

## Tacoma Billboard Community Working Group

### Meeting 6

**Monday, December 1, 2014, 4:00-6:00 P.M**

**Center for Urban Waters, 326 East D Street**

### MEETING SUMMARY

<b>Working Group Members Attending:</b>					
Andy Mordhorst	x	Pete Grignon		Rose Mednick	x
Doug Schafer	x	Eric Jackson	x	Dale Reed	
Tricia DeOme	x	Pam Guinn	x	Ray Velkers	x
Nick Fedaiy	x	Mike Luinstra	x	Steve Wamback	x
Jill Jensen	x	Evette Mason	x	Sharon Winters	x
Rusty George	x				
<b>Working Group Member Alternates Attending (* -- in audience):</b>					
*John Thurlow	x	*Al Ralston	x	Al Mednick	x
*Peter Wangoe	x				
<b>City Representatives, Staff, &amp; Support Team Attending:</b>					
Brian Boudet	x	Karen Reed	x	John Harrington	x
John Griffith	x				

Facilitator Karen Reed welcomed the group and gave a brief overview of the planned discussion for meeting 6.

The November 17 meeting summary was discussed. Pam Guinn requested that the distinction between the recommendations of the two small groups be made clearer. Steve Wamback commented that one of the groups had focused discussion on new billboards with little discussion of existing billboards. He added that the clarification was important because they would need to revisit the discussion of existing billboards in the future. Tricia DeOme provided additional changes to the small group discussion summaries. *The minutes were approved as amended.*

Karen Reed next moved to the information requests section of the packet. There were no questions or comments.

The nomination and election of CWG Co-Chairs was discussed, the group having agreed to hold the nominations at meeting six during the previous meeting. Karen Reed gave an overview of the responsibilities of Co-Chairs and process for nominations and approval before opening the floor for nominations. Tricia DeOme, Steve Wamback, and Rusty George were nominated and each gave a statement as to their interest and perspective on serving as Co-Chair. Tricia DeOme stated that she would strive for fairness and ensure that all views were represented. Steve Wamback stated that he was committed to making sure that the Community Work Group process succeeded. Rusty George stated that he had friends on both sides of the debate and no vested interest in either outcome.

Ray Velkers asked if Co-Chairs would have to represent the group in discussions with the media and if Steve Wamback do so would create any issues. Karen Reed answered that Steve is not a City employee, he works for Pierce County. She said that the role of the co-chairs is to serve as spokespeople for the group, but generally there should be no problem for any member of the working group to speak to the media so long as they take care to distinguish their own views from those of the work group, and generally.

The work group voted on the candidates for the two Co-Chair positions with each member allowed to vote for two candidates. *Tricia DeOme and Steve Wamback received the most votes and were approved as Co-Chairs.* Karen Reed said that she would be in touch with them to discuss next steps.

John Harrington gave a brief presentation, providing additional information on the differences between city and state regulations and the key reasons billboards do not comply with current code. Notable differences between City of Tacoma and WSDOT billboard regulations were highlighted. The state regulations required a lower maximum height than City Code but also allow a larger maximum size of billboard and allowing a smaller separation between them -- 100 feet, as compared to 500 feet under current City code.

Nick Fediy asked if the more restrictive state regulations could overrule the city standards. John Harrington responded that where the state has jurisdiction, if state regulations are more restrictive, then state rules govern; if the city standards are more restrictive, the city regulations govern.

Pam Guinn asked for clarification on Type 5 signs and if they were only placed by WSDOT. John Harrington answered and read the WAC language: "A Type 5 sign displays a message of specific interest to the traveling public. Only information about public places operated by federal, state, or local governments, natural phenomena, historic sites, areas of natural scenic beauty or outdoor recreation, and places for lodging, camping eating, and vehicle service and repair is deemed to be in the specific interest of the traveling public." These are the familiar blue signs preceding exits of the highway.

Steve Wamback asked how the state enforces its regulatory requirement that billboards be within 12 air miles of the advertised content. John Harrington said Pat O'Leary at WSDOT would be the best person to answer the question.

Tricia DeOme asked about the state rule restricting signs that could be seen by the highway. John Harrington clarified that if you could see an off-premise sign within 660 feet while driving down a state or federal highway, it would be subject to the WAC regulations.

Eric Jackson asked for clarification on whether or not Type 4 billboards require that the content of the ad is within 12 air miles of the relevant business. John Harrington confirmed that the regulation required the advertised activity or business had to be within 12 air miles. Pam Guinn added that the enforcement

of that regulation occurs rarely if at all and that she hadn't had any calls from the state about non local ads.

