



AGENDA

MEETING: Regular Meeting

TIME: Wednesday, July 6, 2016, 4:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Room 16, Tacoma Municipal Building North, 1st Floor
733 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402

A. Call to Order and Quorum Call

B. Approval of Agenda and Minutes of June 15, 2016

C. Public Comments (up to three minutes per speaker; must be pertaining to items on the agenda, except the public hearing item and the item that had a public hearing recently.)

D. Discussion Items

1. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

Review the status of the TDR program implementation.
(Staff contact: Ian Munce, 573-2478, imunce@cityoftacoma.org)

2. Capital Facilities Program 2017-2022

Review public comments received and staff's responses and suggestions for modifications; and review and consider approving the draft Findings of Fact and Recommendations Report and the draft Letter of Recommendation.
(See "Agenda Item D-2"; Lihuang Wung, 591-5682, lwung@cityoftacoma.org)

E. Communication Items & Other Business

- (1) The "History in the Making" Celebration of the First TDR Transaction in Tacoma, Monday, July 11, 2016, 11:00 a.m., 102 N. G Street.
- (2) Tacoma Amtrak Cascades Station Groundbreaking Ceremony, Wednesday, July 13, 2016, 3:00 p.m., Freighthouse Square.
- (3) The City Council will conduct a public hearing on the 2016 Annual Amendment, as recommended by the Planning Commission, on Tuesday, July 19, 2016, at approximately 5:30 p.m., in the Tacoma Public Utilities Auditorium, 3628 S. 35th St., Tacoma, WA 98409. For more information, please visit: www.cityoftacoma.org/planning and click on "2016 Annual Amendment."
- (4) Planning Commission Vacancy – The City Council continues to seek citizens to fill the "Architecture, Historic Preservation, and/or Urban Design" position for a 3-year term expiring on June 30, 2019. Applications are due to the City Clerk's Office by July 13, 2016. To learn more or to apply, please visit: http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/.
- (5) Infrastructure, Planning and Sustainability Committee meeting, July 13, 2016, 4:30 p.m., Room 16; agenda includes: Grant Submittals/Opportunities; and Initiative Projects: Packages 1, 2 and 3.
- (6) Planning Commission meeting, July 20, 2016, 4:00 p.m., Room 16; agenda includes: Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan; and Planning Commission's Annual Report for 2015-2016.

F. Adjournment





MINUTES (Draft)

TIME: Wednesday, June 15, 2016, 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Council Chambers, Tacoma Municipal Building, 1st Floor
747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402

PRESENT: Chris Beale (Chair), Stephen Wamback (Vice-Chair), Jeff McInnis, Meredith Neal, Brett Santhuff, Scott Winship

ABSENT: Anna Petersen, Dorian Waller

A. CALL TO ORDER AND QUORUM CALL

Chair Beale called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. A quorum was declared.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 2016

The agenda was approved.

The minutes of the regular meeting on June 1, 2016 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No members of the public came forward to provide comments.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. 2016 Annual Amendment

Stephen Atkinson, Planning Services Division, facilitated a discussion to complete the review process and make a recommendation to the City Council. Commissioners concurred with voting for the individual items in the amendment package and for the individual Future Land Use Designation proposals.

Short Term Rentals were discussed. Mr. Atkinson noted that the Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability Committee had expressed support for some of the changes being considered for the final recommendation. He commented that the modified code took a more hands off approach while providing some guidance and a reasonable regulatory structure for short term rentals. Vice-Chair Wamback motioned that Planning Commission recommend Council adoption of the Short Term Rental package as amended in the meeting packet. Commissioner Neal seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Wireless Communication Facilities were discussed. Mr. Atkinson reviewed that the purpose of the amendment was to comply with Federal Communications Commission's rules and to provide a regulatory structure to mitigate the visual impacts of wireless communication facilities. Vice-Chair Wamback motioned to approve the Wireless Communication Facilities proposal as proposed in the meeting packet and recommended Council adoption. Commissioner McInnis seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Code Cleanup amendments were discussed. Mr. Atkinson reviewed minor additions to the code cleanup amendments that had been introduced at the previous meeting including an increase to the notification area for major projects, addressing a conflict in the usable yard space requirements, and providing reasonable accommodation for accessory dwelling units. Chair Beale suggested they use larger text in the notices for site specific rezones so that they could be read from a car. Mr. Atkinson responded that they would consider doing so during the next round of rezones. Vice-Chair Wamback motioned for

approval of the Code Cleanup language as modified in the meeting packet and recommended City Council approval. Commissioner Winship seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Multifamily Design Standards were discussed. Mr. Atkinson reviewed that there had been little community feedback, though they had received a letter from Forterra expressing support. The Master Builders Association had not raised any objections, but did not provide any formal comments. Mr. Atkinson reviewed that the design standards would provide minimum standards for multifamily in commercial districts, industrial districts, residential districts, and on designated pedestrian streets. For pedestrian streets, they would seek to create a more urban focus on the streets with standards such as tying the entrance location to orientation, setting a minimum and maximum build-to area, requiring a transitional space, limiting parking along key streets, transparency requirements, façade articulation, and addressing blank walls. Mr. Atkinson noted that there had been minor edits discussed at the prior meeting, including deletion of carryover commercial standards; the addition of window design standards for façades facing pedestrian streets; a stronger statement about internal streets; and referring back to comparable residential district standards for commercial and industrial districts. Mr. Atkinson proposed additional modifications to the proposal, including the addition of definitions and calculations for building coverage and tree canopy percentage. Other modifications included exceptions and bonuses for maximum building coverage; requiring appropriate usable yard space for duplexes, triplexes, and townhouses; and increasing the usable yard space requirement to 20% of the lot area for multifamily with some flexibilities such as a common open space waiver for properties within a quarter mile of a park.

Commissioners provided the following comments and questions:

- Vice-Chair Wamback noted that for multifamily in R-4, 50 percent of the frontage had to be between 5 and 20 feet. He asked what the other 50 percent was. Mr. Atkinson responded that the other 50 percent could be surface parking or usable yard space and that the requirement was to accommodate surface parking without allowing 100 percent frontage.
- Vice-Chair Wamback asked if there was a path that would allow a developer to build right up to the sidewalk. Mr. Atkinson responded that there wasn't and that it was to provide developers some space to make the transition between public and private.
- Vice-Chair Wamback expressed concern that they were cementing a historic car centric development pattern and not doing enough to support an evolution of those areas.
- Commissioner McInnis asked what components of interior streets were to be incorporated. Mr. Atkinson responded that they were adding a general statement that internal, private streets should be designed to look like a public street, without being prescriptive. He added that they also had some harder requirements that they were proposing for the connectivity of sidewalks.
- Chair Beale commented that he'd prefer a greater distance than a quarter mile from parks for the common open space waiver. Other Commissioners suggested that more than a quarter mile may not be reasonably walkable to account for the onsite common open space requirements.
- Chair Beale commented that he would be okay with front porches being included in usable yard space for single family.
- Chair Beale asked why they were providing a 35 to 45 percent minimum range for window transparency instead of a single minimum standard. Mr. Atkinson responded that he could go back to the minimum of 35%.
- Chair Beale asked how staff would handle a site that does not meet the tree canopy requirements due to all of the trees have been topped and if they would treat it as nonconforming landscaping. Mr. Atkinson responded that the intent would be to treat it the same way through enforcement or non-conforming status similar to some of the other standards that they have in landscaping. Chair Beale requested that they add a statement for the sake of clarity.
- Commissioner Santhuff asked if the waiver for the common open space requirement would be reducing the usable yard space requirement or only eliminating common open yard space aspect. Mr. Atkinson responded that it would reduce the overall requirement. Commissioner Santhuff recommended clarifying that it was an overall reduction.

The discussion of the item was paused at 5:02 p.m. for the public hearing and resumed at 5:37 p.m.

Vice-Chair Wamback motioned for approval of the Multifamily Design Standards as modified in the staff packet, as further modified in the staff presentation, and as further modified based upon Planning Commission discussion, and recommended City Council approval. Commissioner Neal seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Future Land Use implementation was discussed.

