma Ave. S. #313, Tacoma, WA 98402 | 253-627-0949 | info@tpcahc.org

Board of Directors

October 6, 2020

President

Michael Mirra
Tacoma Housing Authority

Tacoma City Council
747 Market Street
Tacoma, WA 98402

Vice-President

Maureen Fife,
TPC Habitat for Humanity

RE: Submitting for Public Comment – City Council Hearing on 10/6/2020

Treasurer

Bryan Schmid,
Pierce County Human Svcs.

Dear Tacoma City Councilmembers,

Secretary

Brian Michael,
US Bank

The Tacoma-Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium supports the proposed updates to the Residential Infill Pilot Program as presented by the Planning Commission. These updates will ultimately provide greater opportunity for missing middle housing to be constructed throughout our City, which our agency and members are hopeful for.

Peter Ansara,
Korean Women's Assoc.

Throughout our work on the Affordable Housing Action Strategy plan, infill development has been identified as one of the many tools to be utilized in lifting the burden of housing affordability and availability. By taking these steps to expand the program, Tacoma comes closer to making these units accessible to those who need them most.

Zac Baker,
*Cascade Affordable
Housing Consultants*

While we understand that the City wants to ensure these projects are meeting design standards and are to code, TPCAHC looks forward to Council moving this from a 'Pilot Program' to a full program that is made available to all. Although the City may not feel ready to move this to a full program, we support the improvements, particularly:

Pamela Duncan,
Metropolitan Dev. Council

Jessica Gamble,
Master Builders Association

- Providing greater flexibility in the types of housing allowed through planned infill as it gives homeowners the opportunity to make the best use of their property while maximizing density and increasing housing choice;
- The increase in allowable housing (now per Council District), as it provides an opportunity for more residents to develop infill on their properties throughout the City;
- Expanding multi-family development opportunities to include properties with existing structures, which will allow more opportunities to develop these units and encourage more of them; and
- Streamlining the permitting process in order to get these projects developed faster.

Denny Hunthausen,
Catholic Community Svcs.

Janne Hutchins,
LASA

Rodd Kowalski,
PC Housing Authority

Felicia Medlen,
City of Tacoma

Mark Merrill,
Shared Housing Services

Again, our agency believes these proposed updates will allow for the expansion of missing middle housing across Tacoma and we support their adoption.

Doug Oberst,
BCRA Design

Faaluaina Pritchard,
Asia Pacific Cultural Center

Sincerely,

Victoria Quinn,
Umpqua Bank

Blain Wolfe,
Absher Construction

Amanda DeShazo, TPCAHC
Executive Director

Michael Yoder,
Associated Ministries

From: karend@harbornet.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 4:40 PM
To: Barrows Family
Cc: City Clerk's Office; Spadoni, Lisa; McCarthy, Conor; Hines, John; Walker, Kristina; Woodards, Victoria; Pauli, Elizabeth; Coble, Kenny; Jodi Cook; Rick Dinicola; Fizz Devlin; lonniechavez@gmail.com; Kristina Maritzak
Subject: Re: Public comment for | Residential Infill Pilot Program - 10/6/20

I also think it's important to note that these comments all apply to the MUC program.

Honorable Council members,

Our names are Chris and Liselotte Barrows and we live with our family at 3622 N 27th Street in the Proctor District. We are relatively new residents to Tacoma and recently settled, and invested, at our current location in the Proctor neighborhood after 29 years of military service in the U.S. Coast Guard.

While in general the proposal for **Residential Infill Pilot Program** seems laudable, there are several aspects - one of process, one of both philosophy and measurement, and two of plan detail - that we would appreciate your consideration on and specific additional action to address.

On the issue of process:

As a new resident of Tacoma it is not easy nor transparent on how to engage in the public process for issues such as this. This needs work by both the Council and by the City (leadership, departments, and staff). It is very difficult for us as new citizens to understand what is being proposed as far as land use planning and code changes in our neighborhood. The entire process seems oriented toward the developers who stand to profit, rather than the citizens whose daily lives will be impacted. It has been a challenge to understand the infill program as being part of City's growth strategy and this needs to be addressed and corrected.

Action requested: Require the city make changes to better communicate with its residential citizens regarding the public process surrounding zoning and residential development planning and changes.

On the issue of philosophy and measurement:

Transitions are necessary between high and low density housing. Appropriate transitions between areas of different densities are needed and do not seem to be addressed in this proposal. It would help to be clear as to how the City will measure and evaluate how the infill program, and other projects addressing the critical need of housing shortages are being incorporated into current infrastructure, are actually working: Is the program generating affordable housing or replacing modest homes with high-end housing? Are the streets becoming more congested and less safe for pedestrians? Do the new buildings fit with the existing streetscape?

Action requested: Require transition standards between high and low density housing. Require the city incorporate measurement and evaluation standards for this program.

On issues of plan detail:

Item 1:

Cars will not disappear on their own given the current transportation and commuting infrastructure that exists in our neighborhood and citywide. While perhaps not ideal nor desired, reality of current transportation options for citizens must be realized and appropriately planned for. Currently the City of Tacoma has simply not done enough to invest nor accomplish moving away from a

car based primary transportation solution to commuting needs. As a result, ignoring certain realities will simply create additional problems, in this case parking and street congestion. Every car requires a space for parking at its place of registration, where trips originate. This reality needs to apply to all sizes of residential developments until such time as reality changes - and to be clear we support a city and regional approach to transition away from cars as our primary options. What can be accomplished right now is to decrease parking at the car's destinations by allowing businesses to determine how much parking to provide their customers.

Action requested: Striking of the parking wording, requirements, and considerations from the Residential Infill Pilot Program is not appropriate and this language should be retained in all sections that it currently exists. **The Director should not be allowed to waive current parking considerations from planned future development** - even in this pilot project. **We do not support these changes to parking in the draft updated Residential Infill Pilot Program.**

Item 2:

Tacoma must ensure that services are available to serve new residents. The north end sewage treatment plant that serves upper downtown to Point Ruston has been operating beyond capacity for years. Incremental increases from ADUs and duplexes will be easier to accommodate than large apartment complexes. Tacoma needs to expand that plant's capacity before allowing more new connections. This current reality needs to be reflected in this update to the **Residential Infill Pilot Program as well as all other and larger residential projects.**

Action requested: Ensure current infrastructure - to include wastewater and transportation - is sufficient to accommodate increased demands being brought on by this **Residential Infill Pilot Program** and other development.