Tricia DeOme asked if the regulations on Type 4 signs applied only to interstate roads. John Harrington answered that it also applied to primary state highways as well.

John Harrington resumed the presentation moving on to the regulatory constraints/maximums for billboard signs. He reviewed the particular rules for limited access state highways and non-limited access state highways, and noted state regulations are generally applicable to all billboards within their jurisdiction. Next he listed the top 5 regulatory causes for non-compliance under current city code, based on a sample of 25% of the billboards now in place in Tacoma. Based on his review, 77% of signs sampled were noncompliant for violating buffer requirements; 48% for height; 47% because of zoning; 47% for design; and 38% for dispersal.

Tricia DeOme asked for more information on where signs would be regulated by the state. John Harrington responded that billboards may be permitted within commercial and industrial areas adjacent to interstate and primary highways, provided they meet the size and spacing requirements.

Sharon Winters asked if tribal land is excluded from state regulation. John Harrington confirmed that it was excluded.

A CWG member asked which regulations would be enforced in a scenario where the city regulations were stricter than the state. John Harrington answered that if the city was stricter, its rules would take precedent.

Tricia DeOme asked if any of the signs were nonconforming to the state regulations when originally put in. John Harrington answered that the state regulations were largely created in 1971, but he couldn't say for certain if any signs were initially nonconforming. Pam Guinn added that Clear Channel currently had to get permits from the state when putting in new billboards. Some discussion ensued. Tricia DeOme requested clarification on which billboards have state permits. Pam Guinn stated that they could not have been erected without permits and that the question has little relevance looking forward unless you think they aren't they are there legally. Tricia DeOme asked if it was possible that they weren't. Peter Wangoe responded that Clear Channel does an inventory count with the state and that they looked at all the signs across the state, so they were all inspected at some point in that process. Pam Guinn added that they pay fees for registration to the state on every single billboard so it is important that both inventories match.

Karen Reed had the members separate back into two smaller groups as per the prior meeting, to resume the discussion about which zones in the city should allow billboards and which should not. She directed them to the summary of the homework on this issue and the discussion guide. If there was time left over she asked them to consider the top five areas where billboards should be prioritized for removal and why.

The two groups resumed the discussion of remaining zones; both groups worked through the “Transitional” zone on the matrix and Tricia DeOme and Steve Wamback reported out results from the discussions. [See **Attachment A** for a cumulative summary of feedback through meeting 6 on the exercise.]

Both groups returned from the discussion with Tricia DeOme reporting the findings of group 1 and Steve Wamback reporting the findings of group 2. Tricia DeOme noted that size limitations had not been a part of the discussion and asked if it should be. Karen Reed responded that it would be addressed at the next meeting and beyond but was not part of today’s discussion.

Karen Reed asked members to review the zoning pamphlet prior to the next meeting and gave a quick overview of some of the components that would be part of the next discussion. Steve Wamback raised the point that the next meeting would be the final meeting for December and that the Work Group would resume in January.

The meeting ended at 6:14 p.m.

**Attachment A:** Summary Matrix of Results of Small Group Discussions from Meetings 5 and 6.

**Meeting 5 & 6: Small group exercises on Geography: Where should billboards be allowed? Where should they not be allowed? Why?**

<i>Results of small group discussion at Meeting 5 &amp; 6:</i>			
Preliminary Consensus Per Homework 2 Tally	Zone Code	Should Billboards be allowed in this zone? <i>(regular font reflects discussion from meeting 5; italicized text reflects discussion from meeting 6)</i>	
		<b>GROUP 1</b>	<b>GROUP 2</b>
<b>Residential Zones</b>	<b>R-1 thru R-5</b>		
<i>Do not Allow</i>		Agree. Question: what about future zoning? Should it depend on the percent of residential population in a zone expected/planned for long-term in a zone?	Agree. Question: should we be considering this based on current zoning or future expectations? Ultimate development expectations are relevant here.
<b>Downtown Zones</b>			
<i>Allow in Warehouse Residential District</i>	<b>WR</b>	<i>Allow. 5 – keep existing, no additional 2—add more—receiving area</i>	<i>Consensus: allow billboards in this zone but with restrictions. Consider adjacent residential zoning-- BB shdn't be visible to adjacent residents (feel similarly about C-1, C-2, PDB) Prefer to place any BB on walls, as opposed to free standing</i>
<b>Commercial Zones</b>			
<i>Allow in General Neighborhood Commercial District</i>	<b>C-1</b>	<i>No new billboards (100% agreement) CCO: Low priority to retain billboards in this area. Group prefers to remove from this area—question of credits for removal.</i>	Allow in all 3 areas but there should be consideration of adjacent residential development—ensure billboards are not visible to adjacent residents.
<i>Allow in General Community Commercial District</i>	<b>C-2</b>	<i>7 – allow BB in this zone CCO: make this a receiving area. General consensus: allow more.</i>	
<i>Allow in Planned Development Business District</i>	<b>PDB</b>	100% agreement to allow billboards in this zone	
<b>Mixed Use Center Zones</b>			
<i>Community Commercial Mixed Use District</i>	<b>CCX</b>	<i>[not discussed]</i>	<i>[not discussed]</i>
<i>Allow in Urban Center mixed use</i>	<b>UCX</b>	Additional billboards ok in this zone.	<i>6—allow 1—do not allow</i>