For Nob Hill, Mr. Atkinson reviewed that the proposal was for an area-wide rezone from R-4 to Downtown Residential and also to clean up the zoning in the right-of-way. The recommendation of staff was to approve as proposed and also to give priority to open space acquisition and seek other mechanisms for conservation of the designated open space corridors Downtown. Chair Beale asked how the prioritization process would work. Mr. Atkinson responded that it would be incorporated into the findings and recommendations. Chair Beale suggested that more study was needed before they could put Nob Hill ahead of other open space corridors. Mr. Atkinson agreed to modify the language to make a broader statement that would recognize the concern generally and suggest that it would need to be evaluated in relation to other priorities. Vice-Chair Wamback motioned for approval of the Nob Hill area-wide rezone to Downtown Residential as modified for the language on open space acquisition and recommend approval to City Council. Commissioner Winship seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

For the McKinley area, Mr. Atkinson reviewed the proposal to rezone a split parcel to NCX. He reported that no comments had been received regarding the proposal. Commissioner Winship motioned for approval as presented. Commissioner McInnis seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

For Franke Tobey Jones, Mr. Atkinson reviewed that the proposal was a cleanup item to amend the Future Land Use Map. He noted that Franke Tobey Jones had also applied for both a PRD modification and a site specific rezone for a portion of the site. Commissioner Winship motioned for approval as presented. Commissioner Neal seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

For N 33rd and Pearl, Mr. Atkinson reviewed the area-wide rezone proposal as modified by staff and presented new options based on Commission feedback: to keep only the R-4L portion of the rezone or to rezone the entire southern area to R-3. He reported that the staff modification to leave the northern portion of the Bates location zoned R-2 had been done in response to neighborhood concerns about the concentration of multifamily and related traffic impacts. Chair Beale expressed concern that leaving the larger parcel zoned R-2 would not achieve the intended transition and that potential redevelopment to something like R-3 would be more viable. Brian Boudet, Planning Services Division Manager, noted that the Bates radio tower location was unlikely to be developed. Vice-Chair Wamback noted that they had received comments from neighbors about the negative aspects of the tower and that rezoning its location to R-3 or R-4L could incentivize Bates to remove the tower. Vice-Chair Wamback added that R-3 or R-4L would be more appropriate for the intensity and that leaving the area zoned R-2 would not be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Santhuff noted that the Future Land Use Designations map designated the parcels as Open Space. Mr. Atkinson commented that the designation was likely due to the existing topography and presence of critical areas, which would help moderate any potential development. Commissioner Neal suggested rezoning the whole area as R-3, including the portion removed by the staff modification. Vice-Chair Wamback motioned for approval of a modified proposal to zone the entire area as R-3. Commissioner Neal seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

For the area from the north of TCC to 6th Avenue, Mr. Atkinson reviewed the proposal for an area-wide rezone and future land use map amendment. Chair Beale noted that the area was between two mixed use centers and asked why an R-5 zoning was not being considered. Mr. Atkinson responded that they wanted residential towers to be concentrated in Downtown, which was the focal point for that level of growth. Vice-Chair Wamback asked if the upzone would affect the ability of Tacoma Public Schools to reuse Hunt Middle School. Mr. Atkinson responded that it would not. Vice-Chair Wamback suggested that in the Findings of Fact they address additional cleanup needed along the commercial area and that the whole area should be investigated for whether a higher zoning might be appropriate. Mr. Atkinson recommended also including a statement about prioritizing street improvements and connectivity in the area to make it a livable neighborhood. Vice-Chair Wamback motioned for approval of the designations and zoning as recommended in the package with the addition of three points in the Findings of Fact

relating to street connectivity, future study on higher density in the area, and cleanup along the border with 6th Avenue. Commissioner McInnis seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

For South Alaska and 72nd, Mr. Atkinson reviewed that staff had recommended postponing the rezone at the intersection for further evaluation and proceeding with the minor cleanups of the two split parcels. Chair Beale commented that the proposal to rezone the parcels from C-1 to C-2 needed to be clarified in the Findings of Fact. Chair Beale asked what options would be available to the City Council to prevent a site specific rezone. Mr. Atkinson responded that he wasn't aware of any, but that significant acquisitions would still need to take place before the property at the intersection was consolidated. Chair Beale asked if it would be an option for the Planning Commission to recommend that the City Council change the area to low density residential as a temporary measure while they restudy it to prevent a site specific rezone. Mr. Boudet noted that the area has been designated for high intensity use some time and a site specific rezone could have happened at any point in the last 20 years. He added that there would still need to be discussion should someone propose a site specific rezone and staff would communicate the issues and concerns raised by the Commission. Discussion ensued. Chair Beale asked if language could be added to the Comprehensive Plan to protect the area while they continue to study it. Mr. Boudet suggested that they could make a broader statement, possibly in the Process Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, that they should not consider site rezones in areas with ongoing area-wide discussions. Commissioners concurred with adding the language to the Comprehensive Plan. Vice-Chair Wamback motioned to postpone action on the South Alaska and 72nd Street area-wide rezone, except to clean up the two changes of C-1 to C-2 as recommended by staff, to correct the language in Findings of Fact to reflect this, to amend the Comprehensive Plan with language calling for a go slow approach for individual parcel rezones while an area is under consideration for an area-wide rezone, and to identify the entire area as meriting further more detailed evaluation as a future area-wide rezone. Chair Beale seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

For the South Tacoma area, Mr. Atkinson reviewed that the proposal was a cleanup to address a number of split parcels for the South Tacoma industrial uses and to consolidate the zoning for the STAR and SERA site. Vice-Chair Wamback requested that the Findings of Fact for the rezone be structured similarly as the other rezones in the amendment package. Commissioner Winship moved for approval as presented. Vice-Chair Wamback seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

For the Cheney area, Mr. Atkinson reviewed that there had been widespread neighborhood concern about the proposed rezone from R-2 to C-2. He reported that the staff recommendation was to postpone the area-wide rezone, to strongly encourage the different agencies that own and manage the property to work together for a long term plan, and to explore a more broadly applicable institutional zoning or overlay. Vice-Chair Wamback motioned to recommend postponing the rezone, the initiation of work on a master plan, and investigation of an institutional zoning or overlay as recommended by staff. Commissioner Winship seconded. The motion was approved.

Vice-Chair Wamback motioned that the Planning Commission approve the 2016 Annual Amendment as amended and recommend approval by the City Council. Commissioner McInnis seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Public Hearing – Capital Facilities Program 2017-2022

At 5:02 p.m., Chair Beale called the public hearing to order and reviewed the procedures, noting that written comments would be accepted through June 17, 2016.

Mr. Atkinson discussed the background of the Capital Facilities Program (CFP) and the role of Planning and Development Services in the process. He reviewed that the CFP was required by the Growth Management Act and was an element of the Comprehensive Plan that identified the project funding needs in a six year time frame. He reviewed that over the last year they had been making meaningful improvements to the CFP process and the document itself. He reviewed that the amendments were proposed in compliance with the Growth Management Act and TMC 13.02. He reported that the notification regarding the public hearing had included advertisements, news releases, email, and hard copy notifications to community groups and agencies. The CFP Roles for staff, the Planning Commission, the City Manager, and the City Council were reviewed.

Christina Watts, Office of Management and Budget, discussed the public hearing materials, noting that the majority of the materials were the list of projects proposed for inclusion. Staff had also provided examples of proposed changes to the CFP document including the table of contents, the reader's guide, the new proposed projects, the future projects list, and an example project section introduction.

The list of projects was discussed. Ms. Watts noted that 68 new projects were proposed for inclusion in the CFP and that several of those projects had secured funding. The next section of the public review document included the list of all 161 projects proposed for inclusion in the 2017-2022 CFP. The projects on the list had been ranked into three prioritization tiers based on how project managers rated their alignment with the prioritization criteria. Ms. Watts reviewed that 35 projects were ranked Tier 1, of which 21 were at least partially funded. 38 projects were ranked Tier 2 with 21 at least partially funded. 63 projects were ranked Tier 3, which would be the lowest prioritization for funding. The next steps for the overall CFP process were reviewed.

Chair Beale called for testimony. The following citizens testified:

(1) **Keith Davidson:**

Mr. Davidson reported that he was a licensed professional engineer in both electrical and mechanical which included heating, ventilation, and air conditioning. He noted that he was one of the design engineers for the heating and cooling systems of the Tacoma Dome. He commented that they needed to put some money into the Tacoma Dome right now, noting that the Dome was starting to lose its sparkle and was not as attractive to potential renters as it used to be. He expressed concern that the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment from 1982 was beyond its rated lifespan and that some of it needed to be replaced. He commented that though the City is not flush with money they should not let the Tacoma Dome crumble.

(2) **Robert Hill:**

Mr. Hill recommended that they sell Cheney Stadium after appraising its current value. He recommended selling the Tacoma Dome or conducting a site study to consider demolishing it and possibly replacing it with condos. He recommended that they implement monthly paid parking at the Pierce Transit garage. He recommended that they develop a plan for Tacoma Public Utilities to buy emergency batteries in case of transmission network overload. Mr. Hill suggested installing call boxes that are just for emergency calls and that they clean the Tacoma Municipal Building.

