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May 7, 2014

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

RE: 2014 Annual Amendment

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council,

On behalf of the Tacoma Planning Commission, I am forwarding our recommendations on the Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code for 2014 (the “2014 Annual Amendment”), which will achieve the following objectives:

1. Support, strengthen and accelerate redevelopment efforts and stimulate job creation and the development of high-density mixed-income housing at the Point Ruston development site;
2. Recognize the significance of Point Defiance Park to the community and facilitate large, strategic development proposals to support and enhance the public users’ experience in the park;
3. Improve consistency and compatibility between the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations and support further growth and development within the City’s Mixed-Use Centers;
4. Promote affordable building design practices and infill housing, through voluntary, market-based and incentive-based approaches, thus increasing the development of affordable housing options in Tacoma;
5. Ensure that local land use decisions consider the needs of the Port of Tacoma and that the Port of Tacoma and freight corridors continue to function effectively alongside vibrant city water fronts and adjacent areas;
6. Reaffirm the vision and goals, enhance guidance on implementation, and maintain the City's grant eligibility pertaining to park, open space and recreation facilities, programs and projects;
7. Advance the City’s goals for sustainable development and for the promotion of public health and active living, through regulatory requirements and incentives;
8. Improve landscaping regulations applicable to development activities, with a focus on achieving such policy intents as incentives, flexibility, quality, varieties, and tree health; and

These proposed amendments are the result of intensive analyses, thorough research, and rigorous deliberations performed by the Planning Commission and City staff over the past eight months. Extensive outreach efforts have been conducted to engage stakeholders, interested parties and concerned citizens, and to ensure early and continuous public participation in the review process. The Planning Commission also held a public hearing on March 19, 2014 to solicit public comments on the proposed amendments.

During the Planning Commission’s deliberations there was considerable discussion of the role of electric vehicles in curbing greenhouse gas emissions, and appropriate strategies for growing the electric vehicle market. While the Planning Commission’s recommendations will move the City forward on this issue, there is considerable work that could still be accomplished, particularly with the use of incentives as a
companion to the recommended off-street parking requirements here-in. An incentive-based strategy will be especially useful for new multifamily developments, which carry additional complexities that make electric vehicle infrastructure planning a greater challenge and potentially more cost-prohibitive. We encourage the City Council to explore and evaluate potential incentives to expand the electric vehicle market and to help the City achieve its greenhouse gas reduction targets.

In regards to the Urban Forestry Landscaping Code updates, the Planning Commission acknowledges the positive outcomes that will result from these updates, and also recognizes that progress is to some degree dependent upon City staff and resources devoted to providing technical support and educational resources to support implementation, and through enforcing landscaping code violations such as extreme pruning, removal and failure to maintain street trees and site landscaping. We commend the Environmental Services' Urban Forestry Program for its engagement in the code development process and for providing technical expertise, information and support to the public. However, while the code authority is there, the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council consider allocating additional resources to the enforcement function, in order to better support implementation.

Also included in our recommendations are proposed shoreline implementation strategies that were initially developed as part of the Annual Amendment in 2013, which were recommended to the City Council on May 1, 2013. However, as a result of delays in the State approval process for the City’s Shoreline Master Program, these documents were held over until the completion of the 2014 Annual Amendment. The Planning Commission carries forward its recommendation to rescind the Ruston Way Plan, Shoreline Trails Plan, and Foss Waterway Design and Development Plan as elements of the Comprehensive Plan and to replace these historic planning documents with the Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines and an update of the Public Access Alternatives Plan.

Enclosed is the “Planning Commission's Findings and Recommendations Report, May 7, 2014” that summarizes the proposed amendments, the public review process, and the Planning Commission’s deliberations. The Planning Commission believes the 2014 Annual Amendment, along with the shoreline implementation strategies carried over from the 2013 Annual Amendment, will help achieve the City’s strategic goals for a safe, clean and attractive community and a diverse, productive and sustainable economy. We respectfully request the City Council adopt the above-mentioned recommendations of the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

Sean Gaffney, Chair
Tacoma Planning Commission

Enclosure
**A. SUBJECT:**


**B. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:**

The 2014 Annual Amendment package includes the following nine applications (proposed amendments), plus a carry-over application from the 2013 Annual Amendment process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application*</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center</strong> <em>(Application #2014-01)</em></td>
<td>Designating that portion of the former ASARCO property located in the City of Tacoma (a 29-acre site) as a Mixed-Use Center and a residential target area. (A private application by Point Ruston LLC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies</strong> <em>(Application #2014-02)</em></td>
<td>Adding a policy to the Comprehensive Plan to recognize Point Defiance Park as a unique asset and a regional destination; and clarifying in the Land Use Regulatory Code potential permitting pathways that Metro Parks Tacoma could utilize, including the City’s Development Regulation Agreement (DRA) process. (A private application by Metro Parks Tacoma).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Mixed-Use Centers Code Review (MUC-Lite)</strong> <em>(Application #2014-04)</em></td>
<td>Conducting an evaluation of the existing development requirements within the Neighborhood Mixed-Use Centers, and particularly those applicable to mixed-use projects in the core of these districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Affordable Housing</strong> <em>(Application #2014-06)</em></td>
<td>Amending the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code to implement Affordable Housing incentive, bonus, and inclusionary strategies which are part of a package of initiatives recommended by the City Council’s Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Container Port Element</strong> <em>(Application #2014-07)</em></td>
<td>Creating a new element in the Comprehensive Plan that specifically addresses and provides goals and policies relative to the ‘Port Industrial Area’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element</strong> <em>(Application #2014-08)</em></td>
<td>Amending this element of the Comprehensive Plan to reaffirm the vision and goals, reflect progress and changing circumstances since its adoption, update inventories, and enhance guidance on implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Sustainability Code Amendment</strong> <em>(Application #2014-09)</em></td>
<td>Amending the Land Use Regulatory Code to encourage and incent sustainable development practices, advance City’s goals for sustainable development, and promote public health and active living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Urban Forestry Landscaping Code Update</strong> <em>(Application #2014-10)</em></td>
<td>Amending the Land Use Regulatory Code to improve trees and landscaping related regulations pertaining to development activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Plan and Code Cleanup</strong> <em>(Application #2014-11)</em></td>
<td>Amending various sections of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code to keep information current, correct minor errors, provide additional clarity, and improve administrative efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shoreline Related** Elements (Application #2013-05)

Rescinding the Thea Foss Waterway Design and Development Plan, the Ruston Way Plan, and the Shoreline Trails Plan, but carrying forward the vision and implementation strategies within the proposed Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines and an update of the Public Access Alternatives Plan.

* Two applications have been removed from the package and deferred to the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update process; they are #2014-03 Growth Strategy and Mixed-Use Centers Review and #2013-05 Land Use Designations.

** This was an application that was recommended to the City Council by the Planning Commission as part of the 2013 Annual Amendment.

C. FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. **Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations** – The Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 1993 by Ordinance No. 25360 and amended by ordinance once every year thereafter, is Tacoma’s comprehensive plan as required by the State Growth Management Act (GMA) and consists of several plan and program elements. As the City’s official statement concerning future growth and development, the Comprehensive Plan sets forth goals, policies and strategies for the health, welfare and quality of life of Tacoma’s residents. The Land Use Regulatory Code, Title 13 of the Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC), is the key regulatory mechanism that supports the Comprehensive Plan.

2. **Planning Mandates and Guidelines** – GMA 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 (adopted on April 24, 2008 and amended on May 28, 2009);
   - Transportation 2040, the action plan for transportation in the Central Puget Sound Region (adopted on May 20, 2010);
   - 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. **Receipt and Review of Applications** – Eleven applications were submitted to the Planning Commission by the deadline of August 1, 2013 for consideration. The Commission conducted an assessment of the applications in August 2013, pursuant to TMC 13.02.045.E, and approved the Assessment Report on August 21, 2013. As noted above (in the section of Summary of Proposed Amendments), two applications were removed in January 2014 from the annual amendment package. The Commission reviewed technical analyses of the remaining nine applications at its meetings on October 16, November 6 & 20, and December 4 & 18 of 2013, and January 8 & 22 and February 5 & 19 of 2014. A staff analysis report was prepared for each application, documenting how the respective proposed amendment was analyzed against the criteria as set forth in TMC 13.02.045.F. The Commission approved of the staff analysis reports individually at various stages during the review process, and on February 19, 2014, authorized the distribution of the 2014 Annual Amendment Package for public review and set March 19, 2014 as the date for a public hearing.
4. **Public Outreach Efforts** – Staff has conducted extensive outreach efforts to ensure early and continuous public participation in the amendment process. The outreach efforts ranged from providing overviews of the proposed amendments and the process and timeline to neighborhood councils and interested entities, to meeting with stakeholders and applicants to address particular issues and suggestions. The entities that staff has approached and worked with include, but are not limited to: Puyallup Tribe, Pierce Transit, Port of Tacoma, Metro Parks Tacoma, City of Ruston, Ruston Pearl Business District, State and regional agencies, Chamber of Commerce, Citizens for a Healthy Bay, Green Tacoma Partnership, Master Builders Association, South Sound Military and Communities Partnership, Foss Waterway Development Authority, Sustainable Tacoma Commission, Tacoma Housing Authority, Transportation Commission, Neighborhood Councils and Community Council, Neighborhood Business District Associations, Blue Ribbon Panel, as well as the City’s departments and offices including Community & Economic Development, Environmental Services, Legal, Public Works, Office of Sustainability and Tacoma Public Utilities.

Also, a Planning Manager’s Letter to the Community was widely distributed to various interested entities on January 9, 2014, informing the community of the status and schedule of the 2014 Annual Amendment, a summary of the applications being considered by the Planning Commission, and how to obtain more information, make inquiries or provide comments and feedback.

5. **Public Hearing Notification Process:**

   (a) The public hearing was set for March 19, 2014, and the record was kept open through March 21, 2014 to receive written comments. Staff also held an Informational Session on March 12, 2014 for citizens to learn more about the proposed amendments and ask questions.

   (b) The notice of the Public Hearing and the Informational Session was disseminated widely as described below:

   - **Public Hearing Notice** – A notice announcing the public hearing on March 19th and the informational session on March 12th was distributed to the City Council, Neighborhood Councils, business district associations, civic organizations, environmental groups, the development community, the Puyallup Tribal Nation, adjacent jurisdictions, major employers and institutions, City and State departments, the Tacoma Public Library, and other known stakeholders and interested entities.

   - **Special Notice** – The 2014 Annual Amendment includes proposed changes in the Comprehensive Plan land use designations for Point Ruston to become a Mixed-Use Center (Application #2014-01). TMC 13.02.057 requires that, for such changes, a special notice of public hearing should be mailed to all property taxpayers within, and within 400 feet of, the subject areas. It was decided to also apply the same requirement on Application #2014-02, because Point Defiance Park is a “focused geographic area.” A special notice postcard was mailed to nearly 265 property taxpayers identified from the records of the Pierce County Assessor-Treasurer.

   - **Public Notice Signs** – Also pursuant to TMC 13.02.057, public notice signs were installed in the “focused geographic areas” associated with the applications of “Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center” and “Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies”, two in Point Ruston and one in Point Defiance Park, with a total of 3 (white, corrugated) signs.

   - **Library** – The public hearing notice and the summary of the 2014 Annual Amendment were also made available for patrons’ review at all eight branches of the Tacoma Public Library.

   - **News Media** – An advertisement was placed in The News Tribune on March 10, 2014; a legal notice regarding the environmental determination was placed in the Tacoma Daily Index on March 4, 2014; a public announcement was placed on TV Tacoma and ran March 1-19, 2014; and an e-mail news release, “Tacoma News”, was issued through the City’s Media and Communications Office on March 5, 2014.
60-Day Notices – 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), the Puget Sound Regional Council (per the Plan Review Requirements and Process in VISION 2040), and Joint Base Lewis-McChord (per RCW 36.70A.530(4)). A similar notice was also sent to the City of Tacoma Attorney’s Office, requesting legal opinions on whether the City Council’s adoption of the proposed amendments might result in an unconstitutional taking of private property (per RCW 36.70A.370). The notices were sent to these entities more than 60 days prior to the Council’s scheduled action on June 3, 2014, so that their comments, if any, can be addressed in a timely manner during the Planning Commission’s public hearing process.

Website – The public hearing notice and all information associated with the 2014 Annual Amendment are posted on the Planning Services Division’s website at www.cityoftacoma.org/planning (under the link to “2014 Annual Amendment”).

Environmental Review – Pursuant to WAC 197-11 and Tacoma’s SEPA procedures, a Preliminary Determination of Environmental Nonsignificance (DNS) was issued on February 24, 2014 (SEPA File Number SEP2014-40000218532), based upon a review of an environmental checklist. The DNS and the environmental checklist were provided or made available to appropriate entities that had received the public hearing notice. Two comments were received through the comment period ending on March 21st, 2014. The first was from the Health Department who had no objections to the proposal as presented. The second was from the Department of Ecology whose comments are summarized in the attached Public Comments and Staff Responses and Suggestions Report. The DNS became final on March 28, 2014.

Public Review Document – The complete text of the proposed amendments, the associated staff analyses, the DNS and the environmental checklist, and relevant background information were compiled into the “Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code – Proposed Amendments for 2014 / Public Review Document / Prepared for Planning Commission Public Hearing, March 19, 2014” document (hereinafter referred to as the “Public Review Document”). The Public Review Document was made available for public review at the office of the Planning and Development Services Department. Its availability was also announced to appropriate entities that had received the public hearing notice.

Shoreline Related Elements – Application #2013-05 was processed as part of the Planning Commission’s 2013 Annual Amendment. The public notice and outreach efforts for the 2013 Annual Amendment have been documented and provided to the City Council as part of the Commission’s findings and recommendations submitted to the City Council on May 1, 2013.

6. Public Hearing Comments and Responses:

(a) In response to the request for review of the proposed amendments for potential takings, the City’s Attorney’s Office indicated that the proposed amendments should not cause a substantial concern over potential takings.

(b) As of the day of this report, no comment has been received from the Puget Sound Regional Council or Joint Base Lewis-McChord.

(c) The Informational Session on March 12, 2014 was attended by 8 citizens.

(d) At the public hearing on March 19, 2014, 10 people testified. By the close of the comment period on March 21, 2014, 23 letters and e-mails were received. The public comments were concerning all applications as well as the DNS and the environmental checklist, except Application #2014-04 Mixed-Use Centers Code Review.

(e) Staff prepared a Public Comments and Staff Responses and Suggestions Report, which summarized public comments and staff’s responses, and where appropriate, staff’s suggested revisions to the 2014 Annual Amendment Package as contained in the Public Review Document. The Commission reviewed the report first on April 2, 2014, concurred with most of staff’s suggested revisions, and provided additional modifications. The Commission reviewed the report again on April 16, 2014 and provided final modifications to the 2014 Annual Amendment.
In summary, the Commission determined that additional modifications be made to the 2014 Annual Amendment Package, as described below:

(i) Concerning Application #2014-01 Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center:
   - To provide assurances to the public that the affordable housing issues will be properly addressed as the City moves forward with the mixed-use center designation, a policy should be added to the Generalized Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan indicating that the Multi-Family Tax Exemption (MFTE) program will become available upon adoption of an Affordable Housing Development Agreement between the property owner and the City; and
   - Add a note to TMC 13.17 indicating that the MFTE program will become available subsequent to adoption of the Development Agreement.

(ii) Concerning Application #2014-07 Container Port Element:
   - Change "Transitional Zone" to "Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area" throughout the document to provide a better characterization of such areas.

(iii) Concerning Application #2014-08 Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element (OSHRE):
   - Clarify the Open Space System section to note that the Port of Tacoma, Tacoma Public Utilities and other public agencies also manage open space and recreation assets;
   - Modify Policy OS-GI-1 Green Neighborhoods to make the policy statement pertaining to achieving 30 percent citywide tree canopy cover by 2030 to be consistent with the Urban Forestry Policy Element of the Comprehensive Plan;
   - Update the Community Gardens section to reflect the evolving relationships between the City, Metro Parks Tacoma (MPT), and the Pierce Conservation District;
   - Update Policy OS-HA-11 Habitat Stewardship Outreach and Training to reflect ongoing progress;
   - Modify the Implementation and Funding section by adding language describing the several City departments which collaborate to achieve the objectives of the OSHRE in partnership with MPT and other public agencies;
   - Amend Policy OS-CW-2 Transfer of General Government Property to reflect that properties deemed unnecessary for their current function to be evaluated for designation as open space, and in some cases for transfer to MPT or other entities;
   - Modify Policy OS-LF-12 Scenic Views-Private Benefit to indicate that tree topping shall not be allowed on public land, and tree removal on public land for private view benefit shall not be allowed unless as part of a coordinated plan that achieves view, habitat, environmental, slope stability and other objectives;
   - Modify Policy OS-LF-13 Scenic Views-Public Benefit to indicate that significant public views are described in the Urban Forest Policy Element; and
   - Add “Tollefson Plaza Enhancements” to Appendix I – Open Space Projects.
   - Add information regarding the primary responsible City departments to the Open Space Inventory.

