

**From:** [Jason Gauthier](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Cc:** [Woodards, Victoria](#); [McCarthy, Conor](#); [Walker, Kristina](#)  
**Subject:** Resolution 40816 - public comment  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 27, 2021 9:44:18 AM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[Res. 40816 public comment.docx](#)

---

Please see Tacoma/Pierce County Habitat for Humanity's attached public comment in support of Resolution 40816.

## Jason Gauthier

[He/Him]

Director of Operations & Government Affairs

906-221-5382 [call/text]



*This communication may contain privileged and/or confidential information. It is intended solely for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing or using any of this information. If you received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately and destroy the material in its entirety, whether electronic or hard copy. This communication may contain nonpublic personal information about consumers subject to the restrictions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. You may not directly or indirectly reuse or redisclose such information for any purpose other than to provide the services for which you are receiving the information.*



**everyone**  
deserves a decent place to live.

July 27, 2021

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

RE: *Resolution 40816*

Mayor Woodards, Deputy Mayor Blocker, and Members of the City Council,

Tacoma/Pierce County Habitat for Humanity is fully supportive of Resolution 40816 to enter into an intergovernmental agreement to support and fund the work the South Sound Housing Affordability Partners (“SSHAP”), and it’s mission to improve housing attainability, affordability, and accessibility in the cities, towns, and unincorporated areas of Pierce County. There is no larger issue facing Pierce County communities than housing availability and cost. As a primary detriment of health it’s imperative that we address this issue in a coordinated regional effort to ensure the holistic wellness of our communities. We applaud Mayor Woodards’ multi-year long leadership on this issue and in the formation of SSHAP and our organization looks forward to working with SSHAP members and staff leadership to create a pathway for every Pierce County resident to access a safe, decent, and affordable housing unit.

In partnership,

Jason Gauthier  
Director of Operations & Government Affairs

**From:** [Kit Burns](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Cc:** [Woodards, Victoria](#); [Blocker, Keith](#); [Hunter, Lillian](#)  
**Subject:** Written Comments - July 27 - ORD28773 - Electric System Revenue and Refunding Bonds  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 27, 2021 3:56:07 PM

---

Dear Mayor Woodards and Council,

Perhaps there will be an explanation on how much TPU pays for interest and principal on the Bonds - annually.

Maybe TPU will explain how much interest on these bonds cost the citizens annually and if there is a plan to reduce those amounts.

What is the total 'indebtedness' TPU carries?

What is the plan to pay this down over the next 30 years?

Will any of these loans carry balloon payments?  
Can balloon payments in loans be prohibited?

Just some general thoughts and questions.  
Maybe these are questions that you or the council have.

Sincerely,

Kit Burns

--

PO Box 2341  
Tacoma, WA 98401

. . ."the world reveals itself to those who travel on foot". . . . .

**From:** [Rick Donohue](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** I'm opposed to the Home In Tacoma plan  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 9:25:08 AM

---

Hello -

I wanted to express my lack of support for the Home in Tacoma plan. I am very much opposed to increasing the density of various neighborhoods across the city. These plans seem a gift to developers and do not seem to address actual pricing challenges for homes. A plan such as this simply can not create enough capacity to appreciably impact the supply/demand imbalance as individuals and families move to the area, something compounded by remote work...why live in the insanity of Seattle when you can move to Tacoma where its pretty, the streets are clean and housing is (relatively) 'cheap'?

What will happen, is that developers will build to what the market wants. The market, and the profit is in building and catering to mid to higher end. As a result, developers will build denser, higher end units. This will drive some modest increase in density, however it won't solve for the affordability issue, which sadly I don't think the city itself can really impact all that much.

In the end, this is really about money. Its about the City looking to generate increase revenue through (in the long run) property taxes, business tax on businesses in the area, site development fees. Fees, fees, taxes, taxes. This is also about property developers finding a way to make high margin units to sell to the highest bidder.

The cynic in me could really say that its offensive that the city would wrap itself in 'this is about helping poor people find housing' because its not. This is about bolstering the city's coffers, keeping the machine going, and in exchange, the city essentially is giving away rights to developers, who by the way, are highly unlikely to re-invest that money into the local area.

If these projects REQUIRED local Tacoma/Pierce county developers, staffed by Tacoma/Pierce county residents and offered breaks to Tacoma/Pierce county business who occupy retail spaces made available on the ground floor (where applicable)...then I would be more open to a project such as this, because it would be clear that the city is making an honest effort to invest in a flywheel that keeps money IN the city and develops for the long term. Right now I only see the city giving developers and outside businesses huge breaks to come in, develop, and then take their money OUT of Tacoma/Pierce County. This is just funneling money out of the area and keeping Tacoma down. I'd argue its also ENABLING the wealth gap as a result.

Show me project principas that involve hiring only small/mid-size LOCAL developers and we might have something, but only in more natural high density areas.

I know this is an unpopular position, but it seems completely backwards to me that we should take neighborhoods, demolish what's there and then build high density 'junk' construction. The idea that its more 'efficient' to destroy a house, to build 2 or 3 is absurd. Yes these are old 'leaky' houses, but drafty old homes don't consume the resources it takes to destroy a structure and build new. Given that, and given that destroying existing, functional systems is wasteful, how is it that we are not developing downtown? Yes, there are projects lined up, however

there is a seemingly endless supply of empty lots available for development in the slope above downtown. 'Well people don't want to live there, they want to live in a neighborhood' well MAKE it a neighborhood. It would be a nice one as well, especially with all the investment going on downtown over the past generation. Tacoma could have a thriving downtown, with mixed use housing, single family as well, it could actually be very desirable and balanced price wise, especially with my suggestions of investing in local developers.

Net: The city is being lazy if they are being true to their goals. To see 'home in Tacoma' as anything else but a money grab is short sighted and people not \_really\_ being honest with themselves. If the City is honest with the public about solving wage, and real estate prices, it needs to be more creative, and leverage the low cost development, and economic flywheel opportunities it has available before it goes off demolishing existing highly functional properties.