(3) **Randolph Hedgebeth:**

Mr. Hedgebeth reported that he was a registered architect and had done the architectural work for the Harmon Building. He noted that he was focused on energy efficiency and had worked on the Passages building at 708 Broadway where he upgraded the thermal operation of the building significantly during the remodeling process. He commented on the Tacoma Dome having influenced his design direction for sustainable energy efficiency and healthy environments. He commented that the Dome was a marvel of energy conservation compared even to buildings being constructed today. He commented that it was a significant structure that represents the core values of the City and that it should be taken care of.

Seeing no one else coming forward, Chair Beale closed the public hearing at 5:28 p.m. and recessed the meeting. The meeting resumed at 5:37 p.m. to continue the discussion of the 2016 Annual Amendment.

3. Capital Facilities Program 2017-2022

Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division, facilitated a discussion to review the public comments received to date and consider potential modifications to the proposal. Due to schedule considerations they would be seeking Commission recommendations at the next meeting. Mr. Wung highlighted some points for the Planning Commission to consider incorporating into the Findings of Fact and Recommendations report including that the CFP was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; that they recognized the great improvements that staff had made to the CFP process; that projects were being selected and evaluated against criteria that had been adopted into the Comprehensive Plan in the previous year, though there were areas that could be improved; that they recognized the need to prioritize and budget for projects that would complete a network or facility before funding new ones; and that the

proposed CFP document had a number of projects that support the 20-minute neighborhoods concept and the Centers and Corridors concept.

Commissioners provided the following comments and questions:

- Commissioner McInnis asked if concerns expressed about the Tacoma Dome were specific to the HVAC system. Mr. Wung responded that emailed comments had included additional recommendations to improve the facility so that it would continue to be a competitive venue for regional and national events.
- Commissioner McInnis asked if they could request that the Prairie Line Trail be moved to Tier 1. Mr. Atkinson responded that they could highlight it for budget consideration but that they didn't want to give it consideration that had not been given to other projects.
- Chair Beale recommended adding a statement in the Findings of Fact that Urban Forestry is lacking from a capital investment standpoint. He commented that it seemed inconsistent to state in the Comprehensive Plan that plans and investment should include trees, while lacking that infrastructure as part of Capital Facility planning.
- Commissioner Santhuff recommended that staff review projects that did not have complete criteria so that they could be more fairly ranked. He reviewed that he had also recommended identification of projects that were closely linked and should move forward together to be more efficient.

E. COMMUNICATION ITEMS & OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Wung provided the following updates:

- The Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability, Committee had decided to broaden the candidate pool for the "Architecture, Historic Preservation and/or Urban Design" position with results now anticipated in late July or early August.
- At the next meeting the Tacoma Mall Subarea Plan might not be ready but they plan to prepare the Commission's Annual Report, which covers the past 12 months and includes the 12 – 18 month work program.

Mr. Boudet provided the following updates:

- Enforcement on existing illegally operating marijuana storefronts would begin shortly after July 1st.
- At the recent study session the City Manager recognized the need for a community conversation about the vision for the tide flats area and the appropriate regulations. The City Manager also began to discuss what the process might look like for a partnership between the City and the Port.
- Mr. Boudet expressed his appreciation for the work of the Commission on the Annual Amendment process.

F. ADJOURNMENT

At 7:28 p.m., the meeting of the Planning Commission was concluded.



City of Tacoma
Planning and Development Services

**Agenda Item
D-2**

To: Planning Commission
From: Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division
Subject: **Capital Facilities Program 2017-2022**
Date of Meeting: July 6, 2016
Date of Memo: June 28, 2016

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on June 15, 2016 concerning the proposed Capital Facilities Program (CFP) for 2017-2022, and kept the record open through June 17 to accept written comments.

At the next meeting on July 6, the Commission will review all comments received and a report prepared by staff that provides responses to the comments and suggestions for potential modifications to the draft CFP document. The Commission will also be asked to consider formulating its recommendations and moving the 2017-2022 CFP forward to the City Manager and the City Council for their review in a timely manner.

To facilitate the Commission's review, staff has prepared the following documents, as attached:

- Public Comments and Staff Responses and Suggestions Report
- Compilation of Public Comments Received (i.e., Attachment A of the above report)
- Draft Planning Commission's Letter of Recommendation
- Draft Planning Commission's Findings of Fact and Recommendations Report

Note that Exhibit A to the Draft Planning Commission's Findings of Fact and Recommendations Report, i.e., the Draft 2017-2022 CFP, has been provided to the Commissioners prior to the public hearing on June 15 and is not being provided here.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 253-591-5682 or lwung@cityoftacoma.org.

Attachments

c: Peter Huffman, Director



CAPITAL FACILITIES PROGRAM 2017-2022

Public Comments and Staff Responses and Suggestions Report

Prepared for the Planning Commission's Review on July 6, 2016

I. Introduction

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on June 15, 2016, concerning the Draft Capital Facilities Program (CFP) for 2017-2022 and kept the record open through June 17, 2016, to accept written comments. Three individuals testified at the public hearing and seven pieces of written comments were received (See Attachment A).

This report summarizes public comments received during the public hearing process, identifies major issues and concerns reflected therein, provides staff's responses to the issues and concerns, and suggests modifications, where appropriate, to the draft CFP that was distributed for public review prior to the public hearing.

II. Comments and Staff Responses and Suggestions

Comments	Commenters	Staff Responses and Suggestions
<p>Support for Tacoma Dome capital projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tacoma Domes needs upgrades and/or enhancements to remain a competitive venue in the area• Support and endorsement for future funding considerations to the Tacoma Dome• Tacoma Dome was built with a one-of-a-kind energy efficient HVAC system• Analysis of current system should be undertaken to identify areas for improvement.• Tacoma Dome plays significant role for community, enhancing quality of life and having a positive economic impact.• Recommend allocation resources to Tacoma Dome to improve efficiencies of event set-up and the quality of backstage areas.• Tacoma Dome has busy schedule, inefficient seating, and challenging loading dock that causes the venue to lose potential concerts.• Encourage investments in improved seating a loading dock at Tacoma Dome.	<p>Dean Burke; Allen Creten; Keith Davidson; Craig Sneiderman; Jeff Trisler</p>	<p>Needed Tacoma Dome upgrades and enhancements for the next six years are currently included in the CFP document, including projects to replace the Tacoma Dome's HVAC system and seating system, improve the loading dock, and upgrade behind-the-scenes areas. An analysis of the most cost-effective way to improve the HVAC system would be part of the process in the event the project moves forward. The needs for maintaining the Tacoma Dome will be balanced with the City's other capital maintenance needs.</p>

<p>Support for Library Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added prioritization order to projects currently included 	Sara Sandefur	All projects are included in the CFP and the Library Department has requested funding. The needs for these facilities must be balanced with the City's other capital and maintenance needs.
<p>Environmental Services Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested language clean-up in the draft CFP for various Environmental Services projects 	Merita Trohimovich	Language improvements and minor changes will be reviewed and incorporated as appropriate into the final CFP document.
<p>Various Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Build a new city hall building. Construct two more "Community Solar" projects. Purchase five SEGWAY PT devices for employee use. Sell or demolish Tacoma Dome. Sell the Cheney Stadium. Create parking structures on Tacoma Dome surface lots. Assist Pierce Transit with paid parking proposal. Purchase "truck-trailer" amount of batteries for TPU use for emergency power shunting. Purchase "truck-trailer" amount of batteries for TPU use for overnight power purchasing from BPA. Install 911 payphones throughout the City. 	Robert Hill	Comments acknowledged. It is noted that many suggestions are beyond the scope of the CFP, such as Items 4 and 5 that would require policy discussion at the City Council level and Items 6 and 7 that would require policy discussion with other agencies. Many suggestions would not be included within the CFP (e.g., Items 3, 8 and 9), but rather the City's operating budget, subject to approval by the City Council.

III. Attachment

A. Compilation of Public Comments Received

Capital Facilities Program for 2017-2022

Public Comments Received

A. Oral Testimony Received at the Planning Commission Public Hearing on June 15, 2016

1. Keith Davidson
2. Robert Hill
3. Randolph Hedgebeth

B. Written Comments Received through the Comment Period Ending on June 17, 2016

1. Dean Burke, Tacoma South Sound Sports Commission
2. Allen Creten and Keith Davidson
3. Robert Hill
4. Sara Sandefur, Friends of Tacoma Public Library
5. Craig Sneiderman, Concerts West
6. Jeff Trisler, Live Nation
7. Merita Trohimovich, City of Tacoma Surface Water



CAPITAL FACILITIES PROGRAM 2017-2022

SUMMARY OF ORAL TESTIMONY

Planning Commission Public Hearing
June 15, 2016

(1) **Keith Davidson:**

Mr. Davidson reported that he was a licensed professional engineer in both electrical and mechanical which included heating, ventilation, and air conditioning. He noted that he was one of the design engineers for the heating and cooling systems of the Tacoma Dome. He commented that they needed to put some money into the Tacoma Dome right now, noting that the Dome was starting to lose its sparkle and was not as attractive to potential renters as it used to be. He expressed concern that the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment from 1982 was beyond its rated lifespan and that some of it needed to be replaced. He commented that though the City is not flush with money they should not let the Tacoma Dome crumble.