(iv) Concerning Application #2014-09 Sustainability Code Amendment:
   - Modify TMC 13.06.510.F.5 by adding the following requirement: “Accessible electric vehicle charging stations should be located in close proximity to the building or facility entrance and shall be connected to a barrier-free accessible route of travel. It is not necessary to designate the accessible electric vehicle charging station exclusively for the use of disabled persons”;
   - Modify TMC 13.06.510.F Table 1 to clarify that single-family housing is specifically exempted from the proposed electric vehicle requirements, as intended;
   - Modify TMC 13.06.510.F Table 1 to remove electric vehicle parking requirements for multifamily development that were proposed in the public hearing document and to
identify that no minimum electric vehicle parking requirement applies to multifamily development, due to the additional complexities and potential cost implications of providing electric vehicle charging for future tenants;

- Modify TMC 13.06.510.F Table 1 to apply a maximum number of required electric vehicle parking spaces to office uses.
- Modify TMC 13.06.510.F.1 to strongly encourage multifamily residential development to proactively plan for electric vehicle infrastructure, including consideration of electrical capacity to accommodate additional dedicated circuits and the provision of conduit from the electrical room or an electrical panel to the parking area;
- Modify TMC Table 13.06.512.D.7 to better align the requirements for specific types of park and recreation facilities with the Metro Parks Tacoma facility typologies; and
- Modify TMC 13.06.512.D to provide design and location flexibility for bicycle parking at parks and open space/natural areas.

(v) Concerning Application #2014-10 Urban Forestry Landscaping Code Update:
- Revise TMC 13.06.502.B.2.b to better define the circumstances where street trees are required in association with street and sidewalk construction;
- Amend TMC 13.06.502.C.2.e.(2) to clarify that trees under power lines shall have varieties that do not exceed 25 feet in height at 25 years of age;
- Amend TMC 13.06.502.D.2 to remove the minimum 6-inch requirement for tree retention credit and allow trees of the same size for equal credits;
- Refine TMC 13.06.502.D.6 to make the process more straightforward and an incentive tool for self-managed agencies to engage in urban forest planning, and to indicate that landscaping planted in alternative sites must be located within the City of Tacoma;
- Modify TMC 13.06.502.E to exempt Park and Open Space uses from the Overall Site Landscaping requirement, to allow alternative planting plans that meet the intent of providing a substantial vegetated buffer, and to clarify that single, two and three-family developments in association with short plats of 5-9 lots would not be exempt from landscaping requirements;
- Modify TMC 13.06.502.C.2 and 13.06.502.C.3 to allow Plant Material Selection and Installation and Maintenance minimum distances to be reduced, with staff approval, upon demonstration that healthy tree growth will be achieved and infrastructure and other conflicts will be avoided;
- Modify TMC 13.06.502.C to require native plant selection as follows: within designated Habitat Corridors – at least 50% native species; adjacent to Habitat Corridors (within 20 feet) – at least 25% native species; and allowing flexibility to follow adopted plans to address slope stability, habitat health, streetscape or area-wide plans.

(vi) Concerning Application #2014-11 Plan and Code Cleanup:
- Update TMC 13.06A.052 to add in the following Primary Pedestrian Streets (proper segments thereof) that were either designated through the recently adopted South Downtown Subarea Plan and the associated code amendments or carried over through the rezone of UCX-TD to DMU: S. Jefferson Ave., S. 25th St., E. ‘C’ St., S. ‘C’ St., Puyallup Ave., E. 25th St., E. 26th St., and E. ‘D’ St.; and
- Revise all Downtown Regional Growth Center maps contained in the following elements of the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the recent boundary adjustment, i.e., the removal of the northern half of the land area on the east side of the Thea Foss Waterway from the Regional Growth Center and its addition to the Manufacturing/Industrial Center: Growth Strategy and Development Concept, Generalized Land Use, Transportation, South Downtown Subarea Plan, and the proposed Container Port Element (Application #2014-07).
D. CONCLUSIONS:

1. Concerning Application #2014-01 Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center, the Planning Commission concludes that the designation of the Point Ruston development site as a Community Mixed-Use Center, along with the requirement for an Affordable Housing Development Agreement, will support, strengthen and accelerate redevelopment efforts and stimulate job creation and the development of high-density mixed-income housing, and will allow Point Ruston to be placed within a well-developed policy framework pertaining to the City’s comprehensive growth strategy (i.e., Mixed-Use Centers).

2. Concerning Application #2014-02 Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies, the Planning Commission concludes that the proposed amendments will establish a clear policy and regulatory framework for Metro Parks Tacoma (MPT) to utilize the Development Regulation Agreement and the associated flexible review process for large, strategic development proposals to support and enhance the public users’ experience in Point Defiance Park.

3. Concerning Application #2014-04 Mixed-Use Centers Code Review (MUC-Lite), the Planning Commission concludes that the proposed amendments are designed to improve consistency and compatibility within the development regulations and between the Comprehensive Plan, zoning classifications and development regulations, and will support further growth and development within the City’s Mixed-Use Centers.

4. Concerning Application #2014-06 Affordable Housing, the Planning Commission concludes that the proposed policy and code amendments are effectively implementing a substantial portion of initiatives recommended by the Council-appointed Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group, and through voluntary, market-based and incentive-based approaches, will help promote affordable building design practices and infill housing, thus increasing the development of affordable housing options in Tacoma.

5. Concerning Application #2014-07 Container Port Element, the Planning Commission concludes that the proposed new element of the Comprehensive Plan specifically addresses and provides goals and policies relative to the "Port Industrial Area", will establish a framework for maintaining and upgrading infrastructure and transportation facilities in the Tideflats, and will ensure that local land use decisions consider the needs of the Port of Tacoma and that the Port and freight corridors continue to function effectively alongside vibrant city waterfronts and adjacent areas.

6. Concerning Application #2014-08 Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element, the Planning Commission concludes that the proposed amendments to this element that was first developed in 2008 will reaffirm the vision and goals contained therein, reflect recent policy initiatives and implementation progress, update and improve inventories, enhance guidance on implementation, and maintain the City’s grant eligibility for park, open space and recreation facilities.

7. Concerning Application #2014-09 Sustainability Code Amendment, the Planning Commission concludes that the proposed amendments address electric vehicle parking and infrastructure, bicycle start and end of trip infrastructure, setback and height exception for exterior insulation, and low impact development, and will further advance the City’s goals for sustainable development and for the promotion of public health and active living. Relating to the recommended off-street parking requirements for electric vehicles, due to the expressed concerns about the provision of electric vehicle parking for future tenants of multifamily developments, the complexities of planning for future charging in situations where parking is deeded to individual units, and the potential cost implications for sizing transformers and electrical capacity to accommodate the future addition of electric vehicle charging stations, the Commission recommends that the City Council explore strategies to incent developers to plan for and provide electric vehicle infrastructure for new multifamily development.
Concerning Application #2014-10 Urban Forestry Landscaping Code Update, the Planning Commission concludes that the proposed amendments will improve trees and landscaping regulations applicable to development activities, with a focus on achieving such policy intents as incentives, flexibility, quality, varieties, and tree health; and will make the code more effective in achieving urban forestry objectives.

Concerning Application #2014-11 Plan and Code Cleanup, the Planning Commission concludes that the proposed clarifications and refinements to the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code will adequately address inconsistencies, correct minor errors, improve clarity, facilitate better administration of the code, and maintain the City’s grant eligibility for transportation projects.

Concerning Application #2013-05 Shoreline Related Elements, from the 2013 Annual Amendment cycle, the Planning Commission concludes that the proposal to rescind three outdated shoreline related elements of the Comprehensive Plan (the Shoreline Trails Plan, Ruston Way Plan, and Thea Foss Waterway Design and Development Plan) and adopt the Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines (TWDG) and the Public Access Alternatives Plan (PAAL) as implementing strategies for the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) should be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at this time. As a result of delays in the State Shoreline Master Program approval process these documents, and the Commission’s recommendation as part of the 2013 Annual Amendment, were initially held over until completion of the 2014 Annual Amendment process. The Public Access Alternatives Plan describes a unified network of public access trails, parks, and recreation facilities that combines and updates elements of the City’s historic public access plans, for the purpose of coordinating and guiding public and private efforts to complete the shoreline public access system. The Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines illustrate how new development can create walkable, people-oriented public and private spaces and promote the overall environmental quality and quality of life for both residents and visitors.

The Planning Commission further concludes that the 2014 Annual Amendment Package has received general support and positive feedback from the community, is consistent with the State Growth Management Act and the regional VISION 2040, will benefit the City as a whole, will not adversely affect the City’s public facilities and services, and is in the best interests of the public health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Tacoma.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code for 2014, as well as the proposed amendments pertaining to the shoreline related elements carried over from the 2013 Annual Amendment process, as described above and as set forth in the following ten sets of documents:

1. **Application #2014-01 Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center:**
   - Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   - Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan – Growth Strategy and Development Concept, and Generalized Land Use Elements
   - Exhibit B – Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code TMC 13.17

2. **Application #2014-02 Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies:**
   - Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   - Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan – Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element
   - Exhibit B – Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code TMC 13.06
3. Application #2014-04 Mixed-Use Center Code Review:
   • Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   • Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code TMC 13.06

4. Application #2014-06 Affordable Housing Policies and Regulations:
   • Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   • Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan – Housing Element
   • Exhibit B – Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code TMC 13.06 and 13.06A

5. Application #2014-07 Container Port Element:
   • Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   • Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan – Container Port Element (new)

6. Application #2014-08 Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element:
   • Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   • Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan – Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element
   • Exhibit B – Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code TMC 1.37

7. Application #2014-09 Sustainability Code Amendment:
   • Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   • Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code TMC 13.06 – Sustainability

8. Application #2014-10 Urban Forestry Landscaping Code Update:
   • Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   • Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code TMC 13.06 and 13.06A

9. Application #2014-11 Plan and Code Cleanup:
   • Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
   • Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan – Transportation, Growth Strategy and Development Concept, Generalized Land Use, South Downtown Subarea Plan, and the proposed Container Port Elements

10. Application #2013-05 Shoreline Related Elements:
    • Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
    • Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan – Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element
    • Exhibit B – Proposed Update of the Tacoma Waterfront Public Access Alternatives Plan
    • Exhibit C – Proposed Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines
Proposed Amendments

Recommended by the Planning Commission

Application #2014-01:

Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center
2014 Annual Amendment Application No. 2014-01  
Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY  
May 7, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2014-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Point Ruston, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Contact:                        | Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division  
(253) 591-5389 elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org |
| Type of Amendment:              | Comprehensive Plan and Regulatory Code Text Changes |
| Current Land Use & Zoning:      | Shoreline Designation – High Intensity; S-15 Shoreline District |
| Location & Size of Area:        | Ruston Way; 35 acres            |
| Neighborhood Council area:      | West End                        |

Planning Commission Recommendations:

This proposal would designate that portion of the former ASARCO site located in the City of Tacoma (excluding the Slag Peninsula) as a Mixed-Use Center (MUC) and Residential Target Area. The proposed Point Ruston MUC would encompass that portion of the City’s S-15 Point Ruston / Slag Peninsula Shoreline District intended for mixed-use development as part of Point Ruston (approximately 29 acres), and an additional approximately 6 acres of right-of-way and rail corridor. Point Ruston, LLC’s initial application included an additional 12 acres (parcel 8950003322) within the proposed MUC. After discussions with City Staff the applicants have removed that parcel from the proposal as it was not appropriate for mixed-use development.

The intent of establishing a MUC and residential target area at Point Ruston is to support, strengthen and accelerate redevelopment efforts and stimulate job creation and the development of high-density mixed-income housing. One of the policy tools available to designated MUCs is the City’s Multi-family Tax Exemption Program, which can provide a boost to development efforts. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan calls for MUCs to be given priority in allocating resources for infrastructure improvements. Finally, designating Point Ruston as an MUC would allow for it to be part of the ongoing discussion of the City’s growth vision and strategies, which will be a major component of the 2015 Annual Amendments.

The following is a summary of the originally proposed amendments, while details are shown in Exhibits A and B:

1. The proposal would amend the Growth Strategy and Development Concept Element of the Comprehensive Plan by adding “Point Ruston” to the list of Community Centers and revising the Growth Concept Map and the Generalized Land Use Map.
2. Revisions in the *Generalized Land Use Plan Map* would also be reflected in the corresponding maps in the *Generalized Land Use and Transportation Elements*.


The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014 and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to receive additional written comments. Public testimony was received from the applicants, and five written comments were provided concerning the proposed amendments. In summary, comments expressed general support for the MUC designation, with two issues raised as concerns. First, comments called for steps to ensure that a range of housing affordability will be provided within the MUC. Second, one commenter expressed concerns regarding consistency with previous Shoreline Permit and environmental approvals for Point Ruston. In regards to consistency issue, staff analysis is that the MUC designation has no direct bearing on the previous permit and environmental approvals and does not alter their conditions. In response to the issue of housing affordability, the Planning Commission directed staff to work with the applicants on an approach that would move the MUC designation forward while providing assurances that the issue will be addressed. Staff and the applicants have collaborated on the following proposed approach, which the Planning Commission directed be included in their recommendations:

1. Designate Point Ruston as an MUC, per the steps described above.

2. Add a policy in the Comprehensive Plan *Generalized Land Use Element* indicating that the MFTE program will become available upon adoption of an affordable housing Development Agreement between the property owner and the City Council.

3. Add a note to *TMC 13.17* indicating that the MFTE program will become available subsequent to adoption of the Development Agreement.

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the *Growth Strategy and Development Concept and Generalized Land Use Elements of the Comprehensive Plan* and *Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) Chapter 13.17 Mixed-Use Center Development* as detailed in Exhibits A and B.

**Exhibit:**

A. Proposed Amendments to the *Growth Strategy and Development Concept* and *Generalized Land Use Elements of the Comprehensive Plan*

B. Proposed Amendments to the *Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.17 Mixed-Use Center Development*
Growth Strategy and Development Concept Element – Page GD-10

Community Center

The community center is a concentration of commercial and/or institutional development that serves many nearby neighborhoods and generally includes a unique attraction that draws people from throughout the city. Some residential development may already be present, and there is a goal to have more residential development. It is directly accessible by arterials and local transit. Pedestrian accessibility is important within the center, but because of its focus on larger scale commercial development, the community center continues to provide for automobile parking, preferably within structures.

Designated Community Centers:
- Tacoma Central Plaza/Allenmore (Tacoma Central)
- S. 72nd and Pacific Avenue
- S. 72nd and Portland Avenue
- TCC/James Center
- Westgate
- Lower Portland Avenue
- S. 34th and Pacific Avenue
- S. 121st and Pacific Avenue (Outside the city within the urban growth area)
- **Point Ruston**
Multifamily Tax Incentive

Intent

In 1995, the State legislature enacted a multifamily property tax exemption and found that the incentive was needed to combat sprawl and to accommodate future population growth by encouraging residential development in cities consistent with the planning goals of the Growth Management Act. The purpose of the multifamily property tax exemption is to provide an incentive for new and rehabilitated housing in urban centers where insufficient housing is available that would make the designated centers desirable, attractive, convenient, livable places. The law defines “urban centers” as areas that are designated by the city that are compact districts that have business establishments providing a variety of goods to serve residents, adequate public facilities and a mix of uses including housing, commercial, recreation and cultural activities.

***

LU-MFTI-3 Mixed Income
Encourage the use of the multifamily tax incentive program to achieve housing for a range of incomes.

***

LU-MFTI-6 Point Ruston Housing Goals
In keeping with the City’s focus on providing affordable housing in all City neighborhoods, the Multi-Family Tax Exemption program will become available within the Point Ruston Mixed Use Center (MUC) upon the adoption of a Development Agreement that establishes the provision for such housing within the MUC. Essential elements of the Development Agreement shall include, but not be limited to, (i) establishing goals for the provision of affordable housing and a diversity of housing choices within the MUC, (i.e., range of product types, size and price points, including housing affordable to families that are at or below the Area Median Income); and, (ii) establishing a mechanism for monitoring the fulfillment of such goals (i.e., reporting requirements).
C. Designated Target Areas. The proposed boundaries of the “residential target areas” are the boundaries of the 18 mixed-use centers listed below and as indicated on the Generalized Land Use Plan and in the Comprehensive Plan legal descriptions which are incorporated herein by reference and on file in the City Clerk’s Office.

