From: Jason Van Cleese <jasonvancleese@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 3:12 PM

To: Woodards, Victoria; Ushka, Catherine; Hines, John; Rumbaugh, Sarah; Bushnell, Joe; Daniels, Kiara;

Blocker, Keith; McCarthy, Conor; Walker, Kristina

Cc: Pauli, Elizabeth; City Clerk's Office

Subject: Community Feedback

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

City Clerk, please put this on the record as written community input. I am listening to your "retreat" -- the first meeting you decided to have for the City Council in person since announcing last night that you were going to do a hybrid approach starting today.

I want you to know that you failed spectacularly to provide the community with "easy virtual access" in the middle of an ongoing pandemic where cases of the more virulent (and potentially more lethal according to early reports from Japan) subvariant of Omicron. As seemingly remote, highly vaccinated, highly educated and highly compliant masking-wise parts of the world -- South Korea, Hong Kong and Denmark -- are battling yet another surge, please note that this sub-variant is steadily increasing in the United States, where people are decidedly less vaccinated, less educated and more irrational when it comes to implementing basic tools to stem the tide lile masking. Can you really say any of what is to come is unprecedented?

Is this a business retreat I am listening to or is this a therapy session? Sounds like some of you are pretty lonely. Councilman Hines said virtual environments aren't great for dialogue. I'm sorry, WHAT kind of Luddite statement is that?!?! Who wrote that for him? That is utter nonsense. What I suggest is that he makes staff work harder to elevate community engagement out of the dark ages, using advancements in tech.

The Mayor herself has pointed out that virtual options have allowed MORE community members to engage with the City of Tacoma, and not just the usual suspects. NEW faces. So, how much money was spent on consultants and staff time for this pointless and risky in-person meeting at a time when 30% of Pierce County and 75% of kids in Pierce County between 5 and 12 are still unvaccinated? Although outbreaks are down, outbreaks in classrooms are still trending higher than any other type out there. What kind of example are you setting for families in Tacoma? Why don't any of you have the political courage to do what is necessary to put an end to this pandemic once and for all? Stop with the vision statements. Just stop.

Put in-person meetings on ice until you figure out how to do hybrid correctly.

From: Jenkins, Jessica

Sent: Thursday, March 3, 2022 2:30 PM

To: City Clerk's Office

Subject: FW: URGENT: DANGEROUS ROAD - Community Forum Written Comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

For public comment.

From: Brian McKee < futurebusiness03@gmail.com >

Sent: Thursday, March 3, 2022 12:59 PM

To: Woodards, Victoria < wwoodards@cityoftacoma.org; Nowman, Nicole < nnowman@cityoftacoma.org; City Manager

<<u>CityManager@cityoftacoma.org</u>>; Hines, John <<u>JHines1@cityoftacoma.org</u>>; Rumbaugh, Sarah

<<u>SRumbaugh@cityoftacoma.org</u>>; Blocker, Keith <<u>kblocker@cityoftacoma.org</u>>; Ushka, Catherine <<u>cushka@cityoftacoma.org</u>>;

Bushnell, Joe < <u>IBushnell2@cityoftacoma.org</u>>; Daniels, Kiara < <u>KDaniels@cityoftacoma.org</u>>; McCarthy, Conor

<cmccarthy@cityoftacoma.org>; Walker, Kristina <KWalker@cityoftacoma.org; Sorum, Doris <DSORUM@cityoftacoma.org;

Subject: URGENT: DANGEROUS ROAD

To whom it may concern:

This stop sign screams for attention. I have lived in the area for over 7 years. I have seen if not daily for sure weekly near misses. This is a danger to your constituents. I implore you to implement an expedient transformation of this highly dangerous area.

- 1. Add a blinking light to the stop sign on both sides.
- 2. Replace the stop sign with a stoplight

Problem: Traffic coming from 509 / Marine View Drive has a stop sign. Traffic coming from East Side Drive NE do not. 8/10 cars are not stopping long enough for cars to turn onto Slaydent Rd from East Side Drive. (See illustration below)

I want to remind you their 2 schools in the area Browns Point Elementary and Meeker Middle School. A number of your constituents are driving their kids to school. Essentially rolling the dice because of the existing road system in place. This is an easy fix. I am quite disturbed this has not been addressed yet.

Lives are more important than a minor inconvenience to drivers. Do I need to obtain a signed petition?

Please do the responsible thing. Come out and view for yourself!