(2) **Robert Hill:**

Mr. Hill recommended that they sell Cheney Stadium after appraising its current value. He recommended selling the Tacoma Dome or conducting a site study to consider demolishing it and possibly replace it with condos. He recommended that they implement monthly paid parking at the Pierce Transit garage. He recommended that they develop a plan for Tacoma Public Utilities to buy emergency batteries in case of transmission network overload. Mr. Hill suggested installing call boxes that are just for emergency calls and that they clean the Tacoma Municipal Building.

(3) **Randolph Hedgebeth:**

Mr. Hedgebeth reported that he was a registered architect and had done the architectural work for the Harmon Building. He noted that he was focused on energy efficiency and had worked on the Passages building at 708 Broadway where he upgraded the thermal operation of the building significantly during the remodeling process. He commented on the Tacoma Dome having influenced his design direction for sustainable energy efficiency and healthy environments. He commented that the Dome was a marvel of energy conservation compared even to buildings being constructed today. He commented that it was a significant structure that represents the core values of the City and that it should be taken care of.



2015 YEAR END NUMBERS

The Big Picture; Tacoma and Pierce County

NOTES & EXPLANATION POINTS

The data is in...crunched, bunched, chopped, diced and has a bow tied around it. 2015 is in the can and from many angles, appears to be our best year ever.

As a reminder to the reader, this report by no means represents every sports event in Pierce County. In fact, it does not even account for the obvious stand out event of the year, the US Open. That's because this report takes into account only events that we are actively involved engaged with. In some cases we even omit events in the report that we helped initiate in years past but have since stepped away as the event was able to mature and exist on its own.

Here is our 2015 report.

TOTAL EVENTS	43
TOTAL *VISITORS	179,181
PARTICIPANTS	35,581
SPECTATORS	~143,600
VISITORS FROM...	
OUTSIDE of 50 MILES	~71,932
OUT of STATE	~7,885
PAID ROOM NIGHTS	~20,661
UNPAID OVERNIGHTS	~10,000
DIRECT SPENDING	~\$11.3M
ECONOMIC IMPACT	~\$21M

Approximately 40% of our event Visitors (a participant or a spectator) came from outside of 50 miles or out of state.

*"Visitor's" are the combined number of Participants AND Spectators.

NEW DATA

PERCENT OF TRAVELERS FROM OUTSIDE of 50 MILES or OUT OF STATE

Averaged across all 43 events, apprx. 40% of the total visitors (participants AND spectators) were defined as travelers from outside of 50 miles away or out of state. Percentages varied from as low as 4% to as high as 86% over the total year.

ACCURACY OF DATA

New to 2015 we started to incorporate *"Participant Zip Code Capture."* We would get a zip code for *every event participant and, using a zip code mapping software, build physical maps to verify that the event was in fact brining participants from outside of the 50 mile radius mark.

**Only a few events for the year were unable to comply with reporting participant zip code data. In those cases, we worked with the event stake holder to come up with other models to help ensure we could accurately calculate the event.*

REPORTING DIRECT SPENDING/ ECONOMIC IMPACT

In years past, Tacoma Sports reported what I would call a "blended number." It was conservative and it was built to be closer to a "Direct Spending" number. But in 2015 we made advances in our ability to track our travelers which gives us better data when we go out to build economic models. We still use the NASC (National Association. of Sports Commissions) Economic Impact calculator as our go-to tool, but we also blend it with our own improved data collection to further insure that we are getting a proper reflection of the impact of our hosted events.

DEFINITIONS:

DIRECT SPENDING

Direct Spending is our absolute lowest estimate of dollars brought into the community. For overnight stays it uses \$114 per room night and for all visitors is accounts for \$50 per person, per day for basic food and beverage. These numbers are based on DMAI (Destination Marketing Assoc. International), NASC (National Assoc. of Sports Commissions), Dean Runyan Associates studies, the IRS per diem and our own review of average rates in our local market. We can put a good stake in the ground on the estimates of Direct Spending. Where other "impact" numbers may get questionable, this one should always be our best data.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Economic Impact uses further multipliers to estimate for additional dollars put into the community. These can include rental cars, fuel, gift shopping, museums tickets, entertainment, etc. For our reports, we look not only to our calculators but also to peer markets. As your Executive Director, I like to say this; *"With Economic Impact numbers....please add salt to your own tastes."* These numbers can sometimes seem wildly inflated or nebulous. As such, we prefer not to state them as an "absolute." So we will report based on a range of Direct Spending

AND Economic Impact as to meet you, our audience, where you are in your perspective of such data. If you have an in-depth knowledge of tourism gains, then these numbers will not surprise you. But if you are new to the market, then understanding them can sometimes be a little challenging. We present you with both for ease of digestion and understanding.

CHANGES FROM 2014

WHY THE DECREASE IN TOTAL VISITORS?

Three reasons:

- a) Some events went away this year (a few that are on “rotation” that will move into other regions to best serve their clients).
- b) We stopped counting a few other events, like the WIAA swim/ dive event in Federal Way (It still takes place, but it is a King County event and serves King County hotels in Federal Way, not Pierce County) and the Tacoma City Marathon, among others.
- c) We no longer conduct “Let’s Play” in the Tacoma Dome. (This was a non-tourism based local/ community event that was outside of scope of the organizations objectives.)

However, despite those changes, we did bring 11 new events to the calendar this year and based on a “per event” basis, our averages are actually up.

WITH THE DECREASE IN TOTAL VISITORS....THEN WHY THE INCREASE IN HOTEL ROOM NIGHTS?

Because the participant zip code data, combined with our own research and studies against our event stake holders, hotel partners and participant feedback has resulted in much improved data for reporting. What we report is only as good as the data we can collect. We have a full time, dedicated hotel relations manager on staff and we have a dedicated staff member who collects the zip code data in conjunction with the event stake holder. Working together we vet out every single event to have a complete understanding of its participation and impact.

Data specific to Tacoma only

TOTAL EVENTS	31
TOTAL *VISITORS	151,475
PARTICIPANTS	26,064
SPECTATORS	125,411
VISITORS FROM...	
OUTSIDE of 50 MILES	62,269
OUT of STATE	6,076
PAID ROOM NIGHTS	16,207
UNPAID OVERNIGHTS	7,500
DIRECT SPENDING	~\$9.4M
ECONOMIC IMPACT	~\$18M

Approximately 41% of our event Visitors for TACOMA (a participant or a spectator) came from outside of 50 miles or out of state. *"Visitor's" are the combined number of Participants AND Spectators.

WE SUPPORT THE TACOMA DOME

Of the 151,475 visitors in Tacoma, approximately 100,000 of those are by way of the Tacoma Dome. That represents more than half of the total volume of visitors we see county wide. Direct Spending and Economic Impact by way of the dome carries ~\$9.4M - \$18M; a clear demonstration of the value the dome provides.

The Tacoma South Sound Sports Commission supports future capital expenditures for the Tacoma Dome in effort that we might not only sustain the positive impacts generated now, but also be competitive in securing new business for our future. The Tacoma Dome could potentially be a great host venue for events like the following:

- Pacific Rim Gymnastics Championships
- WIAA State Volleyball and USA Volleyball State
- NCAA Girls Basketball Scouting Exhibition
- PNW Kart Racing (outdoors on parking surfaces)
- The return of WIAA State Football Semifinals

And many more large-scale events for the Western US or National level bids. All in all, our potential is to see the dome play host to upwards of 150,000 annual visitors by way of sports, which in turn drives all tourism driven economic gears.

Other forward thinking ideas that the Dome could see....

- A partnership with Metro Parks Tacoma, as both a Community and Destination Facing MPT venue with unique programming opportunities.
- A training camp venue for non-local pro-teams, with community facing interactive points.

To achieve this, we recognize that the Dome needs a variety of upgrades or enhancements to remain competitive. Examples are:

- A modern video screen, capable of functioning as a score clock.
- New turf to host football (and could potentially also host soccer.)
- New basketball courts and hoops to maintain support of the WIAA and attract new event business.
- New retractable modern seating that allows the transition time to go from a day to minutes and reducing operating costs that would allow the dome to be more financially approachable for sports events.
- Modern advertising opportunities, such as ribbon board video display, creative ad spaces and more.