The designated target areas do not include those areas within the boundary of the University of Washington Tacoma campus facilities master plan (per RCW 84.14.060).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED-USE CENTER</th>
<th>CENTER TYPE</th>
<th>ORIGINALLY ADOPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South 56th and South Tacoma Way</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Tacoma</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor (North 26th and Proctor)</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Mall Area</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. (South 11th and MLK Jr. Way)</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln (South 38th and “G” Street)</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Avenue and Pine Street</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Central Plaza/Allenmore</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South 72nd and Pacific Avenue</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 72nd and Portland Avenue</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>November 21, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium (North 1st and Tacoma)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>January 16, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Center/TCC</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>December 11, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Portland Avenue</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>December 11, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South 34th and Pacific Avenue</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>December 11, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley (E. 34th and McKinley)</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>December 11, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrows (6th Avenue and Jackson)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>August 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The multi-family housing property tax exemptions program will become available within the Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center upon Council adoption of a Development Agreement addressing affordable housing goals.
Proposed Amendments

Recommended by the Planning Commission

Application #2014-02:

Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies
2014 Annual Amendment Application No. 2014-02
Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
May 7, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2014-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Metro Parks Tacoma, Curtis Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division (253) 591-5389 <a href="mailto:elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org">elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Amendment:</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan and Regulatory Code Text Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use Intensity:</td>
<td>Low Intensity; Shoreline – Natural and Urban Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Area Zoning:</td>
<td>R-1 Single-Family Residential District. S-4, S-5, and S-15 Shoreline Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location &amp; Size of Area:</td>
<td>Point Defiance Park; 768 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Council area:</td>
<td>West End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Amendment:</td>
<td>Amend the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan and Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) 13.06.560 Parks, recreation and open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission Recommendations:
This proposal would add recognition to the City’s Comprehensive Plan for Destination Point Defiance and for the unique role that Point Defiance Park plays as a significant citywide destination, as a preparatory step for Metro Parks Tacoma (MPT) to submit applications for City permits. The proposal would also clarify potential City permitting pathways that MPT could utilize, including the City’s Development Regulation Agreement (DRA) process. MPT’s long range plan and vision for the 768-acre park, generally referred to as Destination Point Defiance, was developed through a multi-year, broadly inclusive public process. The conceptual plan for Point Defiance Park enjoys very consistent, strong public and stakeholder support and was officially approved by the MPT Board in 2008.

The proposed amendment would improve consistency between MPT’s plans and the City’s by updating the Comprehensive Plan to reflect MPT’s Point Defiance plans. It would also improve consistency between Tacoma’s Plan and regulations, and clarify how the City’s parks and the DRA code sections work together.

The following is a summary of the proposed amendments, while details are shown in Exhibits A and B:

1. Add a new policy to the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element (OSHRE) of the Comprehensive Plan expressing support for the Destination Point Defiance and recognizing the unique role and destination function that Point Defiance Park plays. The policy would be contained in a new section of the OSHRE being proposed as part of Annual Amendment 2014-08.

2. Modify TMC 13.06.560 Parks, recreation and open space to clarify that the DRA process is available for Parks, Recreation and Open Space land uses.
The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014 and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to receive additional written comments. Public testimony was received from the applicants who expressed support for the proposed amendment.

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan and Tacoma Municipal Code 13.06.560 Parks, Recreation and Open Space as detailed in Exhibits A and B.

Exhibit:
A. Proposed Amendments to the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
B. Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.06.560.
Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element:

***

Plans for Specific Areas

**NOTE: This is a new section proposed as part of Annual Amendment 2014-08**

Over time, the City and partners will improve the capacity to achieve the goals of this Element by developing plans for specific areas. This list is intended for larger, signature parks and open space sites. It is not exhaustive, and is intended to be updated regularly. Other public agencies, in particular Metro Parks Tacoma, maintain separate project lists which should be consulted as well. The plans are available from the City Planning and Development Services Department.

Inclusion in this section is intended to convey the City Council's support for and recognition of the policy direction in these plans, and to convey that they are planning and implementation priorities. Inclusion in this section lends support to applications for City approvals such as Conditional Use Permits, Rezones and Development Regulation Agreements meeting the intent of these plans, as well as the policies of the OSHRE. This section also provides a forum for the Council to refine their policy direction on a given site, in consultation with the Planning Commission and other stakeholders.

***

OS-SP-2 Point Defiance Park

MPT’s conceptual plan for their signature 768-acre park, referred to as Destination Point Defiance, was developed over multiple years with broad public input and support. It includes commercial, educational and recreational features (including the zoo, a lodge, eating establishments, gift shops, a visitor’s center, additional pavilion buildings, a farmers market, entertainment and educational facilities, and bike and kayak rental facilities) that broaden the use of the park and expand its function as a unique destination.

While the current (2014) Land Use Intensity Designation is Low, the City recognizes the unique role that Point Defiance Park plays as a citywide and regional destination. Therefore, or until the Land Use Designation changes, alternative review processes such as Development Regulation Agreements may provide an appropriate avenue for City review of more intensive, destination-oriented features within the park.
Chapter 13.06.560 Parks, recreation and open space.

***

Section C. Review Process in Residential Zoning Districts

***

5. Development Regulation Agreements. Per the provisions of TMC 13.05.095, Development Regulation Agreements are an optional application procedure for major projects in key locations. In the case of park, recreation and open space uses, DRAs may facilitate application review by encompassing one or more features defined as Conditional in this section; and, DRAs can authorize alternative development standards and additional land uses to those authorized by the zoning district, that support and complement the plan and functions of a major park, recreation or open space location.
Application #2014-04:

Mixed-Use Centers Code Review (MUC Lite)
2014 Annual Amendment Application No. 2014-04
Mixed-Use Centers Code Review

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
May 7, 2014

Application #: 2014-04
Applicant: Planning and Development Services Department
Contact: Brian Boudet, Planning Services Division
Type of Amendment: Regulatory Code Text Changes
Current Land Use & Zoning: Mixed-Use Centers, and X-Districts
Location & Size of Area: Mixed-Use Centers
Neighborhood Council area: Citywide
Proposed Amendment: Amend the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.06 Zoning to improve development regulations applicable to, and support further growth and development within, the City’s Mixed-Use Centers.

Planning Commission Recommendations:
The City’s Comprehensive Plan calls for the Mixed-Use Centers to accommodate a significant portion of Tacoma’s allocated employment and population growth. The proposed amendments are designed to support this redevelopment and growth, while ensuring that it still supports the creation of a pedestrian-oriented, livable community and is reasonably compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.

The proposed amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.06 Zoning address the following key regulatory standards applicable to Mixed-Use Centers: first level use limitations along core pedestrian streets, yard space standards, upper floor streetfront stepbacks, upper story stepbacks, and off-street parking. The proposed amendments were derived through a focused evaluation of the existing development requirements applicable within the Neighborhood Mixed-Use Centers, and particularly those applicable to mixed-use projects in the core of these districts. The evaluation utilized prototype development scenarios as examples to help identify potential barriers that could be removed and/or alternatives that could be pursued that would support this type of development without sacrificing the long-term community vision and core principles for the Neighborhood Mixed-Use Centers.

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014 and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to receive additional written comments. No public comment was received concerning this application. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.06 Zoning, as set forth in Exhibit A.

Exhibit:
A. Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code, Chapter 13.06
The proposed code amendments include the following key elements:

**Core Pedestrian Street: first level use limitations**
- Revise the requirements for street level use on designated core pedestrian streets to allow for work/live units

**Yard Space Standards**
- Expand the exemptions from the requirement to provide on-site yard space to include:
  - Projects with a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) above 3.0
  - Projects located within ¼-mile of a park or school with recreational facilities (current exemption is at 300 feet)
  - Mixed-use projects that provide ground floor retail or restaurant uses
- Reduce the per-unit yard space requirement for multi-family and mixed-use structures from 100 square feet to 50 square feet
- Provide more flexibility in the types of features that can be provided to meet the yard space requirement (courtyards, roof decks, balconies, etc.)

**Mass Reduction: Upper Floor Streetfront Stepbacks**
- Revise the current stepback exemption for a “tower” feature to allow it to be located anywhere along the pedestrian street frontage (currently limited to just the corner of the building)
- Clarify that one per street frontage is allowed

**Residential Transition Standards: Upper Story Stepbacks**
- Revise the method for calculating this additional height restriction as follows:
  - Revise the starting location of measurement from the edge of the building to the zone transition line
  - Revise the starting height from 25 feet to 35 feet (the standard height limit for residential zones)

**Off-Street Parking**
- Revise the parking exemption for buildings within ten feet of the right-of-way on designated core pedestrian streets to include projects that provide commercial space within ten feet of the right-of-way on all designated pedestrian streets
- For extra parking provided by a project, increase the allowed maximum percentage of compact stalls from 30% to 50%
13.06.300 Mixed-Use Center Districts.

* * *

D. Land use requirements.

1. Use requirements. The following use table designates all permitted, limited, and prohibited uses in the districts listed. Use classifications not listed in this section or provided for in Section 13.06.500 are prohibited, unless permitted via Section 13.05.030.E.

2. Use table abbreviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Permitted use in this district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Conditional use in this district. Requires conditional use permit, consistent with the criteria and procedures of Section 13.06.640.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Temporary use consistent with Section 13.06.635.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prohibited use in this district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. District use table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>NCX</th>
<th>CCX</th>
<th>UCX</th>
<th>UCX-TD</th>
<th>RCX&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>HMX</th>
<th>URX</th>
<th>NRX</th>
<th>Additional Regulations&lt;sup&gt;3,4,5&lt;/sup&gt; (also see footnotes at bottom of table)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse, storage</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>* * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale or distribution</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(also see footnotes at bottom of table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Live</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Not subject to minimum density requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless communication facility</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>*Wireless communication facilities are also subject to Section 13.06.545.D.1. **Wireless communication facilities are also subject to Section 13.06.545.D.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work release center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Permitted with no more than 15 residents in the UCX and no more than 25 residents in the CIX, subject to a Conditional Use Permit and the development regulations found in Section 13.06.550.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses not prohibited by City Charter and not prohibited herein</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>* * *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**

1. The floor area of any development in RCX must be at least 75 percent residential, unless otherwise noted.
2. For uses that are restricted from locating at street-level along designated pedestrian or core pedestrian streets, the following limited exception is provided. Entrances, lobbies, management offices, and similar common facilities that provide access to and service a restricted use that is located above and/or behind street-level uses shall be allowed, as long as they occupy no more than 50 percent of 75 feet, whichever is less, of the site’s street-level frontage on the designated pedestrian or core pedestrian street. See Section 13.06.300.C. for the list of designated pedestrian and core pedestrian streets.
3. For historic structures and sites, certain uses that are otherwise prohibited may be allowed, subject to the approval of a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640.F for additional details, limitations and requirements.
4. Commercial shipping containers shall not be an allowed type of accessory building in any mixed-use zoning district. Such storage containers may be allowed as a temporary use, subject to the limitations and standards in Section 13.06.635.
5. Additional restrictions on the location of parking in mixed-use zoning districts are contained in the parking regulations – see Section 13.06.510.A.1 Table 2.
TABLE 13.06.300.G: X-District Residential Yard Space Standards

1. Duplexes and Triplexes. At least 200 square feet of yard space is required for each dwelling unit. Required yard space could include a combination of front porches, private or shared rear yards, balconies, or rooftop decks. Vehicular access areas and required walkways and buffers shall not count as yard space and front yard areas may not be counted towards this requirement, except for those yard areas set back beyond the minimum requirement.

2. Townhouse Development. At least 200 square feet of yard space is required for each townhouse. Required yard space could include a combination of private front or rear yard space, porches, balconies, rooftop decks, or shared common yard space amongst groups of townhouses. Vehicular access areas and required walkways and buffers shall not count as yard space.

3. Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Development. At least 50 square feet of yard space is required for each dwelling unit. Required setback and buffer areas, vehicular access areas and required walkways and buffers shall not count towards the yard space requirement. This required yard space can be provided through any combination of the following types of areas/features:

   a. Common Yard space. This includes landscaped courtyards or decks, front porches, community gardens with pathways, children’s play areas, or other multi-purpose recreational and/or green spaces. Requirements for common yard spaces include the following:
      (1) No dimension shall be less than fifteen feet in width (except for front porches).
      (2) Spaces shall be visible from multiple dwelling units and positioned near pedestrian activity.
      (3) Spaces shall feature paths, landscaping, seating, lighting and other pedestrian amenities to make the area more functional and enjoyable.
      (4) Individual entries shall be provided onto common yard space from adjacent ground floor residential units, where applicable.
      (5) Space should be oriented to receive direct sunlight for part of the day, facing east, west, or (preferably) south, when possible.
      (6) Common yard space shall be open to the sky, except for clear atrium roofs and shared porches.
      (7) Shared porches qualify as common yard space provided no dimension is less than eight feet.

   b. Private balconies, porches, decks, patios or yards. To qualify as yard space, such spaces shall be at least thirty five square feet, with no dimension less than four feet.

   c. Rooftop decks. To qualify, rooftop decks must meet the following standards:
      (1) Must be accessible to all dwelling units.
      (2) Must include amenities such as seating areas and landscaping.
      (3) Must feature hard surfacing appropriate to encourage residential use.
      (4) Must include lighting for residents’ safety.
      (5) No dimension shall be less than 15 feet in width.

   d. Exceptions:
      (1) Projects located within a quarter mile of a public park or public school that includes outdoor recreational facilities.
      (2) Projects with a minimum floor area ratio (FAR) of 3.
      (3) Projects that meet the ground floor retail/restaurant height bonus requirements.

G. Residential X-District Yard Space Standards. The following standards apply to all new duplex/triplex, townhouse, multi-family or mixed-use development in X-Districts. They are intended to provide yard space for residents of these developments.

1. Duplexes and Triplexes. At least 200 square feet of yard space is required for each dwelling unit. Required yard space could include a combination of front porches, private or shared rear yards, balconies, or rooftop decks. Vehicular access areas and required walkways and buffers shall not count as yard space and front yard areas may not be counted towards this requirement, except for those yard areas set back beyond the minimum requirement.

2. Townhouse Development. At least 200 square feet of yard space is required for each townhouse. Required yard space could include a combination of private front or rear yard space, porches, balconies, rooftop decks, or shared common yard space amongst groups of townhouses. Vehicular access areas and required walkways and buffers shall not count as yard space.
3. Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Development. At least 100 square feet of yard space is required for each dwelling unit. Required setback and buffer areas, vehicular access areas and required walkways and buffers shall not count towards the yard space requirement. Projects located within 300 feet of a public park or public school that includes outdoor recreational facilities are exempt from this requirement.

a. Common Yard space. Where accessible to all residents, common yard space may count for up to 100 percent of the required yard space. This includes landscaped courtyards or decks, front porches, community gardens with pathways, children’s play areas, or other multi-purpose recreational and/or green spaces. Special requirements and recommendations for common yard spaces include the following:

(1) No dimension shall be less than fifteen feet in width (except for front porches).

(2) Spaces shall be visible from multiple dwelling units and positioned near pedestrian activity.

(3) Spaces shall feature paths, landscaping, seating, lighting and other pedestrian amenities to make the area more functional and enjoyable.

(4) Individual entries shall be provided onto common yard space from adjacent ground floor residential units, where applicable.

(5) Space should be oriented to receive direct sunlight for part of the day, facing east, west, or (preferably) south, when possible.

(6) Common yard space shall be open to the sky, except for clear atrium roofs and shared porches.

(7) Shared porches qualify as common yard space provided:

(a) No dimension is less than eight feet.

(b) It is open on at least two sides.

(8) Decks and courtyards located on the top of a portion of a building may count as common open space as long as they are visible from multiple dwelling units within the building (this is distinguished from rooftop decks that are not visible from multiple units, which are addressed separately under subsection c, below).

b. Balconies. Private balconies, porches, decks, patios or yards may be used to meet up to 50 percent of the required yard space. To qualify as yard space, such spaces shall be at least thirty five square feet, with no dimension less than four feet.

c. Rooftop decks may be used to meet up to 25 percent of yard space for all multi-family uses and up to 50 percent of the required yard space in mixed-use developments, provided they:

(1) Must be accessible to all dwelling units.