Thank you for your consideration of my perspective,  
Rick Donohue

--

---

Rick

**From:** [Holly Rydel Kelly](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Approve Home in Tacoma  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 9:28:41 AM

---

City Clerk,

Hi!

Tacoma is my home. By way of a series of fortunate events several years ago, I finally own a house in the city I love. Many are not so lucky to have that right place right time moment and housing is completely out of reach. Please do not get distracted by others demanding that we need to slow down the process, preserve neighborhood character and views, etc., under the guise of environmental concerns or affordability. Density is environmentally better and affordability comes with planned density. We need to move forward. We need the City of Tacoma to invest in all of the City of Tacoma not just the privileged home owners of specific neighborhoods. I am invested in my city and want others to be able to afford to live here too.

We expect Home in Tacoma to do a lot of good for the city. We see reducing rents and increasing housing affordability as a relief for housing cost burdened Tacomans. Inclusionary zoning requirements will make sure that the benefits of development are evenly shared with the most vulnerable, and help keep everyone in the city. More density (along transit lines) and more walkability, paired with green buildings, will create a more sustainable and more healthy city.

However, I want to see the following alterations to the plan:

- 1) Stronger emphasis on anti-displacement policy to accompany the more liberalized zoning regime.
- 2) Slash parking mandates.
- 3) Some clarity on the role of design standards and a commitment that this will not serve as a veto point for housing production.
- 4) Mandatory rent restricted, income restricted units as part of an inclusionary zoning framework. CRUCIAL!
- 5) Use inclusionary zoning or other incentive structures to build out the city's Housing Trust Fund, so that it can fund affordable and social housing development.
- 6) Speedy and rapid implementation of this proposal. Slowing down the process will only weaken the ultimate product and justice demands that we move as swiftly as possible.
- 7) Expand the area where the 12 year Multifamily Property Tax Exemption can be utilized, because it has affordability requirements.

8) Complete elimination of the 8 year Multifamily Property Tax Exemption.

Thank you,

Holly Rydel Kelly

Holly Rydel Kelly

t3transcription@gmail.com

910 S M Street

Tacoma, Washington 98405

**From:** [Robert Nelson](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Cc:** ["Jodi Cook"](#)  
**Subject:** Suggested changes to single family  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 10:21:48 AM

---

I'm writing in opposition to proposed changes to single family zoning; specifically to implementation of mid-scale zoning. I used to live in the north end and consider Proctor to be a near perfect example of what an urban neighborhood should be. I currently live in The Perkins Building and would prefer that the city council and Planning Department devote their energies to addressing the problems downtown, and leave the north end alone. Given the hodgepodge of housing the city has approved in other parts of Tacoma, you can only screw up Proctor. Respectfully, Robert T. Nelson, 1101 South A. St., #308, Tacoma. Phone: (253) 219-1103.



**From:** [hausemary](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** FW: RE: Home in Tacoma  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 11:07:44 AM

---

Please file to records.

Thank you,  
Mary Hause

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy Tablet

----- Original message -----

From: hausemary <[hausemary@gmail.com](mailto:hausemary@gmail.com)>  
Date: 7/14/21 11:06 AM (GMT-08:00)  
To: "Hines, John" <[John.Hines@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:John.Hines@cityoftacoma.org)>  
Subject: RE: Home in Tacoma

Dear Council Member Hines,

Thank you for your recent reply.

I was able to attend four hours of last evening's public hearing. I urge you to at least vote down any mid scale rezoning. If the council truly wants to serve constituents equally there should be no single family neighborhood, home owner or renter threatened by mid scale development.

We who find ourselves targeted for that simply because we live on a "corridor," are being considered unfairly. What's good for people like Elliott Barnett and others tucked away on dead end roads with views of the bay, for instance, should be good for hard working people like me at age 70 who dons knee high rubber boots to clear storm drains during hard rains. And, BTW, the infrastructure mid scale would build on is older than I!

Sincerely Worried About Tacoma,  
Mary Hause  
4118 N 26th St  
Tacoma, Wa 98407  
253 380 9279  
[Hausemary@gmail.com](mailto:Hausemary@gmail.com)

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy Tablet

----- Original message -----

From: "Hines, John" <[John.Hines@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:John.Hines@cityoftacoma.org)>  
Date: 7/13/21 10:00 PM (GMT-08:00)

To: hausemary <hausemary@gmail.com>  
Subject: RE: Home in Tacoma

Good Evening Mary,

Thanks for sharing your comments with the mayor and I and I also saw your comments to the City Clerk. After the public hearing this evening the council will debrief and discuss how we will make adjustment and changes (including scope and scale) before anything is put in place.

Overwhelmingly, I heard from residents that want this process slowed down and want more questions answered before we move forward. This is something that the council has agreed to and the will discuss further at our July 20<sup>th</sup> Study Session follow up of the public hearing ([link here](#)).

I listened very closely to what was shared this evening and read through the public comments that were submitted. I heard good comments about how we can find ways to grow in thoughtful ways. I think that with good design and consideration of infrastructure, services and impacts I think low-scale seems supported and that mid-scale is not. I think that is a place we can start the future conversation.

Thank you again for our continued conversation,

John

---

**From:** hausemary <hausemary@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 10, 2021 6:36 AM  
**To:** Hines, John <John.Hines@cityoftacoma.org>; Woodards, Victoria <victoria.woodards@cityoftacoma.org>  
**Subject:** Home in Tacoma

Mayor Woodards and Council Member Hines,

I am strongly opposed to council approval of the proposals for rezoning Tacoma. We have bigger fish to fry in another likely surge of the coronavirus pandemic as well as drastic changes needed to avert climate change. Tacoma should be concentrating on using existing infrastructure and resources to house people, and by that I mean the downtown area which is not included in the planning commission's proposals.

I have an emotional stake in refusing to buy in to mid scale development on North 26th Street, near Proctor. My family has been in this neighborhood for a hundred years, and in this house for seventy. We've paid a lot in taxes and have supported our schools and local businesses through all kinds of weather, but further mid scale development is frightening. It is another tier of sadness atop all else we in the Proctor Neighborhood, Tacoma, the country, and the world are facing. Noise, traffic, safety, pollution, sewage disposal, water needs, and neighbors becoming strangers are a few of the problems anticipated if you go forth with **these** proposals.