district		100% would allow with size and design limitations.	<i>Tacoma Mall area good location for new BB. If BB allowed in this zone, separation is key, as well as buffering from residential areas. Slight preference for poster size.</i>
Allow in Commercial Industrial Mixed Use	<b>CIX</b>	5: yes allow in this area, 1 no.	<i>6—allow 1—do not allow Tacoma Mall area good location for new BB. If BB allowed in this zone, separation is key, as well as buffering from residential areas. Poster size maximum.</i>
<b>Industrial Zones</b>			
Allow in Light Industrial District	<b>M-1</b>	100% of the group would allow billboards in these zoning districts.	Allow with consideration for impacts on adjacent residential areas
Allow in Heavy Industrial District	<b>M-2</b>		Allow
Allow in Port Maritime & Industrial District	<b>PMI</b>		Allow
<b>Shoreline Zones</b>			
Do not allow in Shoreline zones	<b>S1-17</b>	No consensus on whether to allow or prohibit. Defer to hear additional input from Clear Chanel on whether they want to keep existing BB in this zone.	Agree that no new billboards should be allowed in shoreline zones
<b>Overlay Zones</b>			
Do not allow in View Sensitive Overlay District	<b>VSD</b>	Unanimous: do not allow	Unanimous: do not allow new BB. Note: VSD outcome (no BB) should govern in the C-1 area along the shoreline (Old Town)
Do not allow in Historical Special Review Overlay District	<b>HIST</b>	Unanimous: do not allow	Agree: do not allow new BB
Do not allow in Conservation Overlay District	<b>CONS</b>	Group divided (3 allow BVB; 4 against BB). Discussion centered on keeping existing and not allowing new BB	Agree with homework consensus: do not allow new BB
Do not allow in S. Tacoma Groundwater Protection District	<b>STGPD</b>	Allow – defer to other zoning regs here	Allow – defer to underlying zoning
S. Tacoma Manufact./Indust. Center Overlay	<b>ST-M/IC</b>	Allow	Defer to underlying zoning

no consensus in HWK#2			
-----------------------	--	--	--

Discussion commenced at Meeting 6:

	Zones where there is <u>no preliminary consensus</u> per the homework	Group 1	Group 2
	<b>Downtown Zones</b>		
1	<b>DCC – Downtown Commercial Core</b>	Allow: 6 <i>It's a commercial zone</i>  Don't Allow: 1 <i>Not appropriate for this density</i>	Allow: 5 <i>High intensity commercial urban core.</i>  Don't Allow: 2 <i>Most intense pedestrian uses, so reduce visual clutter.</i> <i>Idea: if BB allowed here, should be "artistic" not "photos".</i>
2	<b>DMU-Downtown Mixed Use District</b>	Allow: 6 <i>Commercial(?)</i>  Don't Allow: 1 <i>Meant to become more residential</i>	Allow: 5 <i>High intensity commercial urban core.</i>  Don't Allow: 2 <i>Most intense pedestrian uses, so reduce visual clutter.</i>  <i>Idea: if BB allowed here, should be "artistic" not "photos".</i>
3	<b>DR-Downtown Residential</b>	Allow: 1  Don't Allow: 6. <i>It's residential.</i>	Allow: 2  Don't Allow: 5. <i>It's residential.</i>
4	<b>Commercial Zones- T Transitional District</b>	Allow: 4 -- <i>require conditional use permit (2)</i>  Don't Allow: 1	Allow: 4  Don't Allow: 3  <i>No consensus</i>