(2) Must include amenities such as seating areas and landscaping.

(3) Must feature hard surfacing appropriate to encourage residential use.

(4) Must include lighting for residents’ safety.

4. All units shall have access to at least one qualifying yard space, either their own, a shared yard space, or both.
**H. X-District Mass Reduction Standards.** The following requirements apply to all development located in any X-District, unless specifically exempted.

1. Façade Articulation: The following design choices are intended to help reduce the apparent mass of structures and achieve a more human scale environment by providing physical breaks in the building volume that reduce large, flat, geometrical planes on any given building elevation.

   a. All building facades fronting directly on a Designated Pedestrian Street must include at least two of the following articulation features at intervals no greater than 40 feet to reinforce the desired pattern of small storefronts adjacent to the sidewalk. Buildings that have 60 feet or less of frontage on the designated pedestrian street are exempt from this standard.

   1. Use of window and/or entries that reinforce the pattern of small storefront spaces.
   2. Use of vertical piers to reinforce the pattern of small storefront spaces. Such piers must project at least 2 inches from the façade and extend from the ground floor to the roofline.
   3. Use of weather protection features that reinforce the pattern of small storefronts. For example, for a business that occupies three lots, use three separate awnings to break down the scale of the storefronts. Alternating colors of the awnings may be useful as well.
   4. Roofline modulation as defined in Section 13.06.501.I
   5. Change in building material or siding style.

**Example Figures**

Right: This building uses roofline modulation, window configurations, and weather protection elements to reinforce the pattern of small storefronts.

Below: Other acceptable façade articulation examples. All use window configurations to reinforce the desired small storefront pattern. Other features used in these examples to meet the standards include:

- Vertical piers
- Roofline modulation
- Different weather protection elements
### b. All non-residential facades fronting on a non-Pedestrian Designated Street or containing a pedestrian entrance must include at least three of the following articulation features at intervals no greater than 60 feet. Buildings that have 120 feet or less of frontage on the non-designated street are exempt from this standard. Buildings that employ brick as the siding material on a majority of the subject façade are required to only provide two of the articulation features instead of three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Use of window configurations and/or entries that reinforce the pattern of storefront spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Vertical building modulation. The minimum depth and width of modulation shall be 2 and 4 feet, respectively, if tied to a change in building material/siding style and/or roofline modulation as defined in Section 13.06.501.1 Otherwise, the minimum depth and width of modulation shall be 10 and 15 feet, respectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Use of separate weather protection features that reinforce the pattern of storefront spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Roofline modulation as defined in Section 13.06.501.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Horizontal modulation (upper level step-backs). To qualify for this measure, the minimum horizontal modulation shall be 5 feet and the treatment must be used in increments at no greater than the articulation interval or provided along more than 75 feet of the façade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Change in building material or siding style.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Use of vertical piers. Such piers must project at least 2 inches from the façade and extend from the ground floor to the roofline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Providing a trellis, tree, or other landscape feature within each interval. Such feature must be at least one-half the height of the building (at planting time for any landscaping element).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. All residential buildings and residential portions of mixed-use buildings shall include at least three of the following articulation features at intervals of no more than 30 feet along all facades facing a street, common open space, or common parking areas. Buildings that have 60 feet or less of frontage on the street or façade width facing the common open space or common parking area are exempt from this standard. Buildings that employ brick as the siding material on a majority of the subject façade are required to only provide two of the articulation features instead of three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Repeating distinctive window patterns at intervals less than the required interval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Vertical building modulation. Minimum depth and width of modulation is 2 feet and 4 feet, respectively, if tied to a change in building material/siding style and/or roofline modulation as defined in Section 13.06.501.1 Otherwise, minimum depth and width of modulation is 10 and 15 feet, respectively. Balconies may not be used to meet modulation option unless they are recessed or projected from the façade at least 18 inches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Horizontal modulation (upper level step-backs). To qualify for this measure, the minimum horizontal modulation shall be 5 feet and the treatment must be used in increments at no greater than the articulation interval or provided along more than 75 percent of the façade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Roofline modulation as defined in Section 13.06.501.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Vertical articulation of the façade. This refers to design treatments that provide a clear delineation of the building’s top, middle and bottom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Top features may include a sloped roofline or strong cornice line as defined in Section 13.06.501.1. For facades utilizing upper level stepbacks, the “top” design treatment may be applied to the top of the front vertical plane of the building or the top of the building where it is set back from the building’s front vertical wall (provided the top of the building is visible from the centerline of the adjacent street).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Middle features: provide consistent articulation of middle floors with windows, balconies, exterior materials, modulation, and detailing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Bottom: provide a distinctive ground floor or lower floors design that contrasts with other floors through the use of both contrasting window design/configuration and contrasting exterior materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Façade reduction elements including balconies and bay windows may project into street rights-of-way, where allowed by the Public Works Department, but not into alley rights-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Mass Reduction: Upper Floor Streetfront Stepbacks. The following standards are intended to reduce the appearance of bulk and reduce the potential for shade and shadow impacts on pedestrian streets. They apply to all development along designated pedestrian streets, unless specifically exempted.

a. 8’ minimum stepback along the streetfront façade for 4th floor and above in RCX Districts.

b. 8’ minimum horizontal stepback along for 5th floor and above in X Districts other than RCX, where the ROW width is less than 100’.

c. 8’ minimum horizon stepback for 6th floor and above in X zones other than RCX, where the ROW width is 100’ or greater.

d. Exceptions to b and c above: Portions of buildings adjacent to street corners along designated pedestrian streets can depart from this standard to incorporate distinctive street corner design elements such as a turret. Such corner building features shall be no more than 25 feet in width along both streets and other portions of the building shall meet applicable stepback standards. One distinctive design element of no more than 25 feet in width is allowed to extend vertically without these required stepbacks for each façade along a designated pedestrian street.
3. **Mass Reduction: Maximum Façade Widths.** The following standards are intended to incorporate a significant modulation of the exterior wall through all floors except the ground floor. They apply to the upper story facades of multi-story buildings that are greater than 120 feet in width. Such buildings shall include at least one of the following features to break up the massing of the building and add visual interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Provide vertical building modulation at least 20 feet deep and 30 feet wide. For multi-story buildings the modulation must extend through more than one-half of the building floors. | (1) Utilizes a change in building materials that effectively contrast from the rest of the façade.  
(2) Component is modulated vertically from the rest of the façade by an average of 6 inches.  
(3) Component is designed to provide roofline modulation per 13.06.501.1, below. |
| b. Use of a contrasting vertical modulated design component that extends through all floors above the first floor fronting on the street (upper floors that are stepped back more than 10 feet from the façade are exempt) and featuring at least two of the following: |                                                                         |
|                                                                        | (1) Utilizes a change in building materials that effectively contrast from the rest of the façade.  
(2) Component is modulated vertically from the rest of the façade by an average of 6 inches.  
(3) Component is designed to provide roofline modulation per 13.06.501.1, below. |
| c. Façade employs building walls with contrasting articulation that make it appear like two distinct buildings. To qualify for this option, these contrasting facades must employ the following: | (1) Different building materials and/or configuration of building materials.  
(2) Contrasting window design (sizes or configurations). |

Examples of facades wider than 120 feet that effectively use techniques to reduce the apparent bulk and scale of the structure. The image on the left uses street and upper level courtyards whereas the right image uses both vertical building modulation and the use of contrasting building materials and articulation.
13.06.503 Residential transition standards.
The following items are required to help ensure appropriate transitions between non-residential and/or higher intensity development and adjacent residential districts, in terms of building bulk and scale, location of activity areas for privacy and noise reduction, provision of greenspace, and visual separation:

[See table below.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Upper Story Stepback</th>
<th>1. Structures shall not intercept a 25-degree daylight plane inclined into the C, T, PDB, HM, M, or PMI District from a height of 25-35 feet above existing grade at any R-District / C, T, PDB, HM, M, or PMI District boundaries, excluding boundaries with R-4 Districts, R-5 Districts, and/or non-residential uses in any R District. For purposes of this provision, vacant land located in an R-District shall be considered a residential use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The following requirements apply in all X-Districts, where a Mixed-Use Center boundary is adjacent to single-family zoning (R-1, R-2 and R-2SRD Districts), except where the adjacent use within the single-family zone is a park, permanent open space, undevelopable steep slope, public facility or freeway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Projects abutting a single-family zone at a street, alley or rear or side property line shall not intercept a 45-degree daylight plane inclined into the X-District from a height of 25-35 feet above existing grade, measured from the inside edge of the required buffer or setback (example of abutting scenario below) within the zone transition line (example of the alley scenario below).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Projects abutting a single-family zone at a street shall not intercept a 45-degree daylight plane inclined into the X-District from a height of 35 feet above existing grade at the property line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to TMC 13.06 Zoning (May 7, 2014)
Upper Story Stepback - Abutting Scenario

Provides for a 25’ maximum height at the setback line (15’ buffer in this case) with a 45-degree daylight plan restricting height beyond that point.
**13.06.510 Off-street parking and storage areas.**

* * *

**TABLE 2 – Parking in Mixed-Use Center Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Residential Uses. Minimum 1.0 stall per unit. Commercial or Office Uses. Minimum 2.5 stalls per 1000 square feet of floor area. UCX-TD Commercial or Office Uses (including retail, service and eating and drinking establishments). Minimum 0 stalls per 1000 square feet of floor area. Other Uses. For uses not specifically listed above, the parking requirement in the Mixed-Use Center Districts shall be 70% of the parking requirement for that use identified in Table 1. See Section 13.06.510.B.2.f for use of compact stalls. For purposes of calculating parking quantity requirements, “floor area,” when used, shall not include space devoted to parking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemptions</td>
<td>No parking is required for any structure in existence upon the date the Mixed-Use Center was created within which it exists (see Section 13.17.020). New development shall provide parking as required. In NCX and CCX Districts, no parking is required for buildings located within 10 feet of the right-of-way of the designated core pedestrian streets (see Section 13.06.300.C). In NCX, CCX, and UCX Districts, no parking is required for the first 3,000 square feet of each ground-level retail or eating and drinking establishment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *

**Development Standards – Compact Stalls.**

**Compact Stalls** A maximum 30 percent of the parking spaces provided may be composed of compact stalls, except that for any parking provided in excess of the minimum quantity requirements, up to 50% of those excess stalls may be composed of compact stalls.

* * *

**13.06.700 Definitions and illustrations.**

For the purposes of this chapter, certain words and terms are defined as follows: words used in the present tense include the future, words in the singular number include the plural, and words in the plural number include the singular; the word “building” includes the word “structure”; the word “shall” is mandatory and not directory. For words that are not defined in this chapter, or that do not incorporate a definition by reference, refer to a Webster’s Dictionary published within the last ten years.

* * *

13.06.700.W

* * *

Wireless communication and wireless communication facilities. Facilities used in the transmission of information by wire, radio, optical cable, electromagnetic, or other similar means for communication, cellular phone, personal communication services, enhanced specialized mobile radio, and any other services licensed by the FCC and unlicensed wireless services. These types of facilities also include central office switching units, remote switching units, telecommunications radio relay stations, and ground level equipment structures. This classification does not include communication facilities.

Wireless communication tower. Any structure that is designed and constructed primarily for the purpose of supporting one or more antennas, including self-supporting lattice towers, guyed towers, or monopole towers. The term encompasses wireless communication facilities, radio and television transmission towers, microwave towers,
common-carrier towers, cellular telephone towers, wireless communication towers, and alternative tower structures, and the like.

**Work-live.** A non-residential use that includes a subordinate residential component consisting of at least a kitchen, bathroom and sleeping quarters.

Work release center. An alternative to imprisonment, including work and/or training release programs which are under the supervision of a court or a federal, state, or local agency. This definition excludes at-home electronic surveillance.

Works of art. Artist-produced creations of visual art, including, but not limited to, sculptures, murals, paintings, inlays, earthworks, mosaics, etc. Works of art can be both self-standing and/or integrated into the structure or its grounds. The reproduction of original works of art, mass-produced artwork, or architect-designed elements are not included. Also not included are directional signage or super graphics, maps, etc., except where an artist is employed.

* * *
Proposed Amendments
Recommended by the Planning Commission

Application #2014-06:
Affordable Housing
PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
May 7, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2014-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Planning and Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division (253) 591-5389 <a href="mailto:elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org">elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Amendment:</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan and Regulatory Code Text Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use &amp; Zoning:</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location &amp; Size of Area:</td>
<td>City-Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Council area:</td>
<td>City-Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Amendment:</td>
<td>Amend the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan and amending several sections of the Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission Recommendations:
This proposal would amend the Comprehensive Plan and Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) to implement Affordable Housing incentive, bonus, and inclusionary strategies which are part of a package of initiatives recommended by the City Council’s Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group (AHPAG). This proposal includes two distinct components. First, amendments would strengthen the policy framework calling for the creation of bonuses and incentives targeting the development of affordable housing. Second, a package of code refinements would facilitate or remove barriers to the development of housing types which are likely to be affordable due to their small size, proximity to transit, and/or the fact that they are infill development in areas with existing infrastructure. This year’s work is the second of three phases, which will be followed by consideration of additional affordable housing incentive initiatives and residential infill strategies (as part of the 2015 Annual Amendments).

The following is a summary of the proposed amendments, while details are shown in Exhibits A and B:

1. Amending the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan including changes to one policy and the addition of four new policies, as well as the addition of three proposed Legislative/Regulatory implementation steps. If adopted, the amendments would provide clear policy support for the future development of an Affordable Housing Incentives code and program. This will be considered next year as part of the 2015 Amendments.

2. Create a new parking bonus for affordable and transit-oriented housing types (TMC 13.06.510).

3. Update Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) requirements (TMC 13.06.150).

4. Update parking requirements for Group Housing and Multi-family Housing (13.06.510, and 13.06A.065).

5. Update small lot standards (TMC 13.06.100 and 13.06.145).
The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014 and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to receive additional written comments. Three written comments were received regarding the proposal during the comment period. One individual expressed support for the Small Lots proposals. Another expressed that he does not support requiring a street tree as a part of small lot standards. A letter was received from the AHPAG who expressed their support of the policy and code changes proposed and stated that they are prepared to continue the review of affordable housing recommendations next year. No changes were made by the Planning Commission to the public review draft proposal.

Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan and the Tacoma Municipal Code as detailed in Exhibits A and B.

**Exhibit:**

A. Proposed Amendments to the *Housing Element* of the *Comprehensive Plan*.

B. Proposed Amendments to the *Tacoma Municipal Code* Chapter 13.06.100, 13.06.145, 13.06.150, 13.06.501, and 13.06.510, and 13.06A.065.
Housing Element

Section III – Goal and Policies

Goal
To maintain and support vibrant and stable residential neighborhoods while promoting a variety of housing opportunities to meet the needs of all members of the community.

Policies

Housing Affordability (HA)

| H-HA-1  | Affordable Housing Supply |
| H-HA-2  | Home Ownership            |
| H-HA-3  | Public-Private Partnership|
| H-HA-4  | Special Needs Housing and Support Services |
| H-HA-5  | Affordable Housing Incentive Program |
| H-HA-6  | Regulatory Assistance to Developers of Affordable Housing |
| H-HA-7  | Inclusionary Requirements for Voluntary Residential Upzones |
| H-HA-8  | Inclusionary Requirements for City Initiated Upzones |

*Note – These amendments show all of the changes to the existing Comprehensive Plan. The sections included are only those portions of the plan that are associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that is deleted is shown in strikethrough.
Section III – Goal and Policies

Housing Choice (HC)

Provide land use incentives (e.g. density or development bonuses, lot size reductions, transfer of development rights, height or bulk bonuses increases, fee waivers, accelerated permitting, parking requirement reductions, and tax incentives) to facilitate the development of housing in designated areas, particularly within mixed-use centers.

Housing Affordability (HA)

Intent

The policy intent is to increase the amount of housing that is affordable, especially for lower income families and special needs households. The generally accepted definition of affordability is for a household to pay no more than 30 percent of its annual gross income on housing. Families that pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care. The challenge for Tacoma is that there is a mismatch between the cost of housing in the City and the incomes of Tacoma’s populations. Large portions of Tacoma’s population do not have sufficient income to afford the housing available in Tacoma’s private market at a cost of no more than 30 percent, or even 50 percent or more, of their income. Due to an aging population and other factors, this mismatch is likely to increase in the future, resulting in a significant increase in the need for additional affordable housing.

The City, through its policies and programs, is supportive of increasing the supply of housing that is affordable to its citizens. While the City recognizes the ongoing need by government and nonprofit corporations to provide housing and community support services, especially for households who pay more than 30% of their income for housing, it also recognizes the need to enlist the engine of private market rate developments to include a measure of affordable units.