I'm not just a little old lady trying to age in place on the property honoring my parents ashes. I've lived and worked around the U.S. and world with The Peace Corps and Red Cross, finishing my career at our beloved Mary Bridge Hospital. I've seen how contemporary ideas soon become blemishes on a town's face. It is not too late to save Tacoma from the very development evils that has made places like Seattle, and many others, undesirable.

Please do not vote to approve the Home in Tacoma proposals.

Mary Hause

4118 N 26th St

Tacoma, Wa 98407

**From:** [Cady Chintis](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#); [Thoms, Robert](#); [City Clerk's Office](#); [Walker, Kristina](#); [Hines, John](#); [Blocker, Keith](#); [Ushka, Catherine](#); [Beale, Chris](#); [Hunter, Lillian](#); [McCarthy, Conor](#); [Wung, Lihuang](#)  
**Subject:** 7/13/21 Home in Tacoma Public Hearing  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 11:22:29 AM

---

Dear Tacoma City Councilmembers, Planning Commission Volunteers, and City of Tacoma Planning Staff:

At last night's public hearing before City Council regarding the Home In Tacoma project, we heard several people express their skepticism that more housing choice will increase housing affordability. Prior to the public testimony, we heard Tacoma City Councilmember, Robert Thoms, say there is "NO EVIDENCE" (direct quote emphasized) that zoning affects housing prices.

As leaders in Tacoma in positions to influence and make policy decisions, it is imperative to be educated on the issues and not make misleading or false statements in a public forum. There have literally been dozens of studies in recent decades, from liberal, conservative, and non-partisan organizations, arriving at the same conclusion: land-use regulations increase housing prices. Here are just a few of the many resources you may want to review so that you can make informed decisions and recommendations for Tacoma's future land use policy:

1. [The Impact of Zoning on Housing Affordability](#) (National Bureau of Economic Research)
2. [Housing Development Toolkit](#) (Obama Whitehouse Archives)
3. [Zoning, Land-Use Planning & Housing Affordability](#) (CATO Institute)

Sincerely,

Cady Chintis  
1522 6th Ave #1

**From:** [David Galazin](#)  
**To:** [Woodards, Victoria](#)  
**Cc:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Drop Ord. 28756 - Stop Criminalizing Homelessness!  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 4:35:04 PM

---

Dear Mayor Woodards and City Council:

This ordinance is cruel and unethical, especially in the midst of a global pandemic.

I demand that Mayor Woodards and city council:

- Drop this cruel ordinance
- Cease any and all planned sweeps or evictions of unhoused residents
- End the criminalization of homelessness
- Invest in efforts led by community members directly experiencing or affected by homelessness in developing true and equitable solutions for housing and economic justice.

Tacoma City Council states that its intent is “not to create or otherwise establish any particular class or group of individuals who will be discriminated against by the terms of the ordinance”, but Ordinance 28756 does exactly that. This ordinance punishes unhoused people, a majority of whom are Black, Indigenous, disabled, and/or living with chronic health conditions.

This ordinance bolsters policing in the face of a growing movement of the people calling for the abolition of police. This ordinance is a direct violation of the people’s unalienable right to exist and survive in public space, especially when city-driven development and gentrification have created the very conditions that the city now seeks to outlaw.

Ordinance 28756 effectively:

- 1) criminalizes homelessness
- 2) punishes unhoused people, a majority of whom are Black, Indigenous, and/or living with chronic health conditions, for surviving in the face of city-driven gentrification and displacement
- 3) emboldens and empowers policing in the face of a growing movement of the people calling for defunding and abolition of the white supremacist and violent institution of policing
- 4) violates orders by the CDC and Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department to not disperse encampments (unless safe and alternative housing can be identified for evicted residents — housing which we know does not currently exist in this city) and
- 5) most of all, violates the ethical codes of morality which call on the preservation of dignity of human existence in public space over the “protection” of public property.

Ordinance 28756 should have never been introduced at all and should be dropped now.

Instead, city council should invest in efforts led by community members directly experiencing or affected by homelessness in developing true and equitable solutions for housing and economic justice.

Thank you.

David Galazin

**From:** [Elise Arter Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Tom Arter](#)  
**Cc:** [City Clerk's Office](#); [Rosemary Dennis](#); [Greg Johnson](#); [Darelyn Arter](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Comments - Home In Tacoma Project Proposals  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 5:53:11 PM

---

I agree with you.

On Mon, Jul 12, 2021 at 3:08 PM Tom Arter <[arter57@yahoo.com](mailto:arter57@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Thank-you for the opportunity to weigh in on the Home In Tacoma Project Proposals.

I strongly oppose the Home In Tacoma Project Proposals as regards to the blanket elimination of single family zoning in Tacoma. I believe that the Planning Commission is out of touch with the average homeowner. There is ample opportunity to provide housing options by making it easier to rezone vacant properties without totally eliminating single family zoning. The City has tremendous opportunity to provide for high density house such as "One and Five" along the Link Rail route. I also ask, why does the existing character of Tacoma need to be so radically changed to bring in new people when the City can't even take care of the homeless?

Thomas Arter  
8427 S. 16th St  
Tacoma, WA 98465

**From:** [shortcakerme](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment Deadline for Home in Tacoma  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 10:27:19 PM

---

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

On Saturday, July 10, 2021, 8:50 AM, shortcakerme <[shortcakerme@aol.com](mailto:shortcakerme@aol.com)> wrote:

Hi good morning,

There should be no changes to View Sensitive District Overlay zones and height limits. The existing established neighborhoods should remain as is and not be changed.