Finally, Council members, **please direct city staff to similarly “clean up” the sections of the code that pose even worse problems than these small incremental increases in housing density through the residential infill program.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris & Liselotte Barrows

3622 N 27th ST
Tacoma, WA. 98407

clkbarrows@gmail.com

From: karend@harbornet.com

Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 4:39 PM

To: Barrows Family

Cc: City Clerk's Office; Spadoni, Lisa; McCarthy, Conor; Hines, John; Walker, Kristina; Woodards, Victoria; Pauli, Elizabeth; Coble, Kenny; Jodi Cook; Rick Dinicola; Fizz Devlin; lonniechavez@gmail.com; Kristina Maritzczak

Subject: Re: Public comment for | Residential Infill Pilot Program - 10/6/20

Thank you Chris and Liselotte for these excellent comments, much improved over mine! KD

This email is submitted as public comment on the Residential Infill Pilot Program.

Request assistance to ensure this comment is placed on the record.

Request assistance to ensure this comment is provided to each council member.

Honorable Council members,

Our names are Chris and Liselotte Barrows and we live with our family at 3622 N 27th Street in the Proctor District. We are relatively new residents to Tacoma and recently settled, and invested, at our current location in the Proctor neighborhood after 29 years of military service in the U.S. Coast Guard.

While in general the proposal for **Residential Infill Pilot Program** seems laudable, there are several aspects - one of process, one of both philosophy and measurement, and two of plan detail - that we would appreciate your consideration on and specific additional action to address.

On the issue of process:

As a new resident of Tacoma it is not easy nor transparent on how to engage in the public process for issues such as this. This needs work by both the Council and by the City (leadership, departments, and staff). It is very difficult for us as new citizens to understand what is being proposed as far as land use planning and code changes in our neighborhood. The entire process seems oriented toward the developers who stand to profit, rather than the citizens whose daily lives will be impacted. It has been a challenge to understand the infill program as being part of City's growth strategy and this needs to be addressed and corrected.

Action requested: Require the city make changes to better communicate with its residential citizens regarding the public process surrounding zoning and residential development planning and changes.

On the issue of philosophy and measurement:

Transitions are necessary between high and low density housing. Appropriate transitions between areas of different densities are needed and do not seem to be addressed in this proposal. It would help to be clear as to how the City will measure and evaluate how the infill program, and other projects addressing the critical need of housing shortages are being incorporated into current infrastructure, are actually working: Is the program generating affordable housing or replacing modest homes with high-end housing? Are the streets becoming more congested and less safe for pedestrians? Do the new buildings fit with the existing streetscape?

Action requested: Require transition standards between high and low density housing. Require the city incorporate measurement and evaluation standards for this program.

On issues of plan detail:

Item 1:

Cars will not disappear on their own given the current transportation and commuting infrastructure that exists in our neighborhood and citywide. While perhaps not ideal nor desired, reality of current transportation options for citizens must be realized and appropriately planned for. Currently the City of Tacoma has simply not done enough to invest nor accomplish moving away from a car based primary transportation solution to commuting needs. As a result, ignoring certain realities will simply create additional problems, in this case parking and street congestion. Every car requires a space for parking at its place of registration, where trips originate. This reality needs to apply to all sizes of residential developments until such time as reality changes - and to be clear we support a city and regional approach to transition away from cars as our primary options. What can be accomplished right now is to decrease parking at the car's destinations by allowing businesses to determine how much parking to provide their customers.

Action requested: Striking of the parking wording, requirements, and considerations from the Residential Infill Pilot Program is not appropriate and this language should be retained in all sections that it currently exists. **The Director should not be allowed to waive current parking considerations from planned future development** - even in this pilot project. **We do not support these changes to parking in the draft updated Residential Infill Pilot Program.**

Item 2:

Tacoma must ensure that services are available to serve new residents. The north end sewage treatment plant that serves upper downtown to Point Ruston has been operating beyond capacity for years. Incremental increases from ADUs and duplexes will be easier to accommodate than large apartment complexes. Tacoma needs to expand that plant's capacity before allowing more new connections. This current reality needs to be reflected in this update to the **Residential Infill Pilot Program as well as all other and larger residential projects.**

Action requested: Ensure current infrastructure - to include wastewater and transportation - is sufficient to accommodate increased demands being brought on by this **Residential Infill Pilot Program** and other development.

Finally, Council members, **please direct city staff to similarly “clean up” the sections of the code that pose even worse problems than these small incremental increases in housing density through the residential infill program.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris & Liselotte Barrows

3622 N 27th ST
Tacoma, WA. 98407

clkkbarrows@gmail.com

From: Jill & Rob Jensen <jillandrob@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 4:11 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Residential Infill Comments (final)

October 6, 2020

Tacoma City Council

Tacoma Planning Commission

Tacoma City Clerk

Re: Residential Infill

For years the taxpayers of Tacoma have supported the efforts of our City Council, Planning Commission and others concerned with developing our city in a forward moving direction. In our minds, this means a complete, comprehensive package that aims to meet the needs of everyone who does, or wishes to call Tacoma home.

Yet we now find ourselves in a place where the wishes of some are being subjected on all. This means changing our building code to allow more crowding of our property lots, loss of parking, higher building heights and loss of light, privacy, increased noise all without high quality design standards, loss of continuity, potential property values, more crowding in schools, etc. The “new” suggestions for our code will erase parking requirements and corner lot construction for multi-family housing.

This is not fair to those of us who have put tens of thousands of dollars into home repairs, improving the quality and livability of our neighborhoods, now to see our investment of time and money at risk. I for one, have improved not only my own home since 2005, but also that of what was a dilapidated home which has now been converted into affordable, safe and licensed student housing.

Before we open up our city to investors and developers, let us:

1. Not give them any more tax breaks until they too provide AFFORDABLE housing

2. Make them abide by the same codes as the rest of our citizens – in particular appropriate set-back requirements – not out to sidewalk edges.
3. Parking that allows for a MINIMUM of one space per unit – no less
4. Past strict design standards to ensure the sense of community and eye appeal remains – it's been done in other cities – we MUST do it here or we will have the same jumbled appearance that has befallen so many other cities
5. Keep our current code of only appropriately sized corner lots to provide light and parking for neighbors
6. Require them to pay their fair share of impact fees
7. Increase the area to what it was previously for notifying those in proximity to the proposed project
8. Require a REASONABLE amount of time for neighbors and the city at large to become aware of and respond to ideas being put forth

In addition, we must ENFORCE our codes. Even now illegal parking on front lawns, verges, etc. are not being dealt with which encourages others to do the same. If we can't manage to do it now, how can we expect to do it when there are even more homes not in compliance, more cars to police. Can we have trained volunteers in the city who can help distribute information to people who are not abiding by the law?