As a general rule, the need for affordable housing extends along a housing continuum that extends from basic emergency shelter for the homeless to temporary transitional housing to permanent rental housing and for some households to home ownership. Each segment of this continuum requires ongoing financial support for both public agencies and individuals. In addition, there are individuals and families with special needs (e.g. disabled, frail elderly, large families, female heads-of-household) that often require additional assistance.

It is the intent of the City to: (1) recognize the housing needs of, and provide housing programs for, low income and special needs households and (2) promote housing opportunities and the reduction of isolation of these groups by improving housing and community services delivery.

Further, it is the intent of the City to apply the following principles and acknowledgments to the formulation of policies and support of programs that will increase the amount of affordable housing available to the community.

Principles and Acknowledgements

1. Affordable Housing is Vital to Important Civic Interests

The City’s welfare requires an adequate supply of well built and well managed affordable housing serving the full range of incomes appearing among its residents. An adequate supply of this housing is vital to the following important civic needs or values:

- The City’s prosperity, economic development and growth of employment opportunities;
- The appropriate management of the City’s projected population growth and transportation needs;
• The City’s fulfillment of its legal obligations under the Growth Management Act to make “adequate provisions for existing and projected [housing] needs of all economic segments of the community” and to comply with the related directives of the Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies.

• The survival of green spaces throughout the City and Pierce County;

• The success of the City’s schools;

• The effectiveness of the City’s emergency services;

• The City’s ability to continue its accommodation of a population that is increasingly diverse by income, race, ethnicity, ability, disability and age;

• The City’s ability to accommodate a population that, in the aggregate, is getting older; and

• The City’s values of social justice.

2. Affordable Housing is Attractive, Innovative and Well Managed

Affordable housing developments by nonprofit developers, public and private, in the City, region and nation have been among the most attractively designed, most environmentally innovative and best managed in the market place.

3. The City Needs to Enlist the Engine of Private Development

Nonprofit developments of affordable housing will never likely be adequate to meet the City’s need. The City also needs a companion strategy to enlist the engine of private market rate developments to include a measure of affordable units. These strategies also provide the added benefit of economic and demographic integration.

4. Affordable Housing Developments Spur Other Investments

Affordable housing developments have spurred the revitalization of neighborhoods, encouraging both public and private investment, helping the City attain its desired density, and furthering a neighborhood’s economic development.

5. The City Should Welcome Affordable Housing Developments

Affordable housing is an asset to be encouraged and not a detriment to be tolerated and controlled.

6. Every City Neighborhood Needs Affordable Housing Developments

The City should promote the development of affordable housing in every City neighborhood.

7. Affordable Housing as Innovative Design

In seeking the appropriate balance, the City should not have to compromise important neighborhood design standards in order to promote affordable housing. Instead proper design should allow affordable housing to show the way for all developments serving all incomes toward a greener, more sustainable urban future that accommodates the appropriate density that the City’s planning documents anticipate to be necessary for the City’s projected population allocations.

8. Affordable Housing as a High City Priority amid Competing Interests

In a complex community like Tacoma, interests and policies often clash. Good governance is the effort to balance them appropriately. In doing so, the City should give a very high priority to the promotion of affordable housing development.

Policies

H-HA-1 Affordable Housing Supply
Support both public and private sector development and preservation of affordable housing (e.g. Section 8, LIHTC) especially for lower income and special need households.

H-HA-2 Home Ownership
Facilitate home ownership (both single-family homes and condominiums) for all segments of the community, including lower income households.
H-HA-3 Public-Private Partnership
Work in partnership with for-profit and non-profit housing developers to facilitate the provision of new permanent affordable rental and owner housing.

H-HA-4 Special Needs Housing/ Support Services
Encourage and support emergency and transitional housing as well as needed support services for persons with special needs (e.g. frailty, family size and disability).

H-HA-5 Affordable Housing Incentive Program
Offer incentives to for-profit and non-profit developers of new construction and rehabilitation of pre-existing housing so they include units affordable to a range of incomes. The incentives could include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- density bonuses;
- lot size reductions;
- height or bulk bonuses;
- fee waivers;
- accelerated permitting; and
- parking requirement reductions.

H-HA-6 Regulatory Assistance to Developers of Affordable Housing
Develop City capacity to support affordable housing development, through such measures as developing permit-ready residential plan sets, fee waivers, and designating staff to manage permit review process.

H-HA-7 Inclusionary Requirements for Voluntary Residential Upzones
Develop code provisions to condition rezone proposals that would permit a higher residential density to include at least 10% affordable units in the market rate mix.

H-HA-8 Inclusionary Requirements for City initiated Residential Upzones
Consider an approach that would condition City-initiated residential upzones that would permit a higher residential density to include at least 10% affordable units in the market rate mix.

---

Section IV – Recommended Actions to Implement Housing Policies

The overall housing goal and policies will be implemented by a combination of financial resources and local regulations which must be carefully coordinated with the Generalized Land Use Element to ensure that sufficient land is provided for all community uses. City staff along with the Planning Commission work closely to address the land use requirements. Likewise, three key organizations involved in providing affordable housing include the City of Tacoma, Tacoma Housing Authority (THA) and Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (TCRA). These three organizations work closely with the other groups to coordinate available public (e.g. federal Housing and Urban Development) and private financial resources.

The City’s housing goal and policies will be implemented through a combination of the following actions classified as legislative or regulatory, financial, administrative, and planning.

Legislative/Regulatory

This set of actions involves support or initiating enactment of and/or changes to state and federal laws and regulations as well as local ordinances, codes and standards to accomplish desired housing objectives.

1. **ADU Amendments** – Revise existing ADU standards to: (1) allow such units in detached buildings, (2) increase the ADU size; (3) reduce parking in unique situations, and (4) establish design requirements.

2. **Minimum Lot Size** – Reduce minimum lot standards in single family residential districts to support new infill housing subject to consistency with the comprehensive plan including the Neighborhood Element. Allow further reduction of the requirements subject to design and development standards.

3. **Section 8 Authorization** – Provide political support to continue funding the federal Section 8 rental subsidy program.

4. **Manufactured Housing** – Revise land use and building code regulations to permit new
manufactured housing in all residential zones so long as the housing is in compliance with all applicable codes.

5. **Residential Zoning Code Update** – Update the residential section of the Land Use Regulatory Code to reflect housing and residential needs and conditions.

6. **Affordable Housing Incentive Program** – Develop an affordable housing incentive program and supporting code provisions.

7. **Inclusionary rezones** – develop code provisions to include 10% affordable housing as part of residential upzones, and consider similar provisions for City initiated rezones.

8. **Area-wide Environmental Review** – Pursue SEPA programmatic EISs for specific areas of the City that need housing investment and revitalization to eliminate the need for projects in those areas that conform to the area wide EIS and associated regulations to conduct their own environmental review.
These proposed amendments include modifications to the following Sections of the Land Use Regulatory Code (TMC Title 13):

**Chapter 13.06 - Zoning**
- 13.06.100 – Residential Districts
- 13.06.145 – Small-lot single-family residential development
- 13.06.150 – Accessory Dwelling Units
- 13.06.501 – Building design Standards
- 13.06.510 – Off-Street Parking and Storage Areas

**Chapter 13.06A – Downtown**
- 13.06A.065 – Parking Standards

Note: These amendments show proposed changes to existing Land Use regulations. The sections included are only those portions of the code that are associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that has been deleted is shown as strikethrough.
Chapter 13.06
ZONING

13.06.100 Residential Districts.
The 100 series will contain regulations for all residential classifications, including the following:

- R-1 Single-Family Dwelling District
- R-2 Single-Family Dwelling District
- R-2SRD Residential Special Review District
- HMR-SRD Historic Mixed Residential Special Review District
- R-3 Two-Family Dwelling District
- R-4 Multiple-Family Dwelling District
- R-4-L Low-Density Multiple-Family Dwelling District
- R-5 Multiple-Family Dwelling District
- PRD Planned Residential Development District (see Section 13.06.140)

A. District purposes. The specific purposes of the Residential Districts are to:

1. Implement the goals and policies of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
2. Implement the Growth Management Act’s goals and county-wide and multi-county planning policies.
3. Provide a fair and equitable distribution of a variety of housing types and living areas.
4. Protect and enhance established neighborhoods, and ensure that new development is in harmony with neighborhood scale and character.
5. Provide for predictability in expectations for development projects.
6. Allow for creative designs while ensuring desired community design objectives are met.
7. Strengthen the viability of residential areas by eliminating incompatible land uses, protecting natural physical features, promoting quality design, and encouraging repair and rehabilitation of existing residential structures.
8. Allow for the enhancement of residential neighborhoods with parks, open space, schools, religious institutions and other uses as deemed compatible with the overall residential character.

** C. Land use requirements.
**

3. Use table abbreviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Permitted use in this district.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Temporary Uses allowed in this district subject to specified provisions and consistent with the criteria and procedures of Section 13.06.635.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Conditional use in this district. Requires conditional use permit, consistent with the criteria and procedures of Section 13.06.640.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prohibited use in this district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. District use table. (see next page for table)

---

Annual Amendment Application #2014-06
Exhibit B – Proposed Amendments to the Land Use Regulatory Code (May 7, 2014)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-2SRD</th>
<th>HMR-SRD</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4</th>
<th>R-4L</th>
<th>R-5</th>
<th>Additional Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, single-family detached</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No lot shall contain more than one dwelling unless each dwelling complies with use regulations, height regulations, area regulations, and parking regulations of the district. In the R-2SRD and HMR-SRD districts, two-family dwellings are permitted if lawfully in existence at the time of reclassification to R-2SRD/HMR-SRD or only upon issuance of a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, two-family</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P/CU</td>
<td>P/CU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>In the R-2SRD and HMR-SRD districts, three-family dwellings are permitted if lawfully in existence at the time of reclassification to R-2SRD or HMR-SRD. New three-family dwellings are permitted only upon issuance of a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640. For R-3, three-family dwellings are permitted, provided existing single- or two-family dwellings shall not be enlarged, altered, or occupied as a three-family dwelling unless the entire building is made to comply with all zoning standards applicable to new buildings. And, further provided such enlargement, extension, or alteration is made to conform to the height, area, and parking regulations of this district. Subject to additional requirements contained in Section 13.06.501. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, three-family</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P/CU</td>
<td>P/CU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>In the R-2SRD and HMR-SRD districts, multiple-family dwellings are permitted only upon issuance of a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640. Subject to additional requirements contained in Section 13.06.501. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, multiple-family</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Subject to additional requirements contained in Section 13.06.150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, townhouse</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Subject to additional requirements contained in Section 13.06.100.G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, accessory (ADU)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>In the R-2SRD and HMR-SRD districts, detached ADUs are prohibited while attached ADUs are permitted. Subject to additional requirements contained in 13.06.150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table D. Lot size and building envelope standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Lot Area (in square feet, unless otherwise noted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>R-2SRD</td>
<td>HMR-SRD</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>R-4-L</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single-family detached dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Lots</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lots</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two-family dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three-family dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple-family dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse dwellings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home/trailer court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-existing lots</td>
<td>A lot which was a single unified parcel of land as indicated by the records of the Pierce County Auditor as of May 18, 1953 or a lot which was configured legally to conform to the applicable requirements but which became nonconforming as a result of subsequent changes to this chapter or other official action by the City, and which has been maintained in that configuration since, having an average width, frontage, or area that is smaller than the applicable minimum requirements may be occupied by a single-family dwelling; provided all other applicable requirements are complied with, including required setbacks, yards and design standards (see Sections 13.06.145 and 13.06.630).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Single-family Small Lots—Exceptions to Standard Minimum Lot Area Requirements**

Reductions to minimum detached single-family dwelling lot area requirements, as shown above, may be allowed pursuant to Section 13.06.145. Single-family Small lot development must be oriented such that the lot frontage and the front façade of the house face the street. Small lot exceptions are not applicable to pipestem lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Measurements (in feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Average Lot Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 16 for townhouse dwellings
- 32 for two-family dwellings
### Minimum Lot Frontage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-2SRD</th>
<th>HMR-SRD</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4-L</th>
<th>R-4</th>
<th>R-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum lot frontage requirement does not apply to townhouse dwellings. Pipestem lots which only serve one single-family dwelling are not required to meet the minimum lot frontage requirements, provided the access easement or lot extension to such pipestem lot has a minimum width of 10 feet.

### Small Lots – Exceptions to Minimum Average Lot Width

Reductions to minimum lot width, as shown above, may be allowed pursuant to Section 13.06.145. Small lot exceptions are not applicable to pipestem lots.

### Lot Coverage (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum lot coverage</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Main Buildings**

|     | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 60 | 150 |

**Accessory Buildings**

|     | 15 feet |

### Max. Height Limits (in feet)

- Main Buildings: 35 feet

- Accessory Buildings: 15 feet

- Exceptions: Buildings within a View Sensitive Overlay district are subject to the additional height restrictions contained in 13.06.555. Certain specified uses and structures are allowed to extend above height limits, per Section 13.06.602.

- Single-family Small Lot development on lots with an average width between 40 and 50 feet: Maximum height is 30 feet.

- Single-family Small Lot development on lots with an average width of less than 40 feet: Maximum height is 25 feet.

***
13.06.145 Small-lot single-family residential development.

A. Purpose. These regulations are intended to supplement and amend the regulations pertaining to single-family detached residential development by providing criteria for small-lot single-family detached development in the R-1, R-2, R-2SRD, HMR-SRD, R-3, R-4, R-4-L and R-5 Districts. These regulations are intended primarily to promote residential infill development within the City to be consistent with the mandate of the State Growth Management Act and the City’s Comprehensive Plan, to encourage growth within urban areas, and to minimize sprawl. These provisions are designed to provide a mechanism to create new lots and develop existing lots that have a smaller area and/or width than the standard lot size requirements in the R Districts. However, in allowing for the creation of and development on these smaller lots, additional design standards are applied to better ensure that new single-family development on such lots is compatible with the desired character of the City’s residential areas.

B. Lot size standards.

1. New Small Lots that are are up to 10% smaller than the applicable standard minimum lot dimensions size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D. shall be allowed, without variance, in the R-1, R-2, R-2SRD, HMR-SRD, R-3, R-4, R-4-L and R-5 Districts, subject to the following Small Lot standards of that section, and provided that all new dwellings meet the design standards in Section 13.06.145.E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Lot Area (in square feet)</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-2SRD</th>
<th>HMR-SRD</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4</th>
<th>R-4-L</th>
<th>R-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Lot Measurements (in feet)</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-2SRD</th>
<th>HMR-SRD</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4</th>
<th>R-4-L</th>
<th>R-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Average Lot Width</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Frontage</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. New lots that are more than 10% smaller than the applicable Small Lot minimum lot size and/or width dimensions requirements in Section 13.06.100.D. shall only be allowed with approval of a variance (see Section 13.06.645), and provided that all new dwellings meet the design standards in Section 13.06.145.E and F.

3. New small lot development must be oriented such that the lot frontage and the front façade of the house face the street.

4. The provisions of this section are not applicable to pipestem lots, which are required to meet the applicable Standard Lot dimensions specified in Section 13.06.100.D. and any other applicable provisions.

C. Building envelope standards. New single-family detached dwellings on small lots shall be subject to the standard building envelope requirements for single-family dwellings in the applicable zoning district (see Section 13.06.100.D).

D. Design standards - Applicability.

1. New single-family dwellings on new lots that are up to 10% smaller than applicable standard minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D (for example, 10% is 4,500 square feet and 45 feet average width in most zones) shall be subject to the design requirements found in Section 13.06.145.E.

2. New single-family dwellings on new lots that are more than 10% smaller than applicable standard minimum lot size and/or width requirements (where greater reductions are permitted, or a variance has been approved) shall be subject to the design requirements found in Sections 13.06.145.E and 13.06.145.F.

3. New single-family dwellings on pre-existing lots that are smaller than applicable standard minimum lot size and/or width requirements shall be subject to the design requirements found in Section 13.06.145.E.
E. Design Standards – Level 1. The following design standards shall be met for all new single-family dwellings on new Small Lots that are up to 10% smaller, than the applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D, and on all pre-existing lots that are smaller than the current, applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D:

1. Clear building entries. Dwellings shall provide a clearly defined building entrance that faces the street and provide weather protection that is at least 4 feet deep along the width of the building entry. A porch may serve to comply with this provision.