Please accept our letter of support and endorsement for future funding considerations to the Tacoma Dome. As the primary hub of amateur athletic sports events in Pierce County, the Dome remains relevant, but needs tremendous attention to remain as such. Let us work together to help this venue reach its absolute potential while serving our community.

In Sport & Community,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dean E. Burke".

Dean Burke

Executive Director

Tacoma-Pierce County Sports Commission

DBA: **Tacoma South Sound Sports Commission**

1119 Pacific Ave, Suite 500

Tacoma, WA. 98402

253-284-3259

deanb@tacomaspports.org

www.tacomaspports.org

From: Dean Burke [mailto:deanb@tacomaspports.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 10:36 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Public Comment for Capital Facilities Program

Please accept the attached comment submission in support of the 2017- 2022 Capital Facilities Program.

Thank you,

Dean Burke

Executive Director

1119 Pacific Ave. Suite 500

Tacoma, WA 98402

Direct: 253.284.3259

Office: 253.327.1866

Proudly Serving

See our website for a complete listing of destination sports venues
and hotels throughout Pierce County!

tacomaspports.org | [facebook](https://www.facebook.com/tacomaspports) | [twitter](https://twitter.com/tacomaspports) | [instagram](https://www.instagram.com/tacomaspports)

TACOMA DOME

The Tacoma Dome was created as the result of a Design-Build Competitive Bid. Local Architects, Engineers, Contractors, and the Committee formed for the Bidding Criteria, put forth the highly successful effort which resulted in the most energy efficient building in the world of its type by all information, that was available at the time. It was and is a highly successful building from a function, adaptability, community service, and energy efficiency standpoint.

The heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) system designed for the building was unique in its time consisting of the following major elements:

1. Electric resistance heating boilers – Primary heat source – replaced by gas
2. Evaporative coolers – Primary means of extraction of excess energy from system when needed.
3. A central heat sink consisting of (two) parallel 8" PVC hydronic (that is, heating or cooling by means of circulating water) distribution system with pumped takeoffs to serve Arena, Exhibition Hall, Service, and Administration areas, as well as a heat sink for a large ice floor system. (The ice floor refrigeration equipment has since been removed.)
4. Unique Air Discharge Plenums, four in number, serve the Arena. Served by Water Chillers piped and controlled to operate as heat pump, and which serve (four) 100,000 cubic feet per minute air supply, air filtration, and conditioning the four plenums. There is sufficient refrigerant cooling utilized in order to control the humidity resulting from the breathing of the twenty-thousand (or so) people who could be in the Arena (As listed in the specifications for the Design-Build submittal.) The air conditioning is provided by night-time pre-cooling. Air supply system is very quiet and has maintained excellent comfort conditions when operated as designed.
5. The HVAC system hydronic energy transfer loop was designed to operate between 60F and 90F. All terminal sources serving major areas—Arena, Exhibition Hall, Administration, etc. are served by the Hydronic Heat Pumps which supply air temperatures from 50F cooling and 120F for heating.
6. The hydronic primary loop (two) 8" pipes in Parallel, under the concrete floor slab of the Arena provide the heat sink that is the base for storing heat in the soil under system cooling operations, making this energy available when the building switched to heating cycle, extracting energy and cooling the sink for when the system switches to cooling.
7. System efficiency—The first year of operation (1983-1984) the Dome energy costs were about 70 thousand dollars. The Pontiac Michigan Silver Dome which opened at roughly the same time had an annual energy cost of about one million dollars. A conservative estimate of the energy savings at the Tacoma Dome over the last 33 years, would be in the 10s of millions of dollars, a figure nearly equal to the construction cost of the Dome. My memory tells me that the Base Bid Amount was between 24 million dollars, and 25 million dollars. (That number needs to be verified.) This would be one of the finest bargains that the City of Tacoma has ever realized. The cost of the HVAC system plus the ice floor refrigeration equipment was something less than five million dollars.
8. Control parameters and mechanical systems changes have been made to the HVAC system which have reduced its performance and energy efficiency. Correction of these changes and the installation of more sophisticated temperature controls should be primary efforts in upgrading the energy efficiency and its function.
9. Wholesale replacement of system concept in our judgment should not be a consideration.

10. Summary—A detailed estimate of costs to improve the energy consumption of the major elements of the system could be undertaken. Those elements may consist of the chillers, rooftop units on the Exhibition Hall, pumps in the Boiler Room, and possibly hydronic heat pumps serving smaller zones, and state-of-the-art energy controls.
11. Recommendation—An Engineer who understands the merits of the system, and what possibilities exist for system improvement, should be retained to make a detailed analysis for budgetary purposes.

Allen V. Creten, P.E.

Keith Davidson, P.E.

253.223.7985

FRIDAY, JUNE SEVENTEENTH, 2016

FROM: Hill, Robert unit #277, 2522 North Proctor St, Tacoma, 98400-9999

TO: Planning Commission

RE: public comments for "Capital Projects Program"

ITEM ONE: Build a new city hall building.

There is too much deferred maintenance in the current "Tacoma Municipal Building." Offer the state to pay for tearing down the building at the corner of South Eleventh & Yakima. The site co-locates with the county-city building and provides benefits to the public for shared services. Parking is better. Departing from the 747 Market location frees up space for better business usage.

ITEM TWO: Construct two more "Community Solar" projects.

The ownership by the customers of TPU sold out quickly for the current project, on the roof of one of the buildings of TPU at South 35th & Union. This furthers the City's position as a promoter of renewable energy and reducing greenhouse-gas sourced electricity. Co-locate the batteries that store "DC" power where 100% electric cars can easily connect, thereby saving efficiency by bypassing the AC-to-DC conversion.

ITEM THREE: purchase five SEGWAY® PT devices for employee use.

This 100% electric device exists in the legal category of EPAMD, or "electric personal-assistive mobility device." They would be available at city hall and/or TPU for travelling to off-site meetings or activities which don't require a car. Benefits include property tax income.

ITEM FOUR: Sell or demolish the TACOMA DOME.

Obtain commercial appraisal from at least two firms every 3-4 years. Put out bid for a contract to provide estimate market demand for building multiple high-rise condo and apartment living next to the multi-modal transportation hub in the district.

ITEM FIVE: Sell the CHENEY STADIUM.

Obtain commercial appraisal from at least two firms every 3-4 years. Put out bid for a contract to provide estimate on the process for convincing the current "primary tenants" to forgo the recent lease agreement. Benefits include property tax income.

ITEM SIX: Create mobile parking structures that indicate monthly parking subscription at the surface lots of the TACOMA DOME near the Freighthouse square.

Pierce Transit is considering charging fees for daily and/or monthly parking. Once this takes effect, a market will then come into existence by those transit individuals who want to pay less. EXTRA: the city should implement "reserved" stalls as a premium, because at the Pierce Transit structures, this does not exist.

ITEM SEVEN: Help PIERCE TRANSIT with the structures and infrastructure changes they need to implement their paid-parking proposal.

ITEM EIGHT: Purchase "truck-trailer" amount of batteries for TPU use, as part of a plan for implementing emergency power shunting.

The concept is the collection of batteries would act as one big "bucket" for temporary holding of power from other systems' generating plants, unless they can be shut down, in the case of a system emergency.

ITEM NINE: Purchase "truck-trailer" amount of batteries for TPU use, as part of a plan for implementing daily purchase of cheap overnight power from BPA.

The concept is that the batteries would be needed for temporary holding of power overnight, to immediately be provided to customers the next day.

ITEM TEN: Purchase and install "payphones" throughout the city that simply contact Emergency Services.

The police department has been convincing businesses to remove normal payphones. Thus, the supply of an infrastructure for public safety is being lost.

-----Original Message-----

From: The Hon. Mr. Robert Hill [mailto:TACOMA-ACTIVIST.2016@Tacoma.Robert-Hill.net]

Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 5:02 PM

To: Planning

Subject: [JUN17]---"public written comment for CAPITAL FACILITIE PPROGRAM" ---correction
The sentence "Benefits include property tax income." in my ITEM THREE doesn't belong there...it goes at end of ITEM FOUR.

Thank you.

From: Sara Sandefur [<mailto:sara.sandefur@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 12:01 PM
To: Planning
Cc: Sara Sandefur; Friends of Tacoma Public Library
Subject: 2017 -2022 Capital Facilities Program Comments

To: Tacoma Capital Facilities Planning Commission

I would like to comment on capital projects which should be considered in the 2017-2022 Capital Facilities Program. The Tacoma Public Library provides valuable services and materials which are freely available to every resident of our beautiful city. The majority of the requests below represent repairs and maintenance which protect the city's past and future investments into the library system. As a member of the Friends of Tacoma Public Library, I would like to ask that the Planning Commission carefully review and consider recommending these requests to the Tacoma City Council for funding. This list is given in order with the highest priority items first.