We believe it is critical to provide housing for all – this cannot be stressed enough - but it can be done in a manner which affords those who own single family homes the sense of community and peace they desired in moving here. Even though our children are grown and gone, we always vote for school levies, park initiatives, road improvements – those issues that ensure our city provides for all. We must be cautious as a city to be certain tax-payers choose to continue living in Tacoma because of what it offers them as well as others. Losing our tax base would be our critical downfall.

We appreciate the city's efforts to find accommodation for all but we must be smart about it. A citizen's task force could help us make those determinations before we find ourselves with problems we are unable to control.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rob and Jill Jensen

3002 N 13th

Tacoma WA 98406

From: Barrows Family <clkbarrows@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 3:56 PM
To: City Clerk's Office; Spadoni, Lisa; McCarthy, Conor; Hines, John; Walker, Kristina; Woodards, Victoria; Pauli, Elizabeth; Coble, Kenny
Cc: Jodi Cook; Rick Dinicola; karend@harbornet.com; Fizz Devlin; lonniechavez@gmail.com; Kristina Maritzak
Subject: Public comment for | Residential Infill Pilot Program - 10/6/20

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This email is submitted as public comment on the Residential Infill Pilot Program.

Request assistance to ensure this comment is placed on the record.

Request assistance to ensure this comment is provided to each council member.

Honorable Council members,

Our names are Chris and Liselotte Barrows and we live with our family at 3622 N 27th Street in the Proctor District. We are relatively new residents to Tacoma and recently settled, and invested, at our current location in the Proctor neighborhood after 29 years of military service in the U.S. Coast Guard.

While in general the proposal for **Residential Infill Pilot Program** seems laudable, there are several aspects - one of process, one of both philosophy and measurement, and two of plan detail - that we would appreciate your consideration on and specific additional action to address.

On the issue of process:

As a new resident of Tacoma it is not easy nor transparent on how to engage in the public process for issues such as this. This needs work by both the Council and by the City (leadership, departments, and staff). It is very difficult for us as new citizens to understand what is being proposed as far as land use planning and code changes in our neighborhood. The entire process seems oriented toward the developers who stand to profit, rather than the citizens whose daily lives will be impacted. It has been a challenge to understand the infill program as being part of City's growth strategy and this needs to be addressed and corrected.

Action requested: Require the city make changes to better communicate with its residential citizens regarding the public process surrounding zoning and residential development planning and changes.

On the issue of philosophy and measurement:

Transitions are necessary between high and low density housing. Appropriate transitions between areas of different densities are needed and do not seem to be addressed in this proposal. It would help to be clear as to how the City will measure and evaluate how the infill program, and other projects addressing the critical need of housing shortages are being incorporated into current infrastructure, are actually working: Is the program generating affordable housing or replacing modest homes with high-end housing? Are the streets becoming more congested and less safe for pedestrians? Do the new buildings fit with the existing streetscape?

Action requested: Require transition standards between high and low density housing. Require the city incorporate measurement and evaluation standards for this program.

On issues of plan detail:

Item 1:

Cars will not disappear on their own given the current transportation and commuting infrastructure that exists in our neighborhood and citywide. While perhaps not ideal nor desired, reality of current transportation options for citizens must be realized and appropriately planned for. Currently the City of Tacoma has simply not done enough to invest nor accomplish moving away from a car based primary transportation solution to commuting needs. As a result, ignoring certain realities will simply create additional problems, in this case parking and street congestion. Every car requires a space for parking at its place of registration, where trips originate. This reality needs to apply to all sizes of residential developments until such time as reality changes - and to be clear we support a city and regional approach to transition away from cars as our primary options. What can be accomplished right now is to decrease parking at the car's destinations by allowing businesses to determine how much parking to provide their customers.

Action requested: Striking of the parking wording, requirements, and considerations from the Residential Infill Pilot Program is not appropriate and this language should be retained in all sections that it currently exists. **The Director should not be allowed to waive current parking considerations from planned future development** - even in this pilot project. **We do not support these changes to parking in the draft updated Residential Infill Pilot Program.**

Item 2:

Tacoma must ensure that services are available to serve new residents. The north end sewage treatment plant that serves upper downtown to Point Ruston has been operating beyond capacity for years. Incremental increases from ADUs and duplexes will be easier to accommodate than large apartment complexes. Tacoma needs to expand that plant's capacity before allowing more new connections. This current reality needs to be reflected in this update to the **Residential Infill Pilot Program as well as all other and larger residential projects.**

Action requested: Ensure current infrastructure - to include wastewater and transportation - is sufficient to accommodate increased demands being brought on by this **Residential Infill Pilot Program** and other development.

Finally, Council members, **please direct city staff to similarly "clean up" the sections of the code that pose even worse problems than these small incremental increases in housing density through the residential infill program.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris & Liselotte Barrows

3622 N 27th ST

Tacoma, WA. 98407

clkbarrows@gmail.com

From: Tom Pierson <TomP@tacomachamber.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 3:39 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Hearing - Letter on the Residential Infill Pilot Program
Attachments: Residential Infill 100620 City of Tacoma.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

On behalf of the Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber, we are urging your support the reauthorization, extension, and modification of the Residential Infill Pilot Program.

I hope you are having a great week and let me know if you have questions.

Thanks
Tom

Best wishes,
Tom Pierson
President & CEO
Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber
950 Pacific Avenue
Tacoma, WA 98402

Main: 253.627.2175
Direct: 253.682.1736

tomp@tacomachamber.org
www.tacomachamber.org

Making the South Sound the best place to do business in Washington state!



Business Have Questions

We'll Get The Answers

- Financial Needs & Legal Questions
- Gov't. Regulations
- HR & Employee Issues
- Getting Back to Work
- Communications Questions

www.rapidresponsesouthsound.com



October 6, 2020

Mayor Victoria Woodards
Tacoma City Council Members
733 Market Street
Tacoma, WA 98402

Dear Mayor and Members of the Tacoma City Council:

On behalf of the Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber, we are urging your support the reauthorization, extension, and modification of the Residential Infill Pilot Program.