2. Garages:
   a. The garage shall be located in the rear with rear access if suitable access is available, such as abutting right-of-way that is or can be practicably developed.
   b. Where vehicular access is not available from an alley or side street, garages or carports shall be setback at least 5 feet behind the front facade of the house or the front of a covered porch (where the porch is at least 48 square feet and contains no dimension less than 6 feet). In addition, vehicular doors and carports (measurement based on width of canopy) shall not occupy more than 50% of the width of the front facade.

3. Façade transparency. At least 15% of any façade (excluding exposed foundations and unfinished attic space) facing a street shall be transparent. The façade shall include all vertical surfaces of the façade of the dwelling.

4. Rooflines. For houses with peaked roofs, primary roofline(s) shall be oriented towards the front of the lot, with the tallest ridgelines running perpendicular to the street or front property line to minimize shade and shadow impacts to adjacent properties. Exceptions to this standard are allowed for projects involving multiple, adjacent single-family dwellings on small lots where alternating roofline orientation is being used to meet the Housing Style Variety requirement in Subsection 7, below, or for lots that measure less than 80 feet in depth.

5. Driveways.
   a. The maximum width of driveway approaches shall be 20 feet.
   b. Driveway approach widths for lots less than 45 feet wide shall be no greater than 14 feet.
   c. In no case shall a driveway approach occupy more than 50% of any lot frontage.
6. Functional yard space. All lots shall provide at least one contiguous yard space equivalent to at least 10% of the lot size. (See examples below) This usable yard space shall:

a. Feature minimum dimensions of 15 feet on all sides, except for lots that are less than 3,500 SF, where the minimum dimensions shall be no less than 12 feet.

b. Not include alleys or driveway space

c. Not be located within the **required** front yard

7. Housing style variety. Duplicative front façade elevations adjacent to each other are prohibited. In order to qualify as a different façade elevation, dwellings shall have different roofline configurations and different entry/porch designs. Simple reverse configurations of the same façade elevation on adjacent lots are not sufficient to meet this requirement. In addition, a minimum of two of the following alternatives shall be utilized:

a. Different window opening locations and designs,

b. One and two-story dwellings,
c. Different exterior finish materials and finishes, or
d. Different garage location, configuration and design.

Example Layouts:
These single-family dwellings employ different rooflines, material treatments, porch design, windows, and details to add visual interest and differentiate the dwellings from each other.

8. Prohibited materials. Plywood and other similar sheet siding materials, such as T1-11 siding, shall not be used for front facades and facades facing streets, except that board and batten siding shall be allowed for façade variation up to 40 percent of the front façade facing the street.

9. Street tree. One street tree shall be installed per small lot, per the provisions of TMC 13.06.502.

F. Design Requirements – Level 2. In addition to meeting all the design requirements listed in subsection E, above, all new single-family dwellings on new lots that are more than 10% smaller than the applicable standard minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D (for which a lot size variance is required where greater reductions are permitted, or a variance has been approved), shall meet the following design standards:

1. Architectural details. At least three of the following architectural details shall be incorporated into the street-facing façades of the dwelling:
a. Decorative porch or entry design, including decorative columns or railings,
b. Bay windows or balconies,
c. Decorative molding / framing details around all front facade windows and doors,
d. Decorative door design including transom and/or side lights or other distinctive feature,
e. Decorative roofline elements, such as brackets, multiple dormers, and chimneys,
f. Decorative building materials, including decorative masonry, shingle, brick, tile, stone, or other materials with
decorative or textural qualities,
g. Landscaped trellises or other decorative elements that incorporate landscaping near the building entry, or
h. Other decorative façade elements or details that meet the intent of the criteria
2. At least one of the following must be provided:
a. Dwelling(s) shall meet *Built Green* or other equivalent environmental certification for new construction, or
b. Dwelling(s) shall include a porch with a minimum area of 60 square feet and no dimension less than 6 feet.
13.06.150 Accessory dwelling units.

A. Intent. Accessory dwelling units (hereinafter referred to as “ADUs”) are intended to:

1. Provide homeowners with a means of providing for companionship and security.
2. Add affordable units to the existing housing supply.
3. Make housing units within the City available to moderate income people.
4. Provide an increased choice of housing that responds to changing needs, lifestyles (e.g., young families, retired), and modern development technology.
5. Protect neighborhood stability, property values, and the single-family residential appearance by ensuring that ADUs are installed in a compatible manner under the conditions of this section.
6. Increase density in order to better utilize existing infrastructure and community resources and to support public transit and neighborhood retail and commercial services.

B. Procedures. Any property owner seeking to establish an ADU in the City of Tacoma shall apply for approval in accordance with the following procedures:

1. Application. Prior to installation of an ADU, the property owner shall apply for an ADU permit with Planning and Development Services. A complete application shall include a properly completed application form, floor and structural plans for modification, and fees as prescribed in subsection B.2 below, and an affidavit of owner occupancy as prescribed in subsection B.3 below.

2. Fees. Fees shall be required in accordance with Section 2.09.020. Upon sale of the property, a new owner shall be required to sign a new affidavit and to register the ADU, paying the applicable fee in accordance with Section 2.09.020.

3. Affidavit. The property owner shall sign an affidavit before a notary public affirming that the owner occupies either the main building or the ADU, and agrees to all requirements provided in subsection C.

4. Notice on title. The owner of any property containing an ADU shall record with the Pierce County Auditor a notice on title of the ADU. Such notice shall be in a form as specified by Planning and Development Services, and shall include as a minimum: (a) the legal description of the property which has been permitted for the ADU; (b) affirmation that the owner shall occupy either the main building or the ADU, and agrees to all requirements provided in subsection C.; and (bc) the conditions necessary to apply the restrictions and limitations contained in this section. The property owner shall submit proof that the notice on title has been recorded prior to issuance of an ADU permit by Planning and Development Services. The notice on title shall run with the land as long as the ADU is maintained on the property. The property owner may, at any time, apply to Planning and Development Services for a termination of the notice on title. Such termination shall be granted upon proof that the ADU no longer exists on the property.

5. Permit. Upon receipt of a complete application, application fees, a notarized affidavit, proof of recorded notice on title, and approval of any necessary building or other construction permits, an ADU permit shall be issued.

6. Inspection. The City shall inspect the property to confirm that minimum and maximum size limits, required parking and design standards, and all applicable building, health, safety, energy, and electrical code standards are met.

7. Violations. A violation of this section regarding provision of ownership shall be governed by subsection C.8, and a violation of provision of legalization of nonconforming ADUs shall be governed by subsection C.14. Violations of any other provisions shall be governed by Section 13.05.100.

C. Requirements. The creation of an ADU shall be subject to the following requirements, which shall not be subject to variance.

1. Number. One ADU shall be allowed per residential lot as a subordinate use in conjunction with any new or existing single-family detached dwelling in the City of Tacoma. The lot must meet the standard minimum lot size requirement for a single-family detached dwelling in the applicable zoning district (for example, in the R-2 zoning district a single-family lot must be at least 5,000 square feet to be eligible to have an ADU).
2. Occupancy. The maximum number of occupants in an ADU shall be 4 persons. Maximum occupancy may be further limited by the Minimum Building and Structures Code in Title 2.

3. Location. The ADU shall be permitted as a second dwelling unit added to or created within the main building or, when allowed, permitted as a detached unit preferably located in the rear yard and/or adjacent to alleys. A detached ADU shall not be located in front of the main building or in the side yard setback area.

4. Composition. The ADU shall include facilities for cooking, living, sanitation, and sleeping.

5. Size. The ADU, excluding any garage area and other non-living areas, such as workshops or greenhouses, shall not exceed 40 percent of the total square footage of the main building and the ADU combined, after modification or construction. In addition, the maximum square footage of a detached ADU shall not exceed 10% of the square footage of the lot. An ADU shall not contain less than 300 square feet or more than 1,000 square feet.

6. Height. The maximum height limit for detached ADUs shall be the same as for other detached accessory structures (see Section 13.06.100.D), provided that two-story structures, where a detached ADU is located on the second floor, may be allowed up to 25 feet in height with the approval of a conditional use permit.

7. Setbacks. Detached ADUs shall be setback a minimum of 5 feet from the side and rear property lines, except when the detached ADU abuts an alley where no setback along the alley shall be required.

48. Ownership. The property owner (i.e., title holder or contract purchaser) must maintain his or her occupancy in the main building or the ADU. Owners shall sign an affidavit or record a notice on title which attests to their occupancy and attests that, at no time, shall they receive rent for the owner-occupied unit. Falsely attesting owner-residency shall be a misdemeanor subject to a fine not to exceed $5,000, including all statutory costs, assessments, and fees. In addition, ADUs shall not be subdivided or otherwise segregated in ownership from the main building.

9. Design. Attached ADUs. An attached ADU shall be designed to match the architectural design, style, appearance, and character of the main building as a single-family residence. If an attached ADU extends beyond the current footprint or existing height of the main building, such an addition must be consistent with the existing facade, roof pitch, siding, and windows. Only one entrance for the main building is permitted to be located in the front facade of the dwelling. If a separate outside entrance is necessary for an attached ADU, it must be located either off the rear or side of the main building. Such entrance must not be visible from the same view of the building which encompasses the main entrance to the building and must provide a measure of visual privacy. For units with a separate exterior entrance, a pedestrian walkway, which shall be at least 4 feet wide and composed of materials that are distinct from any adjacent vehicle driving or parking surfaces, shall be provided between the detached ADU and the nearest public sidewalk, or where no sidewalk exists, the nearest public street right-of-way.

10. Design. Detached ADUs. A detached ADU shall be designed to match the architectural design, style, appearance, and character of the main building by utilizing complimentary colors and finish materials, window styles, and a roof design similar to the main building. The entrance door to a detached ADU shall not face the same property line as the entrance door to the main building except when the entrance door to the ADU is located behind the rear wall of the main building. A pedestrian walkway, which shall be at least 4 feet wide and composed of materials that are distinct from any adjacent vehicle driving or parking surfaces, shall be provided between the detached ADU and the nearest public sidewalk, or where no sidewalk exists, the nearest public street right-of-way.

511. Parking. No additional off-street parking space is required for the ADU, in addition to the off-street parking required for the main building, pursuant to Section 13.06.510. If additional ADU parking is provided, such parking shall be located in the rear portion of the lot and shall not be accessed from the front if suitable access to the rear is available, such as an abutting right-of-way that is or can practicably be developed. If access is not practicably available to the rear yard, subject to determination by the City Engineer, then vehicular access to the front may be developed subject to the limitations in Section 13.06.510.A.6.

612. Home occupations. Home occupations shall be allowed, subject to existing regulations, in either the ADU or the main building, but not both. However, if both the main building and the ADU contain home occupations, only one of the two is permitted to receive customers on the premises.

13. Legalization of Nonconforming ADUs. Nonconforming ADUs existing prior to the enactment of these requirements may be found to be legal if the property owner applied for an ADU permit prior to December 31, 1995, and brings the unit up to Minimum Housing Code standards. After January 1, 1996, owners of illegal ADUs shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, subject to a fine not to exceed $1,000, including all statutory
costs, assessments, and fees, plus $75 per day after notice of the violation has been made. All owners of illegal ADUs shall also be required to either legalize the unit or remove it.

D. Bulk, Location and Design Requirements. The creation of an ADU shall be subject to the following requirements.

1. The lot must meet the standard minimum lot size requirement for single-family detached dwellings in the applicable zoning district (for example, in the R-2 zoning district a single-family lot must be at least 5,000 square feet, or 4,500 with Small Lot Design Standards, to be eligible to have an ADU). Attached ADUs that do not increase the building envelope of the existing structure are exempt from this requirement.

2. Size. The ADU, excluding any garage area and other non-living areas, such as workshops or greenhouses, shall not exceed 40 percent of the total square footage of the main building and the ADU combined, after modification or construction. An ADU shall not contain less than 200 square feet or more than 1,000 square feet. In addition, detached ADUs shall meet the standards of 13.06.100.F. Accessory building standards.

3. Height. The maximum height limit for detached ADUs shall be the same as for other detached accessory structures (see Section 13.06.100.D). Alternatively, two-story detached ADUs may be allowed up to 25 feet in height provided the following: The structure shall not intercept a 45-degree daylight plane inclined into the ADU site from a height of 15 feet above existing grade, measured from the required 5 foot setback line; and, second story windows facing abutting properties, and within 10 feet of the property line, shall be constructed in a manner to prevent direct views into the neighboring property, through such methods as clerestory windows, or semi-translucent glass.

4. Location. The ADU shall be permitted as a second dwelling unit added to or created within the main building or, when allowed, permitted as a detached structure located in the rear yard.

5. Setbacks. Detached ADUs shall be setback a minimum of 5 feet from the side and rear property lines, excepting that no setback from the alley shall be required.

6. Design - Attached ADUs. An attached ADU shall be designed to maintain the architectural design, style, appearance, and character of the main building as a single-family residence. If an attached ADU extends beyond the current footprint or existing height of the main building, such an addition must be consistent with the existing facade, roof pitch, siding, and windows. Only one entrance is permitted to be located in the front facade of the dwelling. If a separate outside entrance is necessary for an attached ADU, it must be located either off the rear or side of the main building. Such entrance must not be visible from the same view of the building which encompasses the main entrance to the building and must provide a measure of visual privacy.

7. Design - Detached ADUs. A detached ADU shall be designed to complement the architectural design, style, appearance, and character of the main building by utilizing complementary colors and finish materials, window styles, and roof design to the main building. The entrance door to a detached ADU shall not face the same property line as the entrance door to the main building except when the entrance door to the ADU is located behind the rear wall of the main building.

8. Walkways. For ADUs with a separate exterior entrance, a pedestrian walkway shall be provided between the ADU and the nearest public sidewalk, or where no sidewalk exists, the nearest public street right-of-way. The walkway shall be at least 4 feet wide and composed of materials that are distinct from any adjacent vehicle driving or parking surfaces. The walkway may function as a shared pedestrian/vehicle space provided that it is constructed of distinct materials, is located along an exterior edge of a driving surface, and vehicles are not permitted to park on the walkway.

* * *
N. X-District Single, Two, and Three-Family Dwelling Standards. The following requirements apply to all single, two, and three-family dwellings in X-Districts, and to all two and three-family dwellings in all districts. They are intended to emphasize pedestrian access, compatibility with residential neighborhoods, building orientation to the street, and to minimize impacts of vehicular access.

1. Covered entries are required for each common entry or individual dwelling unit entry with minimum dimensions of 4 feet by 6 feet.

2. Windows on the street. At least 15 percent of the street-facing facades (all vertical surfaces facing the street) shall be comprised of transparent windows and/or doors. Rough openings are used to calculate this requirement.

3. Garage design standards.
   a. Vehicular access and garages for all units shall be placed off of the alley, where suitable access, such as an abutting right-of-way that is or can be developed, is available.
   b. For garages that include vehicular doors facing the front property line, the building or portion of the building with such doors shall be setback at least 20 feet from the property line or private road easement.
   c. The garage face or side wall shall occupy no more than 50 percent of the length of a ground-level facade facing a street.
   d. Where the garage faces the side, but is visible from the frontage, the garage shall incorporate a window on the front-facing facade so that it appears to be a habitable portion of the building. The window size and design must be compatible with the windows on habitable portions of the dwelling.
   e. Driveway approaches shall also be consistent with the standards in Section 13.06.510.

4. Corner duplexes. Duplexes located on corner lots shall be designed with pedestrian entries located on opposite street frontages so that the structure appears to be a single-family dwelling from each street. Where no alley is available for vehicular access, separate driveways for each unit may be placed on opposite streets.

5. Building design, duplexes and triplexes. Duplexes and triplexes shall be articulated to either look like two or three distinct dwelling units from the street or to look like one single-family dwelling. Specifically:
   a. Buildings articulated to look like distinct dwelling units shall include individual covered entries plus one of the following:
      (1) Roofline modulation consistent with Section 13.06.501.I.1 to distinguish one unit from another (or the appearance of separate units) as viewed from the street; or
      (2) Vertical building modulation to help distinguish between the different units in the building. The minimum depth and width of modulation shall be 2 and 4 feet, respectively, if tied to a change in building material/siding style. Otherwise, the minimum depth and width of modulation shall be 10 and 15 feet, respectively.
   b. Buildings designed to look like one large single-family dwelling shall feature only one entrance visible from the street. This could be a common entrance for all units, or the entrances for additional units could be provided at the side or rear of the building.
6. Building design, single-family detached. Single-family detached dwellings shall not use front facades that are duplicative with adjacent single-family detached dwellings. In order to qualify as a different façade elevation, dwellings shall have different roofline configurations and different entry/porch designs. Simple reverse configurations of the same façade elevation on adjacent lots are not sufficient to meet this requirement. In addition, a minimum of two of the following alternatives shall be utilized:
   a. Different window opening locations and designs,
   b. One and two-story dwellings,
   c. Different exterior finish materials and finishes, or
   d. Different garage location, configuration and design.