Thanks, Regina and Rafael Escribano  
922 South Karl Johan Avenue  
Tacoma, WA. 98465

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

**From:** [Madeline Burns](#)  
**To:** [Woodards, Victoria](#)  
**Cc:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Drop Ord. 28756 - Stop Criminalizing Homelessness!  
**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 10:34:45 AM

---

Dear Mayor Woodards and City Council:

This ordinance is cruel and unethical, especially in the midst of a global pandemic.

I demand that Mayor Woodards and city council:

- Drop this cruel ordinance
- Cease any and all planned sweeps or evictions of unhoused residents
- End the criminalization of homelessness
- Invest in efforts led by community members directly experiencing or affected by homelessness in developing true and equitable solutions for housing and economic justice.

Tacoma City Council states that its intent is “not to create or otherwise establish any particular class or group of individuals who will be discriminated against by the terms of the ordinance”, but Ordinance 28756 does exactly that. This ordinance punishes unhoused people, a majority of whom are Black, Indigenous, disabled, and/or living with chronic health conditions.

This ordinance bolsters policing in the face of a growing movement of the people calling for the abolition of police. This ordinance is a direct violation of the people’s unalienable right to exist and survive in public space, especially when city-driven development and gentrification have created the very conditions that the city now seeks to outlaw.

Ordinance 28756 effectively:

- 1) criminalizes homelessness
- 2) punishes unhoused people, a majority of whom are Black, Indigenous, and/or living with chronic health conditions, for surviving in the face of city-driven gentrification and displacement
- 3) emboldens and empowers policing in the face of a growing movement of the people calling for defunding and abolition of the white supremacist and violent institution of policing
- 4) violates orders by the CDC and Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department to not disperse encampments (unless safe and alternative housing can be identified for evicted residents — housing which we know does not currently exist in this city) and
- 5) most of all, violates the ethical codes of morality which call on the preservation of dignity of human existence in public space over the “protection” of public property.

Ordinance 28756 should have never been introduced at all and should be dropped now. Instead, city council should invest in efforts led by community members directly experiencing or affected by homelessness in developing true and equitable solutions for housing and economic justice.

Thank you.

-Madeline Burns

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [ernie zeiger](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Housing hearing  
**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 11:35:21 AM  
**Attachments:** [City of Tacoma \(duplex\).docx](#)

---

City of Tacoma:

I own a rental property on South M St., right across the street from the Evergreen College campus.

That campus is now ringed with tents. I have had long term tenants, but they are now saying that they will move. If they do move, how can I find new tenants? I wouldn't move in there. The alternative is to sell, but who would buy?

My tenants say that their kids witness public sex; they find needles in their front yard; and various crimes have been committed right in the street.

I understand that homelessness is a huge problem, and I understand that those people are experiencing large difficulties in their own lives. But I am not a rich person; I am just a guy who has invested my life savings into a rental unit to get a retirement nest egg. If those people are allowed to stay there, I may have to buy a tent and join them.

Again, I realize that the homeless individuals are having a hard time, but from a bigger perspective, I think the government needs to remember that their responsibility is to 200,000+ citizens, not to just a few. Kids need a good place to grow up, and everyone else needs peace, order, and calm. If you don't enforce the laws that homeless people routinely break, what laws can you enforce? Can you tell me I can't park somewhere when right nearby is someone living and pooping in a spot nearly identical to where I want to park? Can you enforce building codes with a straight face when people are living in squalor right across the street, following no laws or codes at all? Can you regulate food carts (I use this because I have seen people selling food from the truck they are living in.) when all kinds of unsanitary (and unregulated) activities are going on nearby?

I have been paying a rental tax for a number of years now. I would think that the least service I could expect is that the government will keep the city livable and family friendly. I don't have a solution, but I can certainly see the problem.

Thank you for your time,

Ernie Zeiger

253-905-0336

**From:** [Kayla Quinn](#)  
**To:** [Woodards, Victoria](#)  
**Cc:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Drop Ord. 28756 - Stop Criminalizing Homelessness!  
**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 1:06:28 PM

---

Dear Mayor Woodards and City Council:

This ordinance is cruel and unethical, especially in the midst of a global pandemic.

I demand that Mayor Woodards and city council:

- Drop this cruel ordinance
- Cease any and all planned sweeps or evictions of unhoused residents
- End the criminalization of homelessness
- Invest in efforts led by community members directly experiencing or affected by homelessness in developing true and equitable solutions for housing and economic justice.

Tacoma City Council states that its intent is “not to create or otherwise establish any particular class or group of individuals who will be discriminated against by the terms of the ordinance”, but Ordinance 28756 does exactly that. This ordinance punishes unhoused people, a majority of whom are Black, Indigenous, disabled, and/or living with chronic health conditions.

This ordinance bolsters policing in the face of a growing movement of the people calling for the abolition of police. This ordinance is a direct violation of the people’s unalienable right to exist and survive in public space, especially when city-driven development and gentrification have created the very conditions that the city now seeks to outlaw.

Ordinance 28756 effectively:

- 1) criminalizes homelessness
- 2) punishes unhoused people, a majority of whom are Black, Indigenous, and/or living with chronic health conditions, for surviving in the face of city-driven gentrification and displacement
- 3) emboldens and empowers policing in the face of a growing movement of the people calling for defunding and abolition of the white supremacist and violent institution of policing
- 4) violates orders by the CDC and Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department to not disperse encampments (unless safe and alternative housing can be identified for evicted residents — housing which we know does not currently exist in this city) and
- 5) most of all, violates the ethical codes of morality which call on the preservation of dignity of human existence in public space over the “protection” of public property.

Ordinance 28756 should have never been introduced at all and should be dropped now. Instead, city council should invest in efforts led by community members directly experiencing or affected by homelessness in developing true and equitable solutions for housing and economic justice.

Thank you,

~Kayla Quinn (she/her)

**From:** [Kathleen Brooker](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** HiT Comments: Public Hearing July 13, 2021  
**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 1:32:53 PM  
**Attachments:** [HiT Council Public Hearing comments.docx](#)

---

Greetings. Historic Tacoma submitted a letter on July 12 for consideration by City Council at their July 13 Public Hearing for Home in Tacoma.

We did not see our letter in the published written comments.