The Chamber is focused on making the South Sound the most equitable and inclusive place to do business in Washington state. One of our focus areas is the issue of homelessness. Within homelessness, we are paying special attention to workforce, housing, and behavior health, with an overarching lens of race, equity and fairness.

We need to add more available units in housing at all levels. In turn, this will allow more access for those who are facing homelessness. Without an adequate supply of housing units affordable to people experiencing homelessness and those with extremely low incomes (from 0-30% AMI), we will simply fail to end homelessness. We are working in partnership with the Tacoma-Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness for solutions. We join with the Coalition and other affordable housing advocates in support of the proposed Regulatory Code Changes which extend and expand the program and provide new flexibilities.

Therefore, we support the reauthorization of the Residential Infill Pilot Program. If you have any question, please contact me directly. Thank you for your work on this resolution and issue!

Best wishes,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom".

Tom Pierson
President & CEO
Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber

From: Jodi Cook <jodi.cook0983@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 3:16 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Input regarding changes to Infill Housing
Attachments: Infill Housing.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To: Tacoma City Clerk
From: Jodi Cook
Date: October 6, 2020
Subject: Residential Infill

Tacoma does need to provide additional housing within the City. However, it must include strong design elements found not only in a handbook of suggestions, but integrated within the Tacoma Municipal Building Codes.

The beauty found in the simple designs of the pre-WWII housing, for Tacoma's working class, were built before residential zoning even occurred in the 50's. Small local developer's intuitively understood principals of creating architectural styles and elements such as set-backs, which complemented one block to another. Architectural styles continued to evolve after WWII but carried forth a sense of continuity in building materials, street designs etc.

There is an accountability for those making decisions on how all of Tacoma's beautiful neighborhoods can be transformed to allow more people to be included. At one point during the infill process, some architectural prototypes of infill were discussed, allowing for a builder to pick a design that already included the style to incorporate within a neighborhood, street or block, whose architectural character fit and enhanced those existing homes. And decreasing their costs for architectural services. These prototypes should be used to stream line the permitting process, not just give into some developers who present a cost analysis that improves their profitability at residents expense.

The proposed idea to take away residents ability to have a say on how their street and community can be transformed through fast tracking infill approvals, places many outside investor's financial interests over our communities need for light, space, air and a healthy environment, not to mention the social needs that create a true community.

We have the right to experience beauty daily, and limited oversight would be selling out Tacomans' who have stood by this City during tough times. We are the ones who did not pick up and leave, but stood fast. Those moving to Tacoma have come because they see we have neighborhoods that disappeared from their cities, infilled with a "anything goes" building design palette. Again, mandating excellent design solves many problems with creating greater diversity of housing for all.

All developers must contribute towards impact fees. For example, the North End has a healthier tree canopy than those areas of Tacoma where landlords do not care for right of way trees. Use some of the impact fees judiciously through out the City. Use fees to develop a planting and on-going maintenance plan to give these areas a badly needed tree canopy.

Please don't blow it!

Thanks for your time, Jodi Cook 3608 N 25th Street Tacoma WA 98406

From: Lonnie Chavez <lonniechavez@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 2:11 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Comments for 10/6
Attachments: Lonnie's Public comment 10.6.20.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Council members,

My name is Lonnie Chavez, my husband and myself have lived in Tacoma for two years. We were attracted to the area for community 'feel' of the Proctor District and the care and pride of the neighbors for the historical and preservation of the buildings and homes.

As we were relocating here, Proctor was experiencing construction of two major apartment buildings, to accommodate the need for housing. Concerned neighbors have made comments of the increased traffic and parking concerns. Additionally, a proposed eight story apartment structure is now planned in the neighborhood, a block from the commercial district. There are many questions that have not been addressed in adding the additional burden of cars, traffic and services that are needed. This development is next to single-family dwellings with direct impact on the daily lives of the neighbors and further impacting the parking and traffic challenges faced by neighborhood elementary school several hundred feet away.

While the city needs to plan for growth in Tacoma, strategies need to be incorporated preserve our historic neighborhoods, accommodating traffic and parking concerns, and the transition between commercial, high density and single family homes. How is this being considered? How are we considering the safety of the pedestrians?

Also, Tacoma must ensure that services are available to serve new residents. The north end sewage treatment plant that serves upper downtown to Point Ruston has been operating beyond capacity for years. Incremental increases from ADUs and duplexes will be easier to accommodate than large apartment complexes. Tacoma needs to expand that plant's capacity before allowing more new connections.

Please address and consider these concerns in the sections of the code in the MUC that pose even worse problems than these small incremental increases in housing density through the residential infill program. Thank you for your consideration.

Lonnie Chavez
3620 North 27th Street
Tacoma, WA 98407

From: Felicity Devlin <felicitydevlin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 1:44 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Written comments on Infill Program
Attachments: Infill housing Code Change Comments.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Ms. Sorum,

I have attached my comments for the public hearing concerning the Residential Infill Pilot Program.

Thank you,

Felicity Devlin

To: Tacoma City Council
 From: Felicity Devlin
 Date: October 5, 2020

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments concerning Regulatory Code Changes to the Residential Infill Pilot Program.

I have the following comments and questions:

Compatibility of infill with existing streetscape: I appreciate the aims of the program to provide additional, affordable housing options in our neighborhoods while also maintaining responsiveness to “neighborhood patterns” (street frontage characteristics, architectural features, setback, etc.). For many middle-income families, their house is their most important investment. The goal of the Infill Program to “Protect neighborhood stability, property values, and the single-family residential appearance” is an important one.

Program Evaluation: I also appreciate that the City will be evaluating the results of the program after a limited number of projects have been allowed in each district. It’s essential to evaluate whether the program is fulfilling desired goals and whether unanticipated impacts need to be corrected.

Ensuring that the program does generate affordable housing. In particular it’s important the City should monitor whether the program is fulfilling the important goal of generating affordable options. It seems likely—especially in higher priced neighborhoods where affordable options are most needed—that a developer will be incentivized to demolish modest units to replace them with two high-end units neither of which will be “affordable”.

Maintaining quality of life and livability: Will the Planning Dept. be tracking the location of new infill housing to determine whether new housing is being distributed around the City or is becoming concentrated in one area?