1) RFID Phase 3: This phase will provide each branch with an Intelligent-Automated Book Drop. These "smart" book drops will automatically check-in materials the instant a patron places the item in the book-drop, freeing up staff time for other Library needs. Funding request: \$202,895.

2) Main Library Elevator Upgrade: Upgrade the Main Library's elevator. Funding Request: \$90,000.

3) South Tacoma Branch Library Refurbishment: Replace the roof, windows, carpet, furniture, heat pump and repair the walls at the South Tacoma Library. Funding request: \$448,678.

4) Fern Hill Library Refurbishment: Replace the roof, exterior rock wall, carpet, furniture, heat pump and repair exterior finish. All of these items have been in service since 1989 or for 27 years, and are at the end of their useful lives. Funding request: \$862,893.

5) Swasey Branch Library Refurbishment: Replace the roof, windows and frames, furniture, and heat pump at the Swasey Library. Funding request: \$1,005,563.

6) Moore Branch Library Window Replacement: Replace improperly installed windows at the Moore Library. Funding request: \$80,000.

7) Main Branch Library Refurbishment: Replace the Northwest Room windows, main brick outside entryway, the boiler, and the furniture, as well as repair stucco on the west side of the Main Library. Funding request: \$920,000.

8) Wheelock Branch Library Refurbishment: Replace the cooling tower and heating units in the meeting room and children's room, and replace the furniture at the Wheelock Library. Funding request: \$695,000.

9) Kobetich Branch Library Refurbishment: Replace the roof and furniture at the Kobetich Library. Funding request: \$96,000.

We believe that funding these requests is very important in order to maintain the Tacoma Public Library's ability to serve our city as intended, without decreasing or interrupting current service levels. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sara Sandefur
Friends of Tacoma Public Library
253.752.3809
sara.sandefur@gmail.com

From: Craig Sneiderman [<mailto:CSneiderman@concertswest.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2016 2:25 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Tacoma Dome

Dear Planning Commission Representative,

AEG Live has enjoyed a successful working relationship with the City of Tacoma's Public Assembly Facilities in producing live entertainment at the Tacoma Dome for over 15 years.

AEG Live is a company that not only promotes tours and concerts, but also owns and/or operates more than 100 facilities worldwide. We understand and appreciate the day-to-day operations of a venue, particularly the challenge of balancing the community needs with the resources available.

We also understand the significance these facilities play within a community. By having access to a diverse selection of first-rate entertainment 'in their own backyard', the Tacoma Dome enhances the quality of life for citizens while generating economic impact for the city.

We recommend allocating resources to the Tacoma Dome to improve the efficiencies of event setup and the quality of the backstage areas, to provide a first-class experience and meet the needs of the artists and personnel of these international tours. The City of Tacoma will benefit from this investment by solidifying its reputation as a 'must play' venue for the world's biggest tours and the Tacoma Dome will continue to be a source of civic pride for its citizens.

Sincerely,

Craig Sneiderman

Sr Vice President Touring

Concerts West

425 W. 11th St., Suite 400 | Los Angeles, CA 90015

M: 310.990.1939 | O: 323.900.3885 | EMAIL: csneiderman@concertswest.com

From: Jeff Trisler [<mailto:JeffTrisler@LiveNation.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 11:42 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Tacoma Dome improvements

Dear Planning Commission Representative,

As the largest concert promoter in North America, Live Nation produces more than 25,000 shows annually including six of the world's top tours at the Tacoma Dome this year. That number could be greater.

Each year, there are ten to twelve concerts that could be staged at the Tacoma Dome but instead play competitive venues in the market. A busy Tacoma Dome schedule, coupled with inefficient seating and a challenging loading dock, do not allow some shows to be staged within the timeframe that a tour will be in the area.

I am writing to encourage the City of Tacoma to make an investment in improving the production capabilities at the Tacoma Dome, including the installation of more efficient seating and making renovations to the loading dock. These enhancements will help ensure Tacoma remains a destination for these world-class tours for years to come.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to reach out. My contact information is below.

Sincerely,

Jeff Trisler



Jeff Trisler | President Northwest Music

☎:: 206 802 3120 / 206 802 3119 fx

✉:: jefftrisler@livenation.com

📍:: 419 Occidental Ave South Ste. 402 | Seattle, WA | 98104

Environmental Program Group Comments on Capital Facilities Program Proposed Project List – Public Review Document – Dated 6.15.2016

Page 12 – Trans-Active Transportation

Puyallup Avenue Improvements

Design and construct streetscape improvements by reducing pavement area/roadway width and adding facilities such as bike lanes, ~~rain gardens~~ **green stormwater infrastructure BMPs**, and other boulevard treatments.

Page 14 – Trans-Street Rehabilitation

Street Initiatives Package #3 Gravel Streets

Upgrading various existing gravel roads across the City to paved roads ~~and with~~ associated stormwater **upgrades**, signage, and other requirements.

Page 35 – Collection System Projects

Under “Does the project meet growth patterns and projected needs and or serve new development and redevelopment? (is it in a mixed use center?)”

It is stated, “Tacoma’s Surface Water Utility is required by its NPDES permit to plan for future capacity demands.” **Revise to** “These projects will serve and support service to existing areas, growth areas and new development and redevelopment areas.”

Under “Is the project required or mandated by law?”

It is stated “Capital improvements are necessary to ensure compliance with the City’s NPDES Permit for the storm water discharges.” **Revise to** “The Surface Water Utility is required to plan for future capacity demands to ensure compliance with the NPDES permit.”

Page 36 – Facilities Projects

Under “Does the project meet growth patterns and projected needs and or serve new development and redevelopment? (is it in a mixed use center?)”

It is stated, “Tacoma’s Surface Water Utility is required by its NPDES permit to plan for future capacity demands.” **Revise to** “Tacoma’s Surface Water Utility is required by its NPDES permit to maintain and upgrade facilities. These projects will serve and support service to existing areas, growth areas and new development and redevelopment areas.”

Under “Is the project required or mandated by law?”

It is stated “Capital improvements are necessary to ensure compliance with the City’s NPDES Permit for the storm water discharges.” **Revise to** “The Surface Water Utility is required to plan for future capacity demands to ensure compliance with the NPDES permit.”

Page 37 – Treatment and Low Impact Projects

Change Description from: ‘Various projects for low impact and treatment of storm water to improve local flooding issues and improve discharge quality.’ **to** “Various projects that will install water quality or flow control facilities to include green stormwater infrastructure to improve localized flooding and improve water quality.”

Change Rationale from “These projects will be in support of NPDES requirements, or for potential rain gardens and low impact initiatives within the City.” **To** “These projects will support NPDES requirements and support various local, state, and federal green stormwater initiatives.”

Under “Does the project meet growth patterns and projected needs and or serve new development and redevelopment? (is it in a mixed use center?)”

It is stated, “Tacoma’s Surface Water Utility is required by its NPDES permit to plan for future capacity demands.” **Revise to** “These projects will serve and support service to existing areas, growth areas and new development and redevelopment areas.”

Under “Is the project required or mandated by law?”

It is stated “Capital improvements are necessary to ensure compliance with the City’s NPDES Permit for the storm water discharges.” **Revise to** “The Surface Water Utility is required to plan for future capacity demands to ensure compliance with the NPDES permit.”

Page 102 – Puyallup Avenue Improvements

Change Description as follows: “Design and construct streetscape improvements by reducing pavement area/roadway width and adding facilities such as bike lanes, **rain-gardens green stormwater infrastructure BMPs**, and other boulevard treatments.”

From: Trohimovich, Merita
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 12:18 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Environmental Programs Group Comments on the Capital Facilities Program

Thank you for the opportunity to comment if you have any questions or concerns, please give me a call. Merita

Merita Trohimovich, P.E.
Principal Engineer
City of Tacoma Surface Water
Center for Urban Waters
326 East D Street
Tacoma, WA 98421
253-502-2103





City of Tacoma
Planning Commission

Chris Beale, Chair
Stephen Wamback, Vice-Chair
Meredith Neal
Anna Petersen
Brett Santhuff
Dorian Waller
Scott Winship
Jeff McInnis
(vacant)

July 6, 2016

DRAFT

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

RE: Proposed Capital Facilities Program for 2017-2022

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council,

On behalf of the Tacoma Planning Commission, I am forwarding our recommendations on the Proposed Capital Facilities Program (CFP) for 2017-2022, which would amend the existing 2015-2020 CFP, an implementation program element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Enclosed is the "*Planning Commission's Findings and Recommendations Report, July 6, 2016*" that summarizes the proposed amendments, the public review process, and the Planning Commission's deliberations. On forwarding the proposed 2017-2022 CFP, the Commission also recommends that the City Council consider the following continued improvements to the Capital Facilities Program:

- Incorporate "system completeness" as criteria for evaluating capital projects and to give greater weight to projects that will complete a facility prior to starting a new facility;
- Improve the consistency of the responses to the evaluation criteria and ensure that the criteria are fully operationalized; and
- Incorporate the City's existing urban forest infrastructure into the CFP and consider additional capital investment in the City's urban forest.