7. Utilities.
   a. Utility meters, electrical conduit, and other service utility apparatus shall be located and/or designed to minimize their visibility from the street. If such elements are mounted in a location visible from the street, common open space, or shared auto courtyards, they shall be screened with vegetation or by architectural features.
   b. Service, loading, and garbage areas. Developments shall provide a designated area for service elements (refuse and disposal). Such elements shall be sited along the alley, where available. Such elements shall not be located along the street frontage. Where there is no alley available, service elements shall be located to minimize the negative visual, noise, odor, and physical impacts and shall be screened from view from the street and sidewalk.

8. Fencing.
   a. Chain link fencing, with or without slats, is prohibited for required screening.
   b. Barbed or razor wire. The use of barbed or razor wire is limited to those areas not visible to a public street or to an adjacent residential use.
   c. Chain link. Chain link or similar wire fencing is prohibited between the front of a building and a public street, except for wetland preservation and recreation uses.
   d. Electrified. The use of electrified fencing is prohibited in all zoning districts.
   e. The maximum height of free-standing walls, fences, or hedges between any public street and building shall be 3 feet. Exception: Decorative fences up to 8 feet in height may be allowed between a public street and any residential use provided such fence is at least 50 percent transparent and features a planting strip at least 5 feet wide with Type C or D landscaping to soften the view of the fence and contribute to the pedestrian environment.
13.06.510 Off-street parking and storage areas.

** TABLE 1 – Required Off-Street Parking Spaces 9, 14 **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Required parking spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached dwelling, Adult family home, Staffed residential home 1, 2, 12</td>
<td>Dwelling.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-family dwelling in all districts 1, 2, 12</td>
<td>Dwelling.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse dwelling in R-2SRD, R-3, R-4L and R-4 Districts</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-family in R-2SRD, HMR-SRD and R-3 1, 2, 12</td>
<td>Dwelling.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group housing – up to 6 residents</td>
<td>Room, suite or dwelling.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group housing – 7 or more residents 1, 16</td>
<td>Same as for multiple-family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots not conforming to area/width 3</td>
<td>Dwelling.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile home park 1, 2, 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in R-4-L, T, HMR-SRD, and PRD Districts 12</td>
<td>Dwelling.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in R-4, C-1, C-2, HM, and M-1 Districts 12</td>
<td>Dwelling.</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in R-5 District 12</td>
<td>Dwelling.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Center District</td>
<td>See TABLE 2 (next table).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement homes, apartment hotels, residential hotels, residential clubs, fraternities, sororities, and group living quarters of a university or private club 1</td>
<td>Guest room, suite, or dwelling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential in DR, DCC, DMU, and WR Districts</td>
<td>See Chapter 13.06A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1 Footnotes**

1. Guest rooms, *dwellings* or suites in *group housing*, retirement homes, apartment hotels, residential hotels, and residential clubs shall be construed to be dwelling units for purposes of determining the number of off-street parking stalls required. The parking requirements may be reduced to one parking space every three dwelling units; provided, the following conditions exist:
   a. The use will provide residency for retirement age persons with an estimated average persons-per-dwelling unit factor of 1.5 or less, or low-income elderly persons, individuals or households, or a combination thereof;
   b. Yard space is available on the same lot the use is to be located upon or an adjoining lot, where off-street parking at a future time could be provided should the use be converted to an apartment or for other reasons additional parking is needed to serve the premises.

If these conditions do not exist, a variance of the number of parking spaces to be provided is required.

16. Parking requirements may be reduced through provision of one or more of the Parking Quantity Reduction options offered in Mixed-Use Center Districts (Table 2), up to a minimum of 1 stall per 2 rooms, suites or dwellings. Each parking reduction option provided shall receive 50 percent of the credit available in Mixed-Use Center Districts. This reduction may not be utilized in combination with the bonus offered through Footnote 1 of this table (Table 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2 – Parking in Mixed-Use Center Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses. Minimum 1.0 stall per unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or Office Uses. Minimum 2.5 stalls per 1000 square feet of floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCX-TD Commercial or Office Uses (including retail, service and eating and drinking establishments). Minimum 0 stalls per 1000 square feet of floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses. For uses not specifically listed above, the parking requirement in the Mixed-Use Center Districts shall be 70% of the parking requirement for that use identified in Table 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Section 13.06.510.B.2.f for use of compact stalls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For purposes of calculating parking quantity requirements, “floor area,” when used, shall not include space devoted to parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Exemptions** |
| No parking is required for any structure in existence upon the date the Mixed-Use Center was created within which it exists (see Section 13.17.020). New development shall provide parking as required. |
| In NCX and CCX Districts, no parking is required for buildings located within 10 feet of the right-of-way of the designated core pedestrian streets (see Section 13.06.300.C). |
| In NCX, CCX, and UCX Districts, no parking is required for the first 3,000 square feet of each ground-level retail or eating and drinking establishment. |

- Small, affordable housing types: Group housing; student housing; and, efficiency multi-family dwellings (250-450 sf in size) are exempt from vehicular parking requirements (with the exception of required accessible parking), provided the following:
  - A minimum of 0.75 bicycle spaces per dwelling or unit are provided in an indoor, locked location.
  - Within a single building, no more than 20 dwelling units, or 50 percent of the total dwelling units (whichever is greater), may utilize this bonus.

| **Parking Quantity Reductions.** The parking requirements for mixed-use, multi-family, group housing, commercial, institutional and industrial developments within X-Districts may be reduced as follows: |

| **Transit Access** |
| Parking requirement shall be reduced by 25% for sites located within 500 feet of a transit stop and 50% for sites located within 500 feet of a transit stop at which a minimum of 20-minute peak hour service is provided (routes which serve stops at least every 20 minutes during peak hours). Applicants requesting this reduction must provide a map identifying the site and transit service schedules for all transit routes within 500 feet of the site. |

| **Trip Reduction Plan** |
| Parking requirement shall be reduced by 25% for developments that create and implement a site-specific Trip Reduction plan and program that includes features such as employer-provided transit passes, telecommuting, ridesharing, carpooling, car-sharing, bicycling, flexible work schedules, etc. The trip reduction plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City’s CTR Coordinator and yearly reports shall be provided to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and ensure its continued maintenance and operation. |

| **Car-Sharing Stalls** |
| Parking requirements shall be reduced by one stall for each stall that is dedicated and designated for use by a locally-operating car sharing program, such as “Zipcar.” |

<p>| <strong>Mixed-Use/Shared Parking Credit</strong> |
| No parking shall be required for the residential units in a mixed-use project where at least 50 percent of the floor area is designed for commercial or institutional use. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Credit Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking Credit</td>
<td>Parking requirements shall be reduced ½ stall per each new public, on-street parking stall provided as part of the project (through the installation of angled or perpendicular spaces with bulb-outs and curbs or other methods). Any modifications to the right-of-way are subject to the acceptance and approval of the Public Works Department. This one-time credit applies at the time of the development and shall not be affected by any future changes to the right-of-way configuration, design or alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Credit</td>
<td>For every five non-required bicycle parking spaces provided on the site (beyond the standard requirements, as found in Section 13.06.512.D), the automobile parking requirement shall be reduced by one space. This credit is limited to a maximum of 5 automobile spaces, or 15% of the standard parking requirement for the development, whichever is less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle/Scooter Parking Credit</td>
<td>For every 4 motorcycle/scooter parking spaces provided, the automobile parking requirement shall be reduced by one space. Each motorcycle/scooter parking space must be at least 4 feet wide and 8 feet deep and may be located in areas that are otherwise unusable for automobile parking (such as in corners, at aisle ends and near pillars). This credit is limited to a maximum of 5 automobile spaces, or 5% of the standard automobile parking requirement for the development, whichever is less.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Director or designee shall have the authority to require any and all necessary agreements or documentation, as they deem appropriate, to ensure that projects utilizing this parking quantity reduction program maintain all required features for the life of the project. Any such agreements or documentation shall be in a format acceptable to the City Attorney and shall be recorded on the title of the property.
C. Parking Quantity Standards Outside of the RPA

* * *

6. Group housing; student housing; and, efficiency multi-family dwellings (250–450 sf in size) are exempt from vehicular parking requirements (with the exception of required accessible parking), provided the following:

a. A minimum of 0.75 bicycle spaces per dwelling or unit are provided in an indoor, locked location.

b. Within a single building, no more than 20 dwelling units, or 50% of the total dwelling units (whichever is greater), may utilize this bonus.
Proposed Amendments
Recommended by the Planning Commission

Application #2014-07:
Container Port Element
Application #: 2014-07
Applicant: Planning and Development Services Department
Contact: Ian Munce, Planning Services Division
Type of Amendment: Comprehensive Plan Text Changes
Current Land Use & Zoning: PMI, M1, M2, S9 and S10
Location & Size of Area: Port of Tacoma / Tideflats Area – Approximately 5,600 acres
Neighborhood Council area: New Tacoma
Proposed Amendment: Create a new element in the Comprehensive Plan that specifically addresses and provides goals and policies relative to the “Port Industrial Area”.

Planning Commission Recommendations:
The proposed Container Port Element of the Comprehensive Plan is mandated by the State Growth Management Act and has been accomplished in collaboration with the Port of Tacoma. It specifically addresses and provides goals and policies relative to the "Port Industrial Area", will establish a framework for maintaining and upgrading infrastructure and transportation facilities in the Tideflats, will ensure that local land use decisions consider the needs of the Port of Tacoma, and will ensure that the Port and freight corridors continue to function effectively alongside vibrant city waterfronts and adjacent areas.

This application is a carry-over from the 2011 Annual Amendment package. Basically, the work was completed in 2012 and the discussions between the City and the Port were placed on hold while the Shoreline Master Program update was finalized.

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014 and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to receive additional written comments. The Port of Tacoma expressed its support for the proposed element. The Chamber of Commerce expressed some concerns including private terminals or transportation infrastructure not being addressed and the Foss Peninsula being included in the “Transitional Zone” designation. Upon further discussions and clarifications with the Chamber of Commerce, it was resolved that the reference of “Transitional Zone” be revised as “Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area”.

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the Draft Container Port Element as set forth in Exhibit A as a new element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Exhibit:
A. Draft Container Port Element, April 2014
CONTAINER PORT ELEMENT

Draft Container Port Element
April 2014

City of Tacoma
**Introduction**

In 2009, the Washington State Legislature amended the Growth Management Act to include a requirement for a Port Element in the GMA Comprehensive Plan for cities that contain a marine container port with annual operating revenues in excess of $60 million. The City of Tacoma falls into this category. The legislative intent is “… to ensure that local land use decisions are made in consideration of the long-term and widespread economic contribution of our international container ports and related industrial lands and transportation systems and to ensure that container ports continue to function effectively alongside vibrant city waterfronts.” (RCW 36.70A.085).

Accordingly, the City of Tacoma, in collaboration with the Port of Tacoma, has prepared this Container Port Element. Consistent with state requirements, the element provides policy guidance to achieve the following:

- Protection of core areas of container port and port-related industrial areas within the City;
- Efficient access to the core area through freight corridors within the city limits;
- Protection against potential land use conflicts along the edge of the core area; and
- Identification of key transportation corridor improvements.

Preparation of this element began with an existing conditions analysis\(^1\) that provided the land use, plans and policies and transportation context for the element. Based on the existing conditions, potential goals and policies were described in a second white paper\(^2\). In addition, a review of draft goals and policies contained in the preliminary Seattle and Tacoma port elements was conducted.\(^3\) Together, these background papers provided the basis for development of this draft Comprehensive Plan element.

This element begins with an overview that provides the context for planning in the City of Tacoma container port area. This discussion is followed by goals and policies that address land use, capital facilities and transportation.

**Tacoma’s Port**

Where is the container port area located?

Port of Tacoma container port activities are concentrated in the Commencement Bay tideflats area, located in Tacoma’s central waterfront. This area has an established history of maritime industrial activity, dating back to the 1800s. Early uses included lumber and shingle mills, as well as shipyards, flour mills, electrometallurgy and electrochemical companies.

---

In 1918, the Port of Tacoma was created and began development on 240 acres of tideflats. Docks and warehouses were primary components of early Port facilities. Container handling and shipping facilities were attracted to the location by the natural deepwater conditions provided by Commencement Bay. Over time, industrial and commercial uses associated with maritime industries have become the primary use in this area.

Currently, the Port is home to a wide mix of industrial uses, including cargo terminals, manufacturers, warehouses, repair facilities, rail yards and others. Some of the largest cargo terminals, especially the container terminals, are owned by the Port of Tacoma, but there are also numerous private facilities that transfer cargo to and from ships and barges. The Port also owns terminals handling bulk products, auto imports, breakbulk cargoes, and heavy-lift cargoes.

**What are the Port of Tacoma facilities?**

With ownership of approximately 2,725 acres, the Port of Tacoma is a major landowner in the Commencement Bay Tideflats area operating and leasing significant piers, docks, wharfs, cargo handling equipment, and related upland facilities. Ownership also includes shoreline public access sites, habitat mitigation sites and open space.

Currently, the Port of Tacoma Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements does not include plans to significantly add to its operational areas. Accordingly, this element envisions that use of existing facilities will be maximized and that the Port will continue to pursue strategic opportunities to consolidate existing holdings, with no major new acquisitions. In order to provide future flexibility, Policy CP-9 in this element supports ongoing monitoring of cargo market demand, developing technologies and other key factors affecting port and port-related industrial needs.

Major container and intermodal rail facilities in the Tideflats area are shown in Figure 1 and include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep water terminals for containerized cargo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM Terminal</td>
<td>2 berths; 5 container cranes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Container Terminal</td>
<td>1 berth; 4 container cranes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husky Terminal</td>
<td>2 berths; 4 container cranes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Terminal</td>
<td>2 berths; 7 container cranes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington United Terminal</td>
<td>2 berths; 6 container cranes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTE Terminal</td>
<td>3 piers; Roll on/Roll off (Ro/Ro) operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep water terminals for bulk and breakbulk cargo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal 7</td>
<td>Non-containerized cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair Terminal</td>
<td>Autos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Blair One (EB1)</td>
<td>Non-containerized cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The terminals in Tacoma handle a variety of waterborne and intermodal cargo, and this diversity helps to reduce the volatility of individual cargo types. For example, in 2010, container traffic was at a low point due to the economic downturn, but grain exports were near record volumes. Log exports disappeared from Tacoma for several years, but are now strong again.

Economic Impact of Container Port Activities

What is the level of cargo activity at the Port?

In 2009, Tacoma’s total cargo tonnage equaled 17.4 million tons, making it 32nd largest among all U.S. ports. Tacoma’s role in foreign exports is especially important; in 2009 Tacoma’s export tonnage ranked 10th in the U.S. According to Port of Tacoma statistics, containerized trade accounts for over half of the total tonnage moving through the Port.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep water terminals for bulk and breakbulk cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Terminal (TEMCO Cargill)</td>
<td>Grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Export Terminal</td>
<td>Logs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal Rail Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Intermodal Yard</td>
<td>On-dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Intermodal Yard</td>
<td>On-dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyundai Intermodal Yard</td>
<td>On-dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Intermodal Yard</td>
<td>Off-dock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Port of Tacoma, EA|Blumen, 2011
Manufacturers and farmers from throughout Washington import and export a wide variety of products through the Port of Tacoma, generating jobs in Tacoma and throughout the state. The major export commodities include agricultural products, food products, machinery, petroleum products, waste/scrap, paper, chemicals, transportation equipment, other forestry products, fish and seafood products, among others. Imports include electronic components, components for equipment manufacturing, retail goods, and goods and equipment for Joint Base Lewis McChord, as well as other installations in the region.

How does the Port contribute to the economy?

The marine cargo terminal trade plays a vital role in the Tacoma and Pacific Northwest economy, contributing thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in revenues and state and local
taxes to the region. A 2005 Port of Tacoma economic impact study\(^4\), provides specific data describing the magnitude of the economic impact of the Port on the local and regional economy. As described in this report, economic impacts associated with container port activity can be summarized in terms of employment, income, revenue and taxes. Key findings described in this report are listed below.