Associated with this, has the City determined what the “carrying capacity” of a neighborhood should be, given available open space and other amenities, as well as existing infrastructure such as sewer capacity?

Measureable Requirements: G.3.d calls for minimizing “scale contrasts, shading and privacy impacts” and requires that “Privacy and shading impacts on abutting parcels must be prevented or reduced to a reasonable extent.” For something as important as whether a neighbor’s privacy will be compromised or their yard shaded, “reasonable extent” is a very subjective measure. “Reasonable extent” is not a universally shared value. The Code could provide more objective measures, such as windows in new units not having a view into a neighboring house or yard. And in a climate as dreary as ours is in the winter, a time when many Tacoma residents suffer from seasonal affective disorder, any additional shading of a neighboring house or yard should not be permitted.

From: Rachel Randich <Rachel@tpcar.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 12:45 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comment re: Residential Infill Program
Attachments: TPCAR letter re Infill Program.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

My name is Rachel Randich, and I'm the Government Affairs Director for the Tacoma the Pierce County Association of REALTORS®.

I am submitting comment today on behalf of our 2,200 members in support of the Residential Infill Pilot Program.

Thank you staff for getting these comments to the Council, and thank you Council Members for your time and consideration of these comments.

Best,
Rachel Randich
Government Affairs Director
Tacoma Pierce County Association of REALTORS®
253-274-0413



To: Honorable Mayor Woodards, and the Tacoma City Council Members,

RE: Resolution No. 40647, modification of the Residential Infill Pilot Program,

My name is Rachel Randich, I'm the Government Affairs Director for the Tacoma-Pierce County Association of REALTORS®. I am submitting these comments on behalf of our 2,200 members. First and foremost, we would like to thank the Mayor and the Council for their efforts to help remedy the inequities we are experiencing in the market today. We hope that other Pierce County municipalities will embrace and learn from the City of Tacoma's efforts to help make housing more affordable. We applaud the City of Tacoma's leadership in developing the tools necessary to cause the Affordable Housing Action Strategy (AHAS) goals to become a reality.

As you are aware, the AHAS set a goal of providing an additional 10,500 units to the City of Tacoma residents. ("6,000 new affordable units; preserve 2,300 existing affordable units, and serve an additional 2,200 households by 2028") The AHAS study further reports that 33,000 (cost-burdened) Tacoma residents that rent or own are paying at least 30% of their income for rent and utilities. Some are paying over 50%.

As REALTORS® we still believe in the American Dream of Homeownership, but sadly for many in Tacoma that is exactly what it is, "A Dream". Not having different choices available such as the missing middle housing, locks out many and especially hurts our minority populations from owning where they live. For example, the homeownership rates for our African American and Hispanic populations are 35% and 45% respectively, which further exasperates the financial net worth between these populations and everyone else by an unfortunate ten times.

As REALTORS® we are always promoting land-use policies that allow as many people to afford to own the home they live in. Expanding the Residential Infill Project will help with that. Allowing "Light Density" in areas where the infrastructure and land have already been paid for will allow developers to spread the cost of new units for sale and rent over a larger amount of homes thus making the finished product more affordable. It will provide choices for those that haven't been able to afford a single-family home on a lot with ADUs, condos, cottage and carriage housing and perhaps a form of individual homeownership (unit short plat) not currently being considered in Tacoma, but that has been very successful in Seattle and other neighboring cities. Pierce County is currently considering this as a comp plan change.

We wanted to share a few statistics with you:

- Within the City of Tacoma, the Median time on the market today is 5 days. There are 33 days of inventory on the market- A balanced market is 180 days.
- The Median Home Price in January of 2017 was \$233,300; it is now \$352,000.



- During a pandemic recession and unemployment at approximately 9%, home prices are up a staggering 12.5%, year to date.

We wonder what will happen to the cost of housing when the economy rebounds and we go back to an unemployment rate of 3-5%. As REALTORS® we see this playing out in the market every single day and how it impacts a neighbor's ability to obtain affordable housing to own or rent.

We are aware your constituents (NIMBYS) will not immediately warm up to increased density in their neighborhoods. However, this type of inclusive housing can be made to enhance a neighborhood with design standards that are pleasing to those currently living there. Lastly, we ask this simple question: after reading the above statistics and knowing we need more affordable housing: **"don't you think we should do something?"** And if not this, then what?

Thank you for your time and consideration of these comments.

Best,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Rachel Randich".

Rachel Randich
Government Affairs Director
Tacoma Pierce County Association of REALTORS®

From: Maureen Howard <maureenhowardconsulting@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 12:14 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comments for Public Hearing OCT. 6, 2020 on Residential Infill Pilot Program Regulations
Attachments: TPCCEH Letter of Support on Residential Infill.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please find attached comments from the Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness.

Sincerely,

Maureen Howard

--

Maureen Howard

MaureenHowardConsulting
maureenhowardconsulting@gmail.com

Tel: 253-756-8146 (LL)

Cell: 253-255-2200
3320 S. 8th Street
Tacoma, WA 98405

I'm with Angela Davis:

"I'm no longer accepting the things I cannot change.

I'm changing the things I cannot accept."

And with John Lewis:

"Never, ever be afraid to make some noise and get in good trouble, necessary trouble."



October 6, 2020

To: The Tacoma City Council

From: Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness

Public Hearing on Residential Infill Pilot Program Regulations

Who We Are:

The Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness is a loose network of individuals, non-profit organizations, government agencies, and community businesses working together to serve people experiencing homelessness. Each week, 50-100 coalition participants meet and more than 500 people are on the Coalition's email distribution list.

Why This Letter of Support:

Housing ends homelessness. Without an adequate supply of housing units affordable to people experiencing homelessness and those with extremely low incomes - from 0-30% AMI, we will simply never end homelessness. Making new housing construction easier and less expensive allows more units to be built. This increase in the housing supply is the only way to reverse the homelessness epidemic.

Our Coalition has formed a partnership with the Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber of Commerce to work together on Housing and Workforce Development.

We join with the Chamber and other affordable housing advocates in support of the proposed Regulatory Code Changes which extend and expand the program and provide new flexibilities.

Our Coalition voted formally to support these changes. It is our hope that some of these expanded units will be affordable to the people we serve.