During the review process for the previous CFP (for 2015-2020) in October 2014, the Planning Commission expressed a concern that there had been limited time for review and a lack of in-depth analysis on how the proposed capital projects would be consistent with and advance relevant goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission felt that its review of the CFP might not be adding significant value to the City Council's process for selecting, prioritizing, and funding of capital projects. In response to the Commission's request, staff from the Office of Management and Budget and the Planning and Development Services Department have worked diligently to improve the CFP review process. The proposed 2017-2022 CFP reflects the results of staff's efforts. The Commission would like to commend staff for the great work.

The Planning Commission believes that the proposed 2017-2022 CFP represents a sound capital investment strategy that will help achieve the City's strategic goals for a safe, clean and attractive community and a diverse, productive and sustainable economy. We recommend it for adoption by the City Council.

Sincerely,

CHRIS BEALE, Chair
Tacoma Planning Commission

Enclosure



**CAPITAL FACILITIES PROGRAM
2017-2022**

**TACOMA PLANNING COMMISSION
FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
July 6, 2016**

DRAFT

A. SUBJECT:

Draft Capital Facilities Program for 2017-2022.

B. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSAL:

The proposal would update the six-year Capital Facilities Program (CFP) project list from 2015-2020 to 2017-2022. The CFP is an element of the City of Tacoma's Comprehensive Plan, *One Tacoma*, and proposed projects must be consistent with and implement the policies contained therein. The proposed projects vary in sizes, are located citywide, and fall into the following categories: Community Development, Cultural Facilities, General Government Municipal Facilities, Libraries, Local Improvement Districts, Parks and Open Space, Public Safety, Solid Waste, Surface Water, Tacoma Power, Tacoma Rail, Tacoma Water, Transportation, and Wastewater.

The CFP provides a bridge between the City's long term plan and the budget process but does not appropriate funds. The 2017-2022 CFP is being amended pursuant to the State Growth Management Act's (GMA) requirements (RCW 36.70A.130), and will be considered and adopted by the City Council in November 2016 concurrently with the 2017-2018 Biennial Budget.

The GMA requires communities to plan for capital facilities and utilities to ensure that there is an adequate level of service in place to meet community needs over time. These facilities are provided in Tacoma by the City and other agencies. The following table identifies these facility and service types and the providers.

TYPE	PROVIDER
Provided by City	
Electric	Tacoma Public Utilities
General Municipal Facilities	Public Works Department
Fire	Fire Department
Libraries	Tacoma Public Libraries
Police	Police Department
Solid Waste	Environmental Services Department
Stormwater	Environmental Services Department
Wastewater	Environmental Services Department
Water	Tacoma Public Utilities
Provided by City + Other Entities	
Parks (including special public assembly facilities)	Public Works Department, Environmental Services Department, Metro Parks Tacoma
Telecommunications	Tacoma Public Utilities
Transportation	Public Works Department, Tacoma Public Utilities, Pierce Transit, Sound Transit
Provided by Other Entities	
Natural Gas	Puget Sound Energy
Schools	Tacoma Public Schools

The following table illustrates how the draft 2017-2022 CFP document is organized. It is noted that the document is essentially a compilation of proposed capital projects. Additional, non-project information will be added and the full CFP document will be developed over the course of the 2016 budget process.

SECTION	DESCRIPTION
1. Executive Summary	This section includes a summary of the proposal, the Table of Contents for the draft 2017-2022 CFP, and a Reader's Guide.
2. New Proposed Projects	This section identifies 68 new projects proposed for addition to the 2017-2022 CFP and the categories they are organized within, as well as the initial prioritization tier.
3. Proposed Project List	This section identifies the full list of 161 proposed projects, including 68 new projects and 93 projects carrying forward from the previous 2015-2020 CFP, sorted by category and prioritization tier.
4. Tier 1 Project Information	This section provides detailed information on 59 projects ranked within Tier 1.
5. Tier 2 Project Information	This section provides detailed information on 39 projects ranked within Tier 2.
6. Tier 3 Project Information	This section provides detailed information on 63 projects ranked within Tier 3.
7. Future Project List	This section includes a list of desirable future projects for which funding has not yet been identified and which are not prioritized for the 2017-2022 CFP.
8. Sample Project Narrative	This section provides a sample of the project narrative that will introduce each section of the Project List.

C. FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. **Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations** – The City of Tacoma's Comprehensive Plan, *One Tacoma*, is the official statement concerning future growth and development and sets forth goals, policies and strategies for the health, welfare and quality of life of Tacoma's residents. The Comprehensive Plan consists of various policy elements and implementing programs. The Land Use Regulatory Code, i.e., Title 13 of the Tacoma Municipal Code, contains development regulations and is the key regulatory mechanism that supports the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan was first adopted in 1993 by Ordinance No. 25360, pursuant to the State Growth Management Act, and has been amended once every year thereafter. The Land Use Regulatory Code has also been amended on an as-needed basis – in most cases, concurrently with the annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.
2. **Planning Mandates and Guidelines** – The Growth Management Act requires that any amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and/or development regulations conform to the requirements of the Act, and that all proposed amendments, with certain limited exceptions, shall be considered concurrently so that the cumulative effect of the various changes can be ascertained. Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and/or development regulations must also be consistent with the following State, regional and local planning mandates and guidelines:
 - The State Growth Management Act (GMA);
 - The State Environment Policy Act (SEPA);
 - VISION 2040, the Growth Management, Environmental, Economic, and Transportation Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region;
 - Transportation 2040, the action plan for transportation in the Central Puget Sound Region;
 - The Countywide Planning Policies for Pierce County;
 - The City Council's guiding principles for planning the future growth: (1) to protect neighborhoods, (2) to protect critical areas, (3) to protect port, industrial and manufacturing uses,

and (4) to increase densities in the downtown and neighborhood business districts (Resolution No. 37070, December 19, 2006); and

- TMC 13.02 concerning the procedures and criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations and for area-wide zoning reclassifications.

3. Capital Facilities Program Updates – In recent years, the City's CFP has been updated on a biennial basis to reflect the changing needs and status of capital projects and to better coordinate with the City's biennial budget process. The updates are prepared by the Office of Management and Budget in conjunction with the Planning and Development Services Department based on project information submitted by various City departments. The CFP updates are conducted in a manner consistent with the above-mentioned planning mandates and guiding principles; however, the CFP updates are adopted separate from other proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, which is an exception allowed by the GMA because they occur concurrently with the adoption or amendment of the City's budget [RCW 36.70A.130 (2)(a)(iv)].

4. CFP Process Improvement – During the review process for the 2015-2020 CFP in October 2014, the Planning Commission expressed a concern that there had been limited time for review and a lack of in-depth analysis on how the new projects proposed for inclusion in the CFP would be consistent with and advance relevant goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission felt that its review of the CFP might not be adding significant value to the City Council's process for selecting, prioritizing, and funding of capital projects. In response to the Commission's request, staff from the Office of Management and Budget and the Planning and Development Services Department had worked closely with the Commission on developing strategies to improve the CFP review process. In February 2015, a revised process was developed, which included the following improvements:

- The timeline for the development and review of the CFP has been improved to ensure early and continuous participation of the Planning Commission and the public in the process. For example, the 2017-2022 CFP process began in November 2015, about 5 months earlier than what would have transpired with the old process.
- Best practices in development of the CFP document have been researched and applied, and a new system/database for gathering CFP project information has been employed.
- The roles of various parties involved in the CFP update and adoption process are clarified – generally, staff develops project proposals; the Planning Commission guides project prioritization and ensures the alignment of the CFP with the Comprehensive Plan; the City Manager proposes allocation of available funding, balancing a variety of input sources; and the City Council approves the CFP document and project funding.
- The project evaluation and prioritization criteria have been revised, and adopted into the Comprehensive Plan in 2015, to better align proposed projects with the Comprehensive Plan, the community's needs and desire, and other relevant rationales. These criteria include:
 - a) Addresses a public health or safety concern;
 - b) Is needed to correct existing public facility and services deficiencies or replace key facilities that are currently in use and are at risk of failing;
 - c) Aligns with *Tacoma 2025*;
 - d) Is required or mandated by law;
 - e) Has a high level of public support;
 - f) Is financially responsible, for instance by leveraging grant funding or other non-City funding sources, reducing operating costs, avoiding future costs, or by having a sustainable impact on the operating budget;

- g) Reduces greenhouse gas emissions or supports the adaptation to climate change;
- h) The project improves the equitable access to public facilities and services;
- i) The project is located within a designated center and is intended to stimulate or respond to growth and development within the designated centers; and
- j) The project is located on a corridor serving a center or within a designated 20-minute neighborhood.