Could you please confirm that it was received; and if so, include it? Thank you!

Kathleen Brooker  
President  
Historic Tacoma  
206-619-9115

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Kathleen Brooker <[kathleenbrooker@icloud.com](mailto:kathleenbrooker@icloud.com)>  
**Subject:** HiT Comments: Public Hearing July 13, 2021  
**Date:** July 12, 2021 at 4:44:03 PM PDT  
**To:** [cityclerk@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:cityclerk@cityoftacoma.org)



EDUCATION.

ADVOCACY.

PRESERVATION.

[www.HistoricTacoma.org](http://www.HistoricTacoma.org)

**Board of Directors**

Kathleen Brooker  
Steve Dunkelberger  
Marshall McClintock  
Jennifer Mortensen  
Rick Semple  
Steven Treffers

**Staff**

Michael Lafreniere,  
Outreach &  
Communications Director



on Facebook  
[@HistoricTacoma](https://www.facebook.com/HistoricTacoma)



on Twitter  
[@HistoricTacoma](https://twitter.com/HistoricTacoma)



on Instagram  
[@HistoricTacoma](https://www.instagram.com/HistoricTacoma)



[info@historictacoma.org](mailto:info@historictacoma.org)

*Mailing Address*

PO Box 7664  
Tacoma, WA 98417

July 12, 2021

City Council  
Tacoma Municipal Building, Rm. 11  
747 Market Street  
Tacoma, WA 98402

Dear Mayor Woodards and Council Members:

Historic Tacoma unequivocally opposes the Home in Tacoma (HiT) proposal as we did the version before the Planning Commission some weeks ago. (Following that public hearing our opposition was mischaracterized by city staff as “support” to the *Tacoma News Tribune*). HiT is a profound and far-reaching change to Tacoma’s residential neighborhoods. Its negative effects will not be reversible. Our objections are too numerous to detail here, so we have tried to list the most important.

- We object to applying any Mid-scale zoning within Tacoma’s city designated North Slope and Wedge Historic Districts. Mid-scale will add development pressure to these sensitive areas, which is contrary to historic preservation policies already in the Comprehensive Plan (Comp. Plan) as well as claims in the HiT proposal itself to protect these districts. For example, Policy DD-13.12 merely “encourages” but does not require infill to be architecturally compatible and in scale with adjacent buildings in historic districts. The HMR-SRD zoning category was developed in 2005 for the North Slope Historic District to accommodate its historic mix of houses and apartments. It requires no change.
- The Low-scale designation should not include buildings of up to three stories by Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The CUP process has been so diluted as to offer no protection to neighborhoods and adjacent property owners that object to these large buildings. Building three stories and over should be limited to Mid-scale areas.
- The proposal lacks policy additions calling specifically for robust public design review by panels at least partially drawn from the immediate neighborhood for all new construction allowed by HiT. Only such a public review process where neighborhood voices are heard will ensure neighborhood compatibility, stability, and transparency. Currently only vague promises are made about design standards with few mentions of design review. We are skeptical of these promises after similar limits and design requirements were struck from the Mixed-Use Center zoning, creating glaring examples of incompatibility. The MUC examples are so bad that Planning Dept. staff now repeatedly promise that Low-scale and Mid-scale “...won’t be like that”, but those promises are NOT backed by strong policies to prevent it.

- HiT contains no policies that detail how various neighborhoods that require their own unique design standards will be designated and with what citizen input. Denver has 78 separate designated neighborhoods with unique development plans and design standards. How many will Tacoma have? The vague promises of “neighborhood compatibility” are mere rhetoric without Comp. Plan policies that detail processes for how they’ll be created, enforced, and maintained and with what neighborhood input.
- HiT lacks policies that state how the salient building types, scale, setbacks and design characteristics, and unique design standards will be developed and with what neighborhood input. No set of pre-defined building characteristics or pre-approved building designs is sufficient to ensure the quality and compatibility promised in HiT and by Planning staff.
- HiT lacks policies that define per block density maximums that would limit over development as promised by HiT and Planning staff. Unlike area zoning, form-based zoning requires strict limits that serve as “stopping rules” to ensure neighborhood stability and continuity or that development is reasonably distributed across the city. For example, the North Slope Historic District already meets the “Target Development Density” (pg. 8) for Mid-scale, so why is more Mid-scale even proposed there?
- HiT lacks policies that actually require the historic inventories of all of Tacoma’s neighborhoods to identify historic and cultural resources, such as the Asberry House in Hilltop. Most bus routes and transportation corridors follow the city’s early streetcar routes, along which its earliest development occurred. Reference is made to “avoid creating incentives for demolition”, but no policies are included that indicate or require that to be done. HiT only says that historic inventories and proactive designation of landmarks and historic districts are part of a “range of methods” rather than requiring them. Conservation districts are not mentioned as a tool to conserve distinctive neighborhood features worthy of retention and enhancement that might not meet the higher criteria of landmark designation. These have long been in the Comp. Plan but not developed and funded. Policies are needed to ensure these are carried out before Low-scale and Mid-scale are implemented.
- HiT lacks specific policies that require public review for the removal of mature trees 15 or more inches in diameter. Tacoma has the least tree canopy and the least access to open space of any municipality in the Puget Sound region. Nowhere does HiT address the lack of policies in these areas but repeatedly refers to “shared” open spaces and yards. Will Mid-scale apartment buildings be required to have adequate front, rear and side yard space setbacks to allow for tree coverage? This is certainly not the case with new infill buildings in MUCs that cover the entire lot with buildings or impermeable surfaces and reach almost to the sidewalk. No policies in HiT prevent this in Low-scale or Mid-scale designations.
- HiT frequently refers to “smooth transitions” between taller buildings allowed in both Low-scale and Mid-scale designations. However, it provides no policies requiring these. These were also promised and, in fact, developed for MUCs. These transition zones were eliminated at the last minute by City Council without citizen input or warning on July 14, 2009. This action resulted in the terrible example in Proctor at the N. Adams Street project that puts a five-story building next to a 1 ½ story bungalow. How will such transitions to adjacent houses be created? Lot size and setbacks are the only answer, but no policies in HiT require them.