Contacts for the Tacoma Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness:

Gerrit Nyland, gnyland@pchomeless.org 253-304-5105

Maureen Howard, mhoward@pchomeless.org 253-255-2200

From: Jill Sousa <jill@jillsousaarchitect.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 10:37 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Residential infill program 2.0

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

I am writing to support the changes made to the Program. I am looking forward when this program will be implemented and put permanently into the Code.

As a residential architect I am intimately familiar with the implementation of the new ADU code, which was in the initial Infill Project, and find that, though I am very supportive of the goal, code compliance I can be challenging. Specifics for code compliance, once looked at all together, can make it impossible to implement or at the least it takes a trained person to navigate through the requirements, which seems to defeat the purpose of making this housing option available as an affordable solution to housing in the city.

My comments on the Infill 2.0 Project:

- 1) very happy to see the number of spots available increased
- 2) I think that duplexes should be allowed on lots NOT just corner lots. I grew up in Saint Paul Minnesota which has neighborhoods with a mix of SF and duplexes and it was a known type of housing for a long time before modern car-centric suburban zoning was implemented. In Tacoma, some of the older neighborhoods have many duplexes which are for the most part not even distinguishable from single family homes. I have helped clients that have homes that were once turn-of-the century duplexes and converted to single family homes at some time.
- 3) A concern about the Cottage Housing units types. I support the change but have found that the Planning Department is going to only use the Carriage House as a type only as it relates to the Cottage Housing. So any DADU that has living space above a garage cannot use this term. Very confusing and odd as the term is generally used for this purpose.
- 4) Density Based housing seems like a great option, but the details are still fuzzy and my experience is that everything depends on the details.

Jill Sousa

Sent from my iPhone

From: karend@harbornet.com

Sent: Monday, October 5, 2020 6:19 PM

To: Coble, Kenny; Pauli, Elizabeth; Woodards, Victoria; Walker, Kristina; Hines, John; McCarthy, Conor; Spadoni, Lisa; Jumper, Tanisha; Chris Barrows; Lonnie Chavez; jimdefebaugh@aol.com; Kristina Maritzak; robbecky33@msn.com; Fizz Devlin; jason@franklycinematics.com; efarris@live.com; alyssardonohue@gmail.com; Debra Meyerson; Kristen Leon; jodi.cook0983@gmail.com; carlysnapp@hotmail.com; Rick Dinicola

Cc: Crabtree, Mary; City Clerk's Office

Subject: Public comments for 10/6/20

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

Hello again,

Staff have not yet responded to the questions in my email of last Thursday, below, but here are my comments for tomorrow's public hearing. Please let me know as soon as possible if this constitutes an appropriately submitted written public comment. The comment would be about 2.5 minutes if delivered orally. I didn't see guidance as to the maximum length of comment that would be accepted. Thank you! KD

Honorable Council members,

My name is Karen Dinicola and I have lived in Tacoma's north end for nearly 30 years.

It has always been very difficult for citizens to understand what is being proposed as far as land use planning and code changes in our neighborhoods. The entire process seems oriented toward the developers who stand to profit, rather than the citizens whose daily lives will be impacted. It has been a challenge to understand the infill program as being part of the growth strategy for the same city as the MUC. The sections of code should reflect similar policies.

I appreciate the difficulty of keeping everybody happy while planning for population growth in Tacoma. But the overall strategy for infill seems to be leaping decades ahead in thinking. It allows too many big changes too quickly, without transition between areas of different densities. It might help to be clear as to how the City will measure and evaluate how the infill programs are actually working: Is the program generating affordable housing or replacing modest homes with high-end housing? Are the streets becoming more congested and less safe for pedestrians? Do the new buildings fit with the existing streetscape?

High density housing should be oriented along the city's arterials and surrounding the high capacity transit centers at the Dome, downtown, the mall, and TCC. [There is no such transit center in North Tacoma. Perhaps the Cushman project could serve this function in a mixed use.] Transitions are necessary between high and low density housing. Every car requires a space for parking at its place of registration, where trips originate. Apply this concept to all sizes of residential developments. Decrease parking at the car's destinations by allowing businesses to determine how much parking to provide their customers.

Tacoma must ensure that services are available to serve new residents. The north end sewage treatment plant that serves upper downtown to Point Ruston has been operating beyond capacity for years. Incremental increases from ADUs and duplexes will be easier to accommodate than large apartment complexes. Tacoma needs to expand that plant's capacity before allowing more new connections.

Council members, please direct city staff to similarly “clean up” the sections of the code in the MUC that pose even worse problems than these small incremental increases in housing density through the residential infill program. Thank you for your consideration.

Thanks for your reply Kenny. I have a process concern and procedural questions.

The section of code that is under discussion at this hearing is the underlying basis of a highly problematic development proposal in my neighborhood. It is my belief that the dozens upon dozens of citizens and teachers who submitted comments about their concerns regarding that project should have been notified about this upcoming hearing, and the workshops. Unfortunately they were not even all included in the city’s initial response to the collective comments.

I understand you are doing your best to give notice, but the current situation with Covid requires extra efforts. Would you please work with the planning department (I included Lisa Spadoni on the to: line) to ensure broader notification and consider allowing additional time to comment?

Would the city council also please consider delaying a decision on these code updates to provide interested citizens with a meaningful opportunity to engage and voice their concerns about safety and congestion?

We are in favor of stepwise, thoughtful increases in housing density but fear irreversible damage to desirable neighborhoods if these codes are not better aligned with the totality of the Comp Plan policies.

I and many of my neighbors on the cc line will do our best to submit written comments on or before 10/6. These are the only previous commenters whose email addresses I have.

Thank you for your consideration and for sharing any information you have about additional opportunities to better understand and weigh in on the proposed code changes.

Sincerely,
Karen Dinicola

Sent from my mobile phone
253-759-8098

> On Oct 1, 2020, at 9:59 AM, Coble, Kenny wrote:

>

> Hi, Karen. I’m Kenny Coble, Community Engagement Coordinator for the City. My director, Tanisha Jumper, passed your question onto me and I wanted to let you know what we found out. While we are now able to hold verbal public comment again, the meeting you’re interested in was noticed to the public before that decision was made. Council does receive all written comments and we will have further opportunities to speak on housing and residential infill. Home in Tacoma, a project of our planning department, will be hosting a feedback gathering event in late October. I’d be happy to pass that event onto once it’s been scheduled.

>

> I hope that helped.

>

> Have a good day.

>

> Peace,

> Kenny

From: Sherriff, Mesa
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2020 7:55 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: FW: Residential Infill Pilot Program Public Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi,
Please see below.