5. Review of the 2017-2022 CFP – The following is a general schedule and timeline for the 2017-2022 CFP update:

Date	Actions
January – December 2015	Office of Management and Budget updates capital facilities planning process and document production.
March – April 2016	Project Managers compile proposed projects for inclusion in the proposed CFP project list.
December 2015 – May 2016	Planning Commission review and analysis of CFP amendments.
May 18, 2016	Planning Commission sets public hearing date and public comment period.
June 15, 2016	Planning Commission Public Hearing (keeping the hearing record open through June 17 to accept written comments)
July 6, 2016	Planning Commission Findings and Recommendations
July – August 2016	City Manager prepares funding recommendations.
October 2016	City Council study session and public hearing.
November 2016	City Council adoption of the 2017-2022 CFP.

- 6. Public Review Document** – A Public Review Document was compiled and distributed for public review prior to the public hearing on June 15, 2016. See Section “B. Summary of the Proposal” above for the description of the document.
- 7. Environmental Evaluation** – The City made a preliminary determination that the proposed CFP update would not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment and issued a preliminary Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) on May 22, 2016 after review of an environmental checklist. The DNS and the environmental checklist report were also included in the Public Review Document distributed for public review and comment. No comments were received on the preliminary determination by the deadline of June 17, 2016. Subsequently, the preliminary determination became final on June 24, 2016.
- 8. Notification for the Public Hearing** – More than 230 notices announcing the public hearing were mailed to interested parties including state agencies, neighborhood councils and business district representatives, adjacent jurisdictions, civic groups and agencies, major employers in the Tacoma area, the news media, and City of Tacoma internal staff. An e-mail notice was sent to more than 360 recipients that are on the Planning Commission’s distribution list. An advertisement on the public hearing was published in the Tacoma News Tribune on May 23, 2016. A legal notice regarding the environmental determination was published in the Tacoma Dailey Index on May 23, 2016. A “Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment 60 Days Prior to Adoption” was sent to the State Department of Commerce (per RCW 36.70A.106) and to Joint Base Lewis-McChord.
- 9. Public Hearing Comments and Responses** – Three individuals testified at the public hearing on June 15, 2016, and seven pieces of written comments were received by the comment deadline of June 17, 2016. The Planning Commission reviewed all public comments. The Commission also reviewed, and concurred with, the responses provided by staff, as summarized below:

Comments	Commenters	Staff Responses
<p>Support for Tacoma Dome capital projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tacoma Domes needs upgrades and/or enhancements to remain a competitive venue in the area • Support and endorsement for future funding considerations to the Tacoma Dome • Tacoma Dome was built with a one-of-a-kind energy efficient HVAC system • Analysis of current system should be undertaken to identify areas for improvement. • Tacoma Dome plays significant role for community, enhancing quality of life and having a positive economic impact. • Recommend allocation resources to Tacoma Dome to improve efficiencies of event set-up and the quality of backstage areas. • Tacoma Dome has busy schedule, inefficient seating, and challenging loading dock that causes the venue to lose potential concerts. • Encourage investments in improved seating a loading dock at Tacoma Dome. 	<p>Dean Burke; Allen Creten; Keith Davidson; Craig Sneiderman; Jeff Trisler</p>	<p>Needed Tacoma Dome upgrades and enhancements for the next six years are currently included in the CFP document, including projects to replace the Tacoma Dome's HVAC system and seating system, improve the loading dock, and upgrade behind-the-scenes areas. An analysis of the most cost-effective way to improve the HVAC system would be part of the process in the event the project moves forward. The needs for maintaining the Tacoma Dome will be balanced with the City's other capital maintenance needs.</p>
<p>Support for Library Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added prioritization order to projects currently included 	<p>Sara Sandefur</p>	<p>All projects are included in the CFP and the Library Department has requested funding. The needs for these facilities must be balanced with the City's other capital and maintenance needs.</p>
<p>Environmental Services Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested language clean-up in the draft CFP for various Environmental Services projects 	<p>Merita Trohimovich</p>	<p>Language improvements and minor changes will be reviewed and incorporated as appropriate into the final CFP document.</p>
<p>Various Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build a new city hall building. 2. Construct two more "Community Solar" projects. 3. Purchase five SEGWAY PT devices for employee use. 4. Sell or demolish Tacoma Dome. 5. Sell the Cheney Stadium. 6. Create parking structures on Tacoma Dome surface lots. 7. Assist Pierce Transit with paid parking proposal. 8. Purchase "truck-trailer" amount of batteries for TPU use for emergency power shunting. 9. Purchase "truck-trailer" amount of batteries for TPU use for overnight power purchasing from BPA. 10. Install 911 payphones throughout the City. 	<p>Robert Hill</p>	<p>Comments acknowledged. It is noted that many suggestions are beyond the scope of the CFP, such as Items 4 and 5 that would require policy discussion at the City Council level and Items 6 and 7 that would require policy discussion with other agencies. Many suggestions would not be included within the CFP (e.g., Items 3, 8 and 9), but rather the City's operating budget, subject to approval by the City Council.</p>

D. CONCLUSIONS:

Based on the information presented, public comments received and the corresponding responses provided by staff, and the discussion and deliberations among the Commissioners, the Planning Commission has reached the following conclusions concerning the proposed Capital Facilities Program for 2017-2022:

1. The proposed 2017-2022 CFP is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and relevant regional and state planning policies. It supports the City's growth strategy, with a strong focus on implementing the principles of the Mixed-Use Centers and Corridors, 20-minute Neighborhoods, Transit-Oriented Development, and Complete Streets. For example, it includes such funding mechanism and priority

projects as: Infrastructure Fund, Puyallup Avenue Improvement, and Signature Trails (e.g., Dome to Defiance Trail, Prairie Line Trail, Water Flume Line Trail, and Pipeline Trail).

2. The proposed 2017-2022 CFP puts into effect the capital project evaluation and prioritization criteria as adopted in the Comprehensive Plan in 2015. However, improvements can be made to the completeness and detail of the responses to the evaluation criteria, and the consistency of reviewing the responses and scoring the projects. For example, the Prairie Line Trail could have been ranked higher had the project evaluation against the criteria not been left incomplete.
3. The proposed 2017-2022 CFP should place more emphasis on the System Completeness attribute associated with a project. Projects that would complete a network or add significant value to an interconnected assembly of facilities (i.e., a “missing link”, a "home stretch", or a "dot connector" such as the Dome to Defiance Trail and the Prairie Line Trail) should be more highly ranked, prioritized, and budgeted for. This could be accomplished by amending the project evaluation and prioritization criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or improving the responses to the criteria.
4. The proposed 2017-2022 CFP does not include any project relating to Urban Forestry, which according to the Comprehensive Plan is both a vital component of many capital projects and in itself an important capital infrastructure/investment.
5. The proposed 2017-2022 CFP could more clearly indicate projects that are inter-dependent or closely related, where, for financial efficiency, the projects should be funded together. Thus, the Council could better evaluate, for example, multiple bicycle or trail projects that interconnect, or, multiple projects to a single facility, like the Tacoma Dome, where the individual projects should be considered in total.
6. The proposed 2017-2022 CFP satisfactorily reflects the result of staff's efforts, in response to the Planning Commission's request in 2014, to improve the evaluation and prioritization of capital projects, the content and organization of the document, and the development and review process associated with the capital facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed Capital Facilities Program for 2017-2022, as shown in Exhibit "A". The Commission also recommends that the following actions be considered: 1) modify the capital project evaluation and prioritization criteria to merit the system completeness attribute of capital projects; 2) improve how the criteria are responded to and how the responses are reviewed; and 3) consider additional capital investment that addresses Urban Forestry.

The Planning Commission understands that the proposed document is essentially a compilation of proposed capital projects, that it will be completed with additional, non-project information at the time of the City Council's consideration for adoption, and that upon adoption it will replace the existing capital facilities program element of the Comprehensive Plan.

F. EXHIBIT:

"A" – Proposed Capital Facilities Program for 2017-2022.