In short Historic Tacoma sees HiT being rushed through without adequate consultation. Neither the Tacoma Historical Society, the North Slope Historic District Assoc. nor Historic Tacoma were consulted in HiT's development. Also, no architects or developers actually engaged in residential building were consulted in its creation. The Planning Dept.'s Urban Design Studio has been shut down, and its only on-staff architect has left. Due to COVID there has been limited opportunity for citizen input. No serious, well-designed surveys have been conducted. No serious, critical assessment of the many "Missing Middle" infill claims has been done, and the current research to date suggest that it is not the panacea that is claimed and frequently results in negative, unintended outcomes. We suggest at the very least HiT be put to a city-wide referendum. A better solution, however, is to send it back to Planning with instructions to start over, widen the consultation process, address the vast array of issues that HiT overlooks and develop a new proposal that will directly and effectively address the affordable housing needs of the city while ensuring the stability and continuity of its neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Brooker, Board President



**From:** [Andy Motz](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Approve Home in Tacoma  
**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 3:49:31 PM

---

City Clerk,

To: The Tacoma City Council

Hello! I moved to Tacoma after living in Los Angeles, a city that failed to take proper housing action and now so many residents there are suffering. I hope Tacoma will take strong action NOW to make sure all of its residents can find a place to call home.

I expect Home in Tacoma to do a lot of good for the city. They see reducing rents and increasing housing affordability as a relief for housing cost burdened Tacomans. Inclusionary zoning requirements will make sure that the benefits of development are evenly shared with the most vulnerable, and help keep everyone in the city. More density along transit lines and more walkability, paired with green buildings, will create a more sustainable and more healthy city.

However, they/we also demand the following alterations to the plan:

- 1) Stronger emphasis on anti-displacement policy to accompany the more liberalized zoning regime.
- 2) Slash parking mandates.
- 3) Some clarity on the role of design standards and a commitment that this will not serve as a veto point for housing production.
- 4) Mandatory rent restricted, income restricted units as part of an inclusionary zoning framework.
- 5) Use inclusionary zoning or other incentive structures to build out the city's Housing Trust Fund, so that it can fund affordable and social housing development.
- 6) Speedy and rapid implementation of this proposal. Slowing down the process will only weaken the ultimate product and justice demands that we move as swiftly as possible.
- 7) Expand the area where the 12 year Multifamily Property Tax Exemption can be utilized, because it has affordability requirements.
- 8) Complete elimination of the 8 year Multifamily Property Tax Exemption.

Thank you for your time and attention

Andy Motz

Andy Motz  
andy.motz26@gmail.com  
1012 N 8th St, Apt 3  
Tacoma, Washington 98403

**From:** [mara.cohen](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Citywide Zoning changes  
**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 4:57:13 PM

---

I just returned from a stint on active duty this morning, due to the COVID crises, only to find the notice from West Slope Neighborhood Coalition.

As my unchosen recall denied me the opportunity to find out what City of Tacoma has drummed up now to make Citizen's lives difficult, I have obtained the services of an Attorney, due to the exponentially increasing property taxes. the absolute failure of effective and efficient services provision, and the Planning Department's failure to communicate with me by email, since the first Public Meeting on the subject of rezoning/height limitations.

The inadequacies of the City's Planning Department and the incompetence of the City's Public Works Dept. added an additional 5000.00 USD to the cost of the house rebuild, and in failing to do their job, could easily have caused a gas fire due to their failure to turn off the gas to the property at the end of three days for the FHA inspection. Instead they sought to charge us for a half year of gas service while the house was being built when we were half way through the demo.

The City of Tacoma

The Tacoma City Police had an interesting comment regarding the issue of actually doing anything to prevent the fraud and thefts perpetrated by a squatter who made charges regarding Domestic Abuse that got us kicked out of our own house while she thieved 6000.00 USD of our belongings, and we had to pay for 10,000.00 of Attorneys during the month Pierce County Commissioners sat on their thumbs, and allowed her to camp out and thief from us, along with 3000.00 to the perjuring Squatter to not vandalize the property, and I got to watch as she removed our property from the house and loaded it into a truck the night before the Court had ordered her to vacate the house. So much for Police assistance when necessary.

Now, despite my requesting at the first Public Meeting regarding changes in zoning, this is the surprise we get. On top of a huge increase in property taxes for nothing at all.

So. I would like to make an appointment to come to the Planning Department for a precise explanation of this Zoning Change that is apparently being shoved up everyone's noses.

H.M. Cohen  
1544 S.Walters Rd  
Tacoma, WA 98465  
253-304-8843

**From:** [Charrie Hayward](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Home in Tacoma  
**Date:** Saturday, July 17, 2021 8:20:06 AM

---

[PC Packet - ACOD 09-19-18.pdf \(cityoftacoma.org\)](#)

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

To whom it may concern,

I live in this "Airplane crash zone" and wanted to see if we are included in this "Home in Tacoma" revision.

Personally, I do not believe this area should be occupied by anything but single family homes. The disaster and casualties that can happen with a huge military plane crash will most certainly be devastating enough with the population we currently have. Many times a day we have to stop what we are saying to each other until the very loud Military planes fly past.

I am asking the city to make sure this disaster zone be excluded.

Please let me know, Thank You.

Charrie Hayward  
7031 S Puget Sound Ave  
Tacoma, WA 98409  
(253) 212-2685 - Home

**From:** [Brett Jacobsen](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Graffiti  
**Date:** Saturday, July 17, 2021 9:21:06 AM

---

Dear Council members,

Everyday the graffiti gets worse and worse, our city looks like LA. Why are we not enforcing anti-tagging laws? What???