Thanks,

MESA SHERRIFF, AIA, LEED AP
Senior Planner, Urban Design Studio
City of Tacoma, Washington
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

PH: 253.591.5480
msherriff@cityoftacoma.org
www.cityoftacoma.org/planning

From: Grace A <GraceAK01@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 4, 2020 4:55 PM
To: Sherriff, Mesa <msherriff@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: Residential Infill Pilot Program Public Comment

Good afternoon,

I noticed that there was a public hearing coming up for a program I have been following with interest, and wanted to add my voice to the public comments for it. As a Tacoma resident, I strongly support expanding residential infill across the City. Access to affordable housing is an equity and equality issue, because the lack of it most negatively affects minority communities who have historically been disadvantaged in the housing market. Encouraging residential infill to address this issue also maintains the character and diversity of the City of Tacoma's neighborhoods in a way that large redevelopment projects like apartments which would either designate a few units as affordable or contribute to a fund for affordable housing, as is modelled in some other jurisdictions, would not. When the options to improve access to affordable housing are assessed in terms of goals including impact on equality of outcomes, impact on efficiency in providing affordable housing, impact on public expenditure, impact on neighborhood character, impact on development potential, other externalities, and political feasibility, residential infill is clearly the superior way to zone.

Please let me know if you have any questions, or if my comments should be submitted in another way.

Kind regards,

Grace Amundsen Barnkow, PE
253-389-6086
7401 E G St, Tacoma WA 98404
Graceak01@hotmail.com

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Ken Miller <ken.miller@daduhomes.com>
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2020 8:03 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Barnett, Elliott; Sherriff, Mesa; Boudet, Brian
Subject: October 6 Council hearing on density
Attachments: city comments.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Attached are my comments for the upcoming hearing. Thanks for including them.

Best, Ken Miller

--

Ken Miller / Principal

DADU Homes / Building Forward

Direct: 253.973.3171



2522 N. Proctor
Suite 534
Tacoma 98406
September 29, 2020

Mayor Victoria Woodards
Deputy Mayor Keith Blocker
Members of the Tacoma City Council

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for the chance to comment on infill and density for the October 6 hearing.

Our small company builds DADUs, with 12 units completed, in construction, or in permitting. On each job we work with as many as 20 other small businesses ranging from surveyors and engineers to framers and painters as well as local distributors and manufacturers. Not incidentally we rely on City staff, uniformly helpful despite the challenges of COVID.

We support the proposed changes to and expansion of the infill pilot program. More people across the City will see how densification builds healthy neighborhoods.

That said, I encourage you to go beyond 15 new sites (three for each of the five Councilmanic districts). Please consider: we're not hitting our AHAS targets; Tacoma's population growth has lagged Pierce County's and Washington State's for 20 years; and our slow growth can't support the rising cost of government.

Unless and until we embrace density – not just tolerate it but pursue it aggressively – we can't provide the varied housing necessary to grow the City in a healthy way. Lots of new homes temper the rising cost of housing. And affordable housing at various price points will make Tacoma attractive to new talent, new money, and new civic participation.

In closing I thank the Planning Commission and staff for proposing this useful, though modest, step. I hope it launches us on a long run of healthy growth.

Best wishes,

Ken Miller,
principal

From: Jerod Meacham <jerod@meachamdev.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2020 12:57 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Ryan Meacham
Subject: Letter to City Council for meeting on 10/6/2020.
Attachments: 20201001 Meacham Development City council letter.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

We would like to submit the attached letter for the City Council meeting on the Residential Infill Pilot Program. Please let me know if any additional information is required.

Thank you,

- Jerod Meacham

Owner, Meacham Development, LLC

951-204-0666



Meacham Development, LLC
3422 N. Puget Sound Ave
Tacoma, WA 98407
Tel: 951-204-0666
Jerod@MeachamDev.com or
Ryan@MeachamDev.com

10/1/2020

To Whom It May Concern:

Meacham Development, LLC, is a local company developing real estate and building single-family and multi-family residential homes in Tacoma and the surrounding area. We have been designing, building, maintaining as rentals, and selling under a local real estate license, under this company and others, for over twenty years in Tacoma. We find the residential in-fill program to be very beneficial and successful in its goals. In furtherance of the city Comprehensive Plan, the small-lot code and in-fill program has been instrumental in our building of new housing in Tacoma, increasing density, and allowing for more available housing inventory resulting in helping with home affordability. We believe that it is extremely important, if new construction is expected to continue, to allow the small-lot and in-fill program to continue.

In order to make the program even better, the following suggestions would allow for further development without any substantial negative impacts. We hope that the city council will consider the following proposals in the renewal of the program or any new related programs.

- Right-of-way (ROW) improvements – Often we come across projects that are not financially viable despite meeting the criteria of small-lot code with respect to lot size, setbacks, density, and other requirements due to the cost and difficulty of ROW improvements required. When looking to purchase property to short-plot into new small lots, the city requires many ROW improvements such as replacement of an existing wedge curb with a new hard curb (whether or not the wedge curb was recently installed by the City), moving existing driveways, re-doing existing driveway approaches, and paving unpaved roads. The costs associated with this include 3rd party civil engineering, ROW bonds, permits, work orders, and substantial time commitments. On a recent project, the simple replacement of a wedge curb with a hard curb has cost us over \$15,000 to meet the city requirements and we have not yet even begun the actual curb replacement. We expect those costs to double by the time the curb is completed. On other projects, where ADA access ramps are required, the costs are even higher. We have been able to absorb this cost on some projects but it has meant that we did not proceed with other projects such as a corner lot that would have required a curb replacement for ~200 linear feet. Another project we did not proceed with was due to an unpaved road that would have to be replaced with a concrete road. While we understand that the city would like to negate the costs of the improvements by passing them off to developers, the reality is that these areas never get improved because they are not financially viable. We estimate that approximately 50% of the projects we consider are not viable due to the ROW upgrade requirements, the lack of transparency on the required improvements, the costs being buried in the right of way design manual, and the difficulty in determining requirements in a timely manner during a feasibility study phase. This is even more problematic in lower value communities in Tacoma wherein resale and return on investment are less despite the lower value communities being the best place to increase affordable housing.