Sincerely,

Concerned parent and constituent.

| From: | Sara Kiesler <sara.kiesler1@gmail.com></sara.kiesler1@gmail.com> | |
|---|---|--|
| Sent: | Saturday, March 5, 2022 7:16 AM | |
| То: | City Clerk's Office | |
| Subject: | South Tacoma resident against mega-warehouse | |
| | | |
| Follow Up Flag: | Follow up | |
| Flag Status: | Flagged | |
| | | |
| Mayor and Council members, | | |
| | | |
| climate goals this year, thi | e mega-warehouse planned for my neighborhood, South Tacoma. As the city has just released new is warehouse would unleash pollution, noise, and be detrimental to our future supply of water via our ll negatively impact our climate and put us even farther behind on our goals. | |
| About 18 years ago, I lived in DeLand FL and watched as a mega-warehouse went in nearby. The diesel fumes from trucks, the light pollution, the noise, and the damage to our roads were all very damaging to our community. | | |
| Please oppose the mega- | warehouse. | |
| Sara Kiesler | | |
| 5410 S Junett St, Tacoma | a, WA 98409 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| From: | Emily Monahan <egmonahan@gmail.com></egmonahan@gmail.com> | |
|---|---|--|
| Sent: | Saturday, March 5, 2022 8:31 AM | |
| То: | City Clerk's Office | |
| Subject: | Public Comment About Proposed South Tacoma Warehouse | |
| | | |
| Follow Up Flag: | Follow up | |
| Flag Status: | Flagged | |
| | | |
| Dear Tacoma City Counc | il, | |
| | | |
| I'm writing to you today to speak against the proposed warehouse at 5024 S. Madison St. | | |
| | | |
| I believe the aquifer at that location is an unbelievable asset to this city. It's water supply makes Tacoma more resilient in the face of climate change. If the aquifer stays full of clean and healthy water, than Tacoma can continue to thrive when a drought eventually | | |
| | ot worth a few more jobs in the present. | |
| | | |
| Sincerely, | | |
| Emily Monahan | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

From: Kit Burns <kburns.wcb@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 3:59 PM

To: Woodards, Victoria

Cc: City Clerk's Office

Subject: Citizen Comments March 8th - Cable Access and Competition for all Multifamily Tax Exemption

Program

Attachments: Apartments FCC DOC-380316A1.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mayor,

I would like you and the city council to include in the TMC a simple requirement to ensure that competition must be made available for all Internet & Cable offerings.

This includes all new and existing apartments, rentals, and homes.

This is consistent with the franchise agreements for internet and cable providers to ensure that no one is trapped as a "captive audience" and forced to pay a non-competitive fee for substandard service. To ensure equity for all citizens this is necessary.

It is consistent also with FCC requirements as recently affirmed in the attached February 15th document.

FCC ADOPTS RULES TO GIVE TENANTS IN APARTMENTS AND OFFICE BUILDINGS MORE TRANSPARENCY, COMPETITION AND CHOICE FOR BROADBAND SERVICE

I met recently with my council representative to discuss this issue. It needs to be included as a specific requirement. It will benefit all of our citizens and bring fairness and competition.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I would like to have your comments on this and ensure that there is follow-up and the TMC is modified.

| Sincerely, |
|--|
| Kit Burns |
| |
| William Burns |
| PO Box 2341 |
| Tacoma WA 98401 |
| |
| "the world reveals itself to those who travel on foot" |
| |
| |



Media Contact:

Anne Veigle anne.veigle@fcc.gov

For Immediate Release

FCC ADOPTS RULES TO GIVE TENANTS IN APARTMENTS AND OFFICE BUILDINGS MORE TRANSPARENCY, COMPETITION AND CHOICE FOR BROADBAND SERVICE

Order Bans Certain Revenue Sharing Agreements and Requires Providers to Clearly
Disclose Marketing Practices for Broadband Service

WASHINGTON, February 15, 2022—The Federal Communications Commission announced today that it has adopted rules to unlock broadband competition for those living and working in apartments, public housing, office buildings, and other multi-tenant buildings. The rules prohibit broadband providers from entering into certain revenue sharing agreements with a building owner that keep competitive providers out of buildings. The rules also require providers to inform tenants about the existence of exclusive marketing arrangements in simple, easy-to-understand language that is readily accessible. Finally, in a Declaratory Ruling, the Commission clarifies that existing Commission rules regarding cable inside wiring prohibit so-called sale-and-leaseback arrangements that block competitive access to alternative providers.

"One third of this country live in multi-tenant buildings where there often is only one choice for a broadband provider, and no ability to shop for a better deal," **said Chairwoman Rosenworcel**. "The rules we adopt today will crack down on practices that prevent competition and effectively block a consumer's ability to get lower prices or higher quality services."

In January, Chairwoman Rosenworcel <u>circulated</u> a proposed Report and Order and Declaratory Ruling aimed at promoting competition and increased choice for broadband services for people living and working in multiple tenant environments (MTEs), which the Commission has now adopted in a 4-0 vote.

###

Media Relations: (202) 418-0500 / ASL: (844) 432-2275 / Twitter: @FCC / www.fcc.gov

This is an unofficial announcement of Commission action. Release of the full text of a Commission order constitutes official action. See MCI v. FCC, 515 F.2d 385 (D.C. Cir. 1974).