On a separate subject, I went out for dinner downtown last weekend only to get yelled at by a lady on drugs with facial sores, when are we going service the portion of society that are law bidding and want the freedom to enjoy their lives in positive way? It is sad for our community and for those who are out drugging out and living on our streets like dogs, is this what you want? At what point are you going to focus on the needs of our community and not political rhetoric? What ever happened to the concept of law enforcement? Crime is on a major up-tick, while quality of life for the rest of us spiral down. As I write this, I am being informed that my nieces car was stolen last night from the Tacoma Mall...IS THIS THE KIND OF SOCIETY THAT WE REALLY WANT? It is sick and sad that we have neutered our law enforcement in so many ways to the determent of our society. Do you care?

Brett Jacobsen

**From:** [Cheriece Brown](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Tacoma SD drivers  
**Date:** Monday, July 19, 2021 6:51:41 PM

---

Good evening council members,

I'll just get right into my concern.

Tacoma School District has a somewhat unique transportation design. There are Tacoma School District drivers and busses as well as a contracted company that usually changes every few years. These contracted drivers do get to claim unemployment thru the summer and district drivers do not. In the current negotiations between the district and the district drivers, the district is not budging on much, as well as trying to send all activity and sport trips to the contractor to keep district drivers out of overtime. Now, the contractor already receives all middle school sport trips as well as all after school activity routes. Most of their drivers do work at least 40 hrs (of course, in a "regular" school year). This means that the district drivers will have work taken away from them - therefore lessening their income significantly as they are on a differal- a portion of there monthly wages is taken out for summertime pay. Truly there is a nationwide shortage of CDL drivers and there doesn't seem to be any end to that soon- we have not only worked thru the entire pandemic, delivery meals and making sure our vulnerable population of special needs students get safely to and from school, but we have also stayed dedicated to our jobs as district employees doing everything that has been asked of us to stay safe during this unprecedented time. It leaves a bad taste to see the district of which we are supposedly valued employees of, attempt to take work away and ignore the incredible efforts of our team. We are going into mediation and hope to have some better offers - we know all surrounding districts are in desperate need of clean, safe drivers as well as many other companies. We have so many people who have vested their lives into the Tacoma public school system and are barely making ends meet. This is unacceptable and there's no way the contractor would even be able to fulfill the needs of transportation for the entire district- they would definitely go so far into OT therefore needing a much larger contract when the current one expires and they also get to collect the unemployment- this is not right - on the latest proposal by the district they take away the attendance incentive & that's all fine and well however, when they take away extra work, work that allows me to pay my bills, what is the incentive to stay? In years past Tacoma School District set the bar for the surrounding districts. So as councilmen of our city you know people's biggest complaint is being unappreciated, overlooked and devalued. Our job is to safely transport our most precious and valuable cargo, regardless of what is going on with the weather, on the roads or in the world. It can be incredibly stressful and certainly no less important than any other jobs in the district.

I appreciate your time and attention.

Cheriece Brown  
Operating Engineers Local 302

**From:** [cascadian@yahoo.com](mailto:cascadian@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Barnett, Elliott](#); [Ushka, Catherine](#); [City Clerk's Office](#); [Alyssa Torrez](#)  
**Cc:** [vadergan@yahoo.com](mailto:vadergan@yahoo.com)  
**Subject:** Home in Tacoma  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 20, 2021 10:46:26 AM

---

Okay... I keep reading and listening, and now have just happened upon some things that are already happening without a rezone eliminating SFR completely and putting in 'low impact' housing that conforms to the neighborhood, building heights and such.

Here are a couple of examples I ran across. Mind you, the City is already doing these things WITH SFR. I'm not sure why you guys need to end SFR when you already allow these things. This was merely as I was out and about yesterday. I am sure I could find others.

In all fairness, the two red dwellings appeared to be connected pair of duplexes. With heights, that's more in the ballpark of my comfort level though would prefer one duplex. But the gargantuan monstrosity behind the beige house? You could not do anything in your back yard without people peering down and watching you. Mostly the same for the green house.

And, frankly, kind of conflicts with my understanding that PDS will only permit new dwellings that fit the neighborhood, are gentle in height changes and would be 'low impact.' Except in 'limited circumstances.' I'm still looking for information as to what qualifies as 'limited' in the minds of PDS. If it's farther than these pictures...

If you guys are already doing these things with the restrictions in place, and even though you assure us that things like this won't happen..... Ummmm... Well, I'll keep listening. But, if these are what are being planned, well, I believe I will continue to oppose this. Can't even keep this from happening with the current zoning. Not sure I am comfortable in placing further trust in PDS and the Planning commission by further enabling these. I really don't want the experience of the green or beige houses.

I'm not sure that, aside from raising the tax base through land assessments, permitting, and increased population sales tax receipts, that there's any real purpose or benefit of ending SFR. Not when you are doing this already. (and, despite the claims of purported north end residents begging for this to come to their area in the public comments, we all know that they will use neighborhood character and historic district exclusions to keep these things in the south end. Like always)

Thank you,

Stephen Hagberg















**From:** [jquil](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Cc:** [Hines, John](#)  
**Subject:** Home in Tacoma Comment from Judith Quilici  
**Date:** Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:15:29 PM  
**Attachments:** [Ltr to City Council.docx](#)

---

Mayor

July 13. 2021

Mayor and City Council  
733 Market Street, Room 11  
Tacoma, WA. 98402

RE: Home In Tacoma proposal

Honorable Mayor Woodards and city Council Members:

STOP!! More time is needed for public input face to face. This proposal will definitely change the character of Tacoma for the next 100 years or more.

- The established character of the Single Family Neighborhoods need to be maintained.
- The proposal does not and will not address the Affordable Housing issue. Programs, other than zoning need to be created and utilized first.
- Design standards need to be adopted that regulate residential as well as commercial development.
- There are many more issues and details that need to be considered and implemented before passing this, i.e: Off street parking, open space, tree canopy, SEPA, and many more..
- The **Planning Commission has rarely used a Minority Report**. It should be acknowledged and very seriously considered before going forward.

I encourage you to take more time and get it right rather than rushing an ill advised plan that may have many unintended consequences. Thank you for consideration.