- Approved site plan example applied to cottage development – one of the biggest struggles in working with the City of Tacoma vs other communities is the lack of transparency in the code requirements of site development and traffic, since the respective codes are sometimes contradictory in what will be allowed. A ‘partial’ solution to this, with respect to the application of cottage communities and other small density projects, would be to layout and provide accepted ‘city appropriate’ site plans for the standard lot sizes in Tacoma – ie 10,000 SF 100 x 100 deep lots, 12,000 SF 100 x 120 deep lots, or larger. These site plans would illustrate an alley access situation and a non-alley access situation wherein the maximum cottages would be allocated based on the SF of the sample lots. The plans would illustrate required road widths, suggested open space, suggested landscape space required, suggested parking, etc. This would be a relatively simple illustration by a City Planner that would guide developers and builders in creating these communities and would likely increase the implementation of cottage development.
- Small lot floor Area Ratio (FAR) – the FAR for small lots is currently set at a maximum of 50%. With small lots in R2 districts having a minimum square footage of 4500 SF, this means the maximum size for a new single-family home is 2250 SF. This is normally not an issue, however in circumstances where there is no alley, an attached garage becomes necessary which then reduces the size of the living space of the house below the threshold expected for new construction and makes the construction less financially viable. Additionally, the recent decision by the permitting staff to reverse previous interpretations of the code and require non-enclosed covered porches and patios to be included in the square footage of the house, further reduces the actual square footage of living space as well as diminishes the appeal of the home. Furthermore, in small lot code, porches of specific size are required and this new interpretation of the code works in opposition to the City’s suggested aesthetic requirements of the same code. We would suggest the permit office go back to the previous interpretation of the code allowing for porches and patios to be exempted which would then allow builders to make new construction homes more aesthetically pleasing by having larger front porches that are more typical to the existing Tacoma inventory of homes. We also suggest that in cases where an attached garage is required due to lack of an alley, the code should exempt that space similarly to how attic or basement space is currently exempted or increase the FAR on those lots. After all, the small lot code has now been in existence for roughly 5 years and it is a proven entity wherein increasing the FAR on specific non-alley lots doesn’t undermine the goal. Please clarify and amend small lot code under FAR to not include garages on no alley lots and to exclude porches and patios in addition to the current exclusion of basements.
- Small-Lot Design Standards – The small lot design standards were clearly created with craftsman designs in mind. While we still build craftsman houses in many areas, overall design and buyer desire is moving to more modern design. Requirements such as roof pitches being 6:12 are not aesthetically pleasing on many types of non-craftsman homes. These 6:12 pitch roofs are also very difficult to implement in view sensitive districts with maximum height requirements while still having a two-story home. As land value increases, and in order to make a project financially feasible and still meet the lot coverage requirements, all new construction essentially has to be two stories. This means that the ceiling heights in these districts end up being artificially low or homes are dug lower than grade in order to accommodate the total height of the house while much of the height is wasted in attic space of the 6:12 roof. Similarly, the requirement for decorative molding and framing on the façade does not often look good on a more modern designed house. We recently got approved permits on two

side-by-side houses in South Tacoma and had difficulty meeting the ‘non-duplicate front façade’ requirement despite the houses being entirely different. We were told the issue was that the front windows and front door were in the same location on both houses. This is despite the roof lines being in different directions, the porches being different, the window types being different, different siding and colors, and different columns. Many craftsman houses that are 25’ wide will follow the same 4-window pattern with a door in the center as it makes for a standard interior layout. In this case, the interpretation of the code by the permit office could use some clarification. We would suggest that the code be re-written or slightly modified to allow for other types of homes to be created as well as clarify some of the requirements. Another possible solution would be to have a design review option wherein the City or board could easily make a determination that the design meets an aesthetic of quality and interest that simple code can’t define. How do we innovate if we are constrained by the basics of code?

- Proposing changes to code and transparency – we have been successful in some discussions with lead planners over the years in determining ‘logical’ interpretations of code wherein code is written but doesn’t reflect the goal of the code, or where code is convoluted or confusing. We appreciate the openness of the lead planners but would like an email address or a more direct method of suggesting code improvements so that our outcomes are not lost over time. Currently, we have not been successful in finding a method to communicate code clarifications and changes. We believe that our input will improve Tacoma, we are clearly making efforts as in writing this letter, and these efforts should assist builders, homeowners, architects and designers to work efficiently through the design and code process. Can the City planners, planning commission or City council create a link or an email address for suggested code improvements that go on a community board and to those in charge of new code? This seems like a simple technology related improvement wherein staff could bring ideas to a meeting, discuss, and effectuate beneficial code improvements.
- Duplex builds –As a realtor, builder, and investor, we can state that the initial pilot program for corner lot duplexes was unsuccessful and didn’t generate the expected results. This is because a duplex is more costly to build than a single-family home, 6000 SF corner lots are rare, and duplex values are typically lower than similarly sized single-family homes for resale. Our suggested change to the duplexes on 6000 SF lot code is to allow duplexes on any lot. If there is land, allow a duplex or single family. There is already design criteria and the neighborhood value can determine if there is greater value in a single-family home vs a duplex; or the builder can determine if they want to build a home for resale, build for investment, or a combination of both. This will generate more density and isn’t a stretch or great modification from the existing small lot code. This also isn’t substantially different than allowing a small lot to have a DADU, which is already part of code. If the intent of the program is to add density, to make this program successful the city should be practical about it and understand that there aren’t many 6000 SF lots available in Tacoma. Any lot can provide a quality duplex. Furthermore, there are 25’ wide 1900-1910 duplexes all over Tacoma that are charming and work on small lots with frontages of 35’ or greater. Even if the current unit standard requires 3000 SF per unit, these duplexes can be exempted on small lots and not affect the character of communities. We have mentioned this 3-4 times over the past but have never received any response from the city. If this is the first time that the city council is hearing of this issue, then clearly our comment regarding the lack of a direct path of communication is applicable in providing better feedback and suggestions to the programs.

We commend the City and City council in the forward thinking, creation and implementation of the residential in-fill program and small-lot creation. We hope that our input is considered and any future changes keep in mind the cost and time constraints that builders and developers must adhere to in order to continue development in Tacoma. We hope that these suggested changes serve to increase the number of viable projects and increase our capability to provide new housing opportunities in Tacoma. We encourage any readers of this letter to reach-out to us if we can be of further assistance.

Thank you,

Jerod Meacham, Designer & Engineer

Ryan Meacham, Realtor

Owners, Meacham Development, LLC