Respectfully,

Judi Quilici  
1530 Fernside Drive S.  
Tacoma, WA. 98465

**From:** [Mary Hause](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Home In Tacoma  
**Date:** Sunday, July 25, 2021 5:04:43 PM

---

Please submit to records.  
Mary Hause

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

From: **Mary Hause** <[hausemary@gmail.com](mailto:hausemary@gmail.com)>  
Date: Sun, Jul 25, 2021, 4:56 PM  
Subject: Home In Tacoma  
To: Hines, John <[john.hines@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:john.hines@cityoftacoma.org)>, <[victoria.woodards@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:victoria.woodards@cityoftacoma.org)>, <[cityclerk@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:cityclerk@cityoftacoma.org)>

Mayor Woodards and Councilman Hines,

I'd be interested to know how each of you is leaning on the issues of low and mid scale density proposals for rezoning Tacoma. You should be able to tell me, as well as how you think the council will vote. Please, be frank.

There continues to be public conversation, and a common thought is you're going for the whole package while pretending to listen to those of us who oppose it.

I am on a corridor where mid scale is proposed. Why should I be subject to more noise and bigger development than anyone in low density proposed areas? I didn't buy into this plan, and my history of paying taxes should be on equal footing with anyone else in Tacoma. Low density for all, or nothing, I say.

Even then, does our infrastructure support low density? Will there really be affordable housing created in all neighborhoods? Will development permits be equally spread out in Tacoma, or will Proctor and Stadium continue to develop until unrecognizable.

Let us know how you're leaning so voter/tax payer/neighbors can talk with information and confidence rather than mistrust and fear.

**From:** [Michael Honey](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Housing rezone proposal  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 27, 2021 7:56:03 AM

---

Four-story apartment buildings would be totally out of scale on North M and destructive to a neighborhood of older homes in a historic district. We oppose. Sincerely,

Michael Honey and Patti Krueger  
718 North M, Tacoma

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Mary Ann Clabaugh](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** Actions?  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 27, 2021 3:19:12 PM

---

Just curious how long it is going to take our "current" elected officials to realize that they had better step up and take our City back. Back from the criminal element who now realize that they have the upper hand in everything and anything. You should all be proud of yourselves, you have created a wonderful mess of our City, one which we can only hope will be fixed by the election of NEW OFFICIALS come November.

Mary Ann Clabaugh

**From:** [Kit Burns](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Cc:** [Woodards, Victoria](#); [Blocker, Keith](#)  
**Subject:** Written Comments - July 27 - AMI Meter Program Will Ensure Rising Utility Rates  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 27, 2021 3:45:14 PM  
**Attachments:** [2020-0226-FinancialSummary NPV-2Budget.png](#)

---

Dear Mayor Woodards,

I have reviewed TPU documents on the costs of the AMI program. I find that the program cost will ensure rising utility rates year after year. Long after the current council is gone.

This is based on TPU information which has not been clearly communicated to the City Council.

The program cost was originally to be \$70 million including contingency. This is per an earlier TPU website.

The Deployment Budget cost now is estimated to be \$93,730,000.

Plus financing of \$42,163,938 (20 year loan at 4%) for a project capital total of **\$135,893,000**

There are additional operating costs (O&M) which occur annually.

Privatization and outsourcing of billing operations to AWS is estimated to cost about \$1,250,000 per year. This eliminates local jobs of about 14 meter readers. As the documentation will be hosted on the cloud the City is at greater risk of Cyber-Attack. Power and Water systems are ripe for this risk.

Additional costs to go to monthly billing, which is not included in the NPV calculations, is for credit card fees of \$1,250,000 annually.

Plus postage, assuming no postal rate increases in the next 25 years, of an additional \$294,000 annually. This is an unnecessary cost of \$1,544,000 annually.

Thus for O&M costs, the cost each year is estimated to be \$2,794,000 based on the information I have from TPU.



Not included in the NPV calculations is the destruction of 287,000 working electrical power and water meters. The estimated value to be destroyed is **\$43,805,000**.


As I read the TPU website it makes the AMI meters to be "almost free".

These meters are not an upgrade. The 'benefits' are already available. The claims for 'savings' are largely non-existent. The promises sound good but are actually 'potential' that will not be realized.

I call upon you as Mayor and the City Council, along with the City Manager and Public Utility Board, to re-evaluate this costly program and terminate it in the public interest.

I would like to discuss this with you and the Council. I look forward to hearing from you. This would be a good topic for a "Meeting of the Whole/ City Council Study session".

## AMI Deployment Budget: February 2020



Category	Current Forecast <sup>1</sup>
Electric Meter Deployment	\$ 26,059,039
Water Meter Deployment <sup>3</sup>	\$ 21,363,073
Communications Network Deployment	\$ 3,280,816
System Integration	\$ 8,891,422
Capital Internal Labor	\$ 2,043,167
Professional Services	\$ 3,788,946
Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Costs	\$ 9,491,736
Customer Engagement Portal	\$ 250,000
<b>Projected Total</b>	<b>\$ 75,168,200</b>
<i>Remaining Contingency</i>	<i>\$ 6,597,243</i>
<b>Total With Contingency</b>	<b>\$ 81,765,443</b>
<b>Internal Support Costs<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$ 11,965,413</b>

- Total with contingency is the cost forecasted in the February 2019 Business Case for the AMI Deployment period, 2018-2022.
- Budget tracking ties directly to the February 2019 Business Case forecast for the 2018-2022 AMI Deployment period.
- The AMI business case financial analysis only considers incremental costs to TPU:
  - Costs that incrementally impact customer rates
  - Consistent with industry practice for AMI business cases
- Internal Support Costs do not incrementally impact customer rates due to AMI, and include:
  - Capitalized administrative and general (A&G) overhead costs
  - Existing utility staff working on the AMI program (existing costs to TPU)

<sup>1</sup>Actual costs through November 2019.  
<sup>2</sup>Does not incrementally impact rates.  
<sup>3</sup>Complimentary budget for replacing water meters deemed at end of life is budgeted within the Water Division.

26

Sincerely,

Kit Burns

--

PO Box 2341

Tacoma, WA 98401

. . ."the world reveals itself to those who travel on foot". . . . .