- Marine terminal activities at the Port of Tacoma generated approximately 9,400 jobs. Of this total, more than 6,600, or 70% of direct port jobs, were related to containers.
- When induced and indirect jobs were included, the total number of jobs generated by marine terminal activities was estimated at more than 16,000. In addition, an estimated 97,000 related jobs relied on or use the marine terminals.
- The marine terminal activities at the Port of Tacoma generated more than $421 million in direct payroll, at an average of approximately $47,000 per worker. For every $1.00 in direct payroll, there was an estimated additional $1.19 associated with indirect and induced impacts in Washington State.
- Cargo movement at the Port of Tacoma was estimated to generate nearly $1.5 billion in direct revenue. Of this total, an estimated $1.25 billion was generated by containerized cargo.
- Estimates of the annual state and local taxes generated by the Port of Tacoma totaled $107.5 million with approximately $82.4 was collected by the state, $11.5 million by the county and $13.6 million by local government.

Preservation of these important economic benefits through a collaborative planning process is a key goal for the City and the Port of Tacoma.

**Goals and Policies**

As vital as container port economic activity is, it could be vulnerable to pressure for land use conversion, and currently is negatively affected by traffic congestion. Infrastructure needs and larger economic conditions are also issues of concern. Preservation of valuable natural features and habitat are also key to the health of Commencement Bay. The Container Port element provides land use policies to promote land use consistency and to minimize and mitigate land use conflicts along the edges of the core area; economic development policies to promote continued economic vitality; natural environment policies to support continued preservation of the environment; capital facilities policies to ensure adequate facilities and services are provided within and beyond the Core Area; and transportation policies to ensure continued efficient freight access and mobility.

**Core Area Vision and Principles**

For the Core Area, this element envisions a strong and vibrant container port and port related industrial center in Tacoma’s Commencement Bay, supported by appropriate levels of service for capital facilities and other infrastructure and an efficient truck and rail transportation

---


network. Key planning principles that guide the goals and policies for the Core Area are as follows:

- Uses should be prioritized as follows: (1) cargo facilities and activities, (2) water dependent port uses, (3) water related port uses, and (4) other uses permitted in Port Maritime Industrial zoning
- The Port of Tacoma should have the opportunity to work cooperatively with the City of Tacoma in setting level of service standards for utilities and transportation
- The Port of Tacoma should have the opportunity to work cooperatively with the City of Tacoma in ensuring that future developments pay for the costs of those capital improvements necessary for the proper functioning of the Core Area

**Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area Vision and Principles**

For the Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area, this element envisions a healthy and attractive industrial and commercial area that provides a buffer between the Core Area and the surrounding area. By providing a buffer, the Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area protects the Core Area from land use conflicts and ensures it long-term continued viability. Key Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area planning principles that guide the goals and policies include:

- Uses shall complement, and not impede the development of, Core area functions and uses
- Industrial uses shall continue to be recognized as a vital part of the Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area
- Land use and development standards shall be designed so as to accommodate the utilities and transportation needs of the Core Area

**Land Use**

The Commencement Bay Tideflats area is regionally and locally recognized as an important industrial center. In 2002, the Puget Sound Regional Council designated the Tideflats area a regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC).

Consistent with the regional designation, the Comprehensive Plan Growth Strategy and Development Concept element designates the tideflats area as an MIC, defined as an area of high intensity development, high activity patterns and high traffic generation (see Figure 2).

The City’s Land Use Regulatory Code (Tacoma Municipal Code, Title 13) implements the MIC land use designation through the Port Maritime and Industrial (PMI) zoning designation (see Figure 3). The PMI zone provides for “…uses which rely on the deepwater berthing to transport raw materials for processing or manufacture, or transport of finished products; and freight mobility infrastructure, with the entire area served by road and rail corridors designed for large, heavy truck and rail loads “(TMC 13.06.400.B).
The policies contained within the Container Port element are consistent with and supplement related policies in the City’s Comprehensive Plan and implementing regulations. Goals and policies are also consistent with the Port of Tacoma Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements.

The land use goals and policies are organized into two sections to address (1) the core area and (2) the Industrial/Commercial Buffer area. Goals and policies for the core area identify an area in which cargo activities are the primary use and focus on protecting port-related cargo and industrial uses and rail-related uses within this area. Industrial/Commercial Buffer area goals and policies identify an area immediately adjacent to the core area and provide for a compatible Industrial/Commercial Buffer for the larger surrounding area.

Core Area Goal

*Identify the core port and port-related container industrial area and protect the long-term function and viability of this area.*

The City recognizes the important role that the Port of Tacoma plays in regional employment and economic development. Identification and long-term preservation of the Core Area ensures that the Port of Tacoma facilities and related industrial uses will have room to thrive in the City.

Figure 4 shows the Core Area, which contains current port, current port-related cargo and industrial uses, and those areas recognized by both the City and the Port as likely to be needed for these uses within the next 20 years. The designated Core Area consists of the following areas:

- Existing Port Maritime Industrial (PMI) zoning designation;
- Those portions of the S-9 and S-10 shoreline districts adjacent to the PMI zoning designation; and
- The TEMCO grain terminal, located on a narrow shelf of land between Schuster Parkway and Commencement Bay.

Other than the TEMCO grain terminal site, the Core Area does not include any portions of the S-7 Shoreline District.

The following policies are intended to make sure that Core Area is preserved now and in the future for port maritime and related industrial uses while respecting the rights of all property owners.
Core Area Policies

CP-1 Port and Port-Related Cargo and Industrial Uses
Within the designated Core Area, prioritize, protect and preserve existing and planned port uses, port-related container and industrial uses and rail-related uses. Uses should consist primarily of cargo port terminal, port-related container and industrial activity, compatible manufacturing, industrial-related office, cargo yard, warehousing, transportation facilities, and other similar uses.

CP-2 Port and Port-Related Cargo and Industrial Land
Preservation of available industrial waterfront land for port and port-related container and industrial activity is vital to the City's economy. Prohibit uses that would negatively affect the availability of land for the primary port and port-related cargo and industrial function of the Core Area. Encourage aggregation of industrial land for future development as cargo port terminals and supporting uses.

CP-3 Incompatible Core Area Uses
Clearly identify and prohibit uses that are entirely incompatible with the Core Area uses. Examples may include those that attract people to the area for non-industrial purposes or that would be incompatible with typical industrial area impacts (noise, truck movement, etc.). These may include residential, general retail, temporary lodging or other similar uses.

CP-4 Land Use Buffers
Reduce the potential for land use conflicts between industrial development and surrounding non-industrial uses by providing for adequate Industrial/Commercial Buffer areas, and clear public commitment to continuation of Port and port-related cargo and industrial uses in the designated Core Area.

To the west, the railroad tracks and steep bluff rising above Dock Street to the neighborhoods to the west provide a clear buffer to the industrial area. Similarly, to the east, the steep bluff rising above Marine View Drive provides a clear buffer from the industrial area to the residential development at the top of the bluff. In both these areas, the existing geography provides a very effective buffer and no additional Industrial/Commercial Buffer area is necessary.

CP-5 Core Area Boundary
Do not allow unrelated uses to gradually encroach on the Core Area through incremental development and modifications of the Core Area boundary. Consider boundary adjustments only in collaboration with the Port of Tacoma and as part of a comprehensive review of long-term port and port-related cargo and industrial land needs.
CP-6 Noise, Odor, and Visual Character

In the Core Area, allow for localized impacts associated with industrial activities, including noise, odor and visual character, that that are appropriate and expected in heavy industrial areas but would not be allowed in other parts of the city. Noise and odor may be associated with transportation and manufacturing facilities. Visual character may include outdoor storage, relatively large building mass and impervious surface area. While localized impacts are permitted, continue to require Core Area industrial uses to be developed in a manner that protects the environment and preserves public health and safety from a citywide and regional perspective.

CP-7 Collaboration

Continue to work in close collaboration with the Port of Tacoma to ensure that port and port-related cargo and industrial uses remain viable and that land use development along the edges of the Core Area is thoughtfully planned to avoid land use conflicts and incompatibility. Consider collaborative efforts to develop landscape and street standards that recognize the special working character of the Core area.

CP-8 Public Service Standards

Within the Core Area the Port should assume a greater role in setting level of service and concurrency standards under City Comprehensive Plan Policies CF-APFS-1, 2, and 3 and in addressing funding responsibilities under City Comprehensive Plan Policy CF-FCF-2. This could be achieved through a stand-alone Port Comprehensive Plan, and/or a City sub-area plan.

CP-9 Maritime Industrial Planning

In order to ensure that the Core Area continues to serve future port needs, encourage the Port of Tacoma to develop and periodically update a comprehensive long-range maritime development program that assesses future cargo market demand, developing technologies, geographic constraints and other factors affecting future intermodal cargo opportunities, and land and capital investment necessary to permit Tacoma to continue to serve port and port-related cargo and industrial needs.

Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area Goal

Establish an Industrial/Commercial Buffer area around the Core Area that will protect the continued viability of the Core Area while providing for a compatible Industrial/Commercial Buffer to development in the larger surrounding area.

The Industrial/Commercial Buffer area shown in Figure 4 provides a protective buffer around the core area, helping to ensure the continued long-term viability of the core maritime industrial uses and providing a compatible Industrial/Commercial Buffer to the larger surrounding area. Existing zoning of the Industrial/Commercial Buffer area is sufficient to protect the core area functions.
Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area Policies

CP-10  Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area Collaboration
The City of Tacoma should work in collaboration with adjacent jurisdictions, including Pierce County and the City of Fife, to ensure a good Industrial/Commercial Buffer from the Core Area to larger surrounding areas.

CP-11  Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area Function
In general, natural buffers, such as change in topography, vegetated areas and water bodies are preferred as a means to buffer and separate incompatible uses (see Policy CP-4). The Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area designation is needed only where the existing geography does not provide an effective buffer.

The City should ensure that unrelated uses in the Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area are not allowed to gradually encroach on the Core Area boundary.

The Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area should remain of sufficient size to provide a long-term buffer for the Core Area.

CP-12  Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area Uses
The Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area contains a mix of industrial, auto-oriented commercial and retail uses that will provide an appropriate Industrial/Commercial Buffer between the Core Area and nearby residential or pedestrian-oriented commercial zones. Development standards for industrial and commercial activities in the Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area should ensure compatibility with the activity levels and physical character of adjacent less intensive community character.

CP-13  Retention of Industrial Uses
Industrial activity and development is an essential component of the Industrial/Commercial Buffer area. Recognizing the importance of industrial activity to the local and regional economy, industrial uses in the Industrial/Commercial Buffer area should be preserved and promoted. Industrial uses, including non-water related industry, is compatible with and can support maritime industrial uses in the core area, as well as contributing to the region’s economy as a whole.

CP-14  Incompatible Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area Uses
While the Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area provides for a wider range of uses than the Core Area, incompatible uses that would be impacted by the potential noise, odor and visual character of industrial areas should continue to be prohibited. This may include residential or other sensitive uses.

CP-15  Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area Character
Establish development or performance standards to allow for continued viability of the Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area, while protecting the livability of adjacent areas.
**Economic Development**

Port and port-related industrial activities play a vital role in the Tacoma and Pacific Northwest economy, contributing thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in revenues and state and local taxes to the region. The Comprehensive Plan Economic Development Element provides broad guidance for container port activities, noting the role of the City of Tacoma as “…an internationally competitive business center located in the Puget Sound region.” Consistent with this vision, the economic development goal and policies listed below provides additional guidance for the port and port-related industrial area. The goal and policies are consistent with and supplement the Comprehensive Plan Economic Development Element.

**Promote the continued growth and vitality of port and port-related industrial activity.**

CP-16 Partnership with the Port of Tacoma
Work in partnership with the Port of Tacoma to target and recruit new businesses that support port and port-related industrial activity.

CP-17 Incentives for Port and Port Related Industry
Identify and consider opportunities to remove obstacles to development and to incentivize businesses that support container port and port-related industrial activity.

CP-18 Workforce Program
Consider coordinating an industrial development workforce program for local citizens. Act as a facilitator between businesses, educational institutions, trade associations and residents in order to reduce the workforce development burden of individual businesses and expand employment opportunities for citizens.

CP-19 Port Area Promotion
In order to build on the port area’s reputation as a prime location of port related industry, seek opportunities, such as speaking engagements, articles and others, to highlight economic development success stories in the port area.

**Environment**

The Commencement Bay area is a unique environment containing shoreline, river deltas, tidal creeks, freshwater and salt marshes, naturalized creeks and river channel corridors. Major water features include Commencement Bay, Puyallup River, Hylebos Waterway, Hylebos and Wapato Creeks and numerous wetland areas. These areas provide valuable habitat for many species of birds and fish, including the marbled murrelet and the White River spring run Chinook salmon. The goal and policies below supplement the Comprehensive Plan Environment Policy Element, providing additional guidance for the Commencement Bay core port area.

**Goal**

*Work in partnership with the Port of Tacoma and other property owners to promote protection, restoration and enhancement of native vegetative cover, waterways, wetlands and buffers.*
CP-20  Low Impact Development Standards
Encourage the use of low impact development standards and stormwater features.

CP-21  Commencement Bay Environmental Improvement
Partner with the Port of Tacoma and other interested stakeholders to establish environmental improvement goals for Commencement Bay, including providing for greater baywide diversity of ecosystems, restoration of historic functions and improvement of physical conditions. Support efforts to identify funding mechanisms and legislative support for strategies to achieve these goals.

CP-22  Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Consider development of measures, such as LID development standards, energy efficient lighting technologies, and transportation design features, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the port area.

**Capital Facilities**

The Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Element addresses overall capital facility needs in Tacoma, including the Tideflats area. Facilities and services to ensure efficient movement of cargo and support for industrial and manufacturing services are critical to ensure a thriving port area. In addition, multiple public and private agencies overlap in the provision of transportation and utility services to this area. In order to ensure adequate and efficient provision of services to this area, active consultation and coordination amongst the multiple agencies is critically important.

The Funding for Capital Facilities section of the Capital Facilities Element recognizes that funding to provide adequate facilities and services can be limited and seeks to pursue all available revenue sources, including partnering with existing and future developments to cover necessary costs of the services and facilities that support them. Specifically, CF-FCF-1 requires review of existing revenue sources and pursuit of all available funding sources for the development of capital improvement projects in order to optimally use limited City resources and meet existing and future needs. CF-FCF-2 requires that the City ensure that existing and future developments pay for some or all of the costs of capital improvements or new facilities that are deemed necessary, by reason of their respective developments, to reduce existing deficiencies or replace obsolete facilities.

The following goal and policies are intended to supplement general policies in the Capital Facilities Element with specific capital facility policy guidance in the container port area.

**Goal**

*Provide, protect and preserve the capital facilities and essential public services needed to support activities within and beyond the Core Area.*

High quality and reliable physical systems and facilities are a necessary component of both Port and City operations. The following policies supplement the guidelines and direction provided in the Capital Facilities element, specifically to achieve quality maintenance and improvement of capital facilities and services within and beyond the Core Area.
Policies

CP-23 Capital Facilities within the Core Area
Partner with the Port to identify required new infrastructure, facilities and services needed to support port activities within the Core Area, as well as priorities for maintenance and preservation of existing infrastructure, facilities and services. By partnering with the Port, the City can make sure that future infrastructure investments are targeted and prioritized to meet the needs of the Port and the Core Area.

CP-24 Utility access within the Core Area
Coordinate with the Port to identify the location and jurisdiction of major utility easements that are located in the Core Area; and develop and implement a utility access plan to ensure that utility providers have access at all times to all major utilities.

CP-25 Standards for New Utilities in the Core Area
Establish and implement design standards for new roadway infrastructure and developments in the Core Area that will include utility corridors and utility access plans.

Transportation

Provision of an effective multimodal transportation system is of vital importance for port operations and for port-related activities. Reliable systems of roadways and railways, as well as connections between them, accommodates a variety of cargo types and destinations, and allows for flexibility in the Port's cargo base as demand for different types of cargoes rises or falls.

Roadways and railways that support port operations are owned and maintained by numerous agencies in addition to the City of Tacoma, including the Port, other cities, counties, Washington State, and private providers such as Burlington Northern Santa Fe and Union Pacific railroads. Cooperation and coordination between jurisdictions is essential for preservation and efficient utilization of existing infrastructure that supports port and port-related operations, and also for future expansion of infrastructure needed support these activities as they grow.

Planning, design and construction of transportation facilities typically takes years, so future land use planning is essential to ensure that infrastructure will be in place at the time it is needed. In addition, transportation infrastructure can be costly, and often requires a variety of funding sources. Identification of future transportation needs through a comprehensive planning process provides a sound basis for identifying projects before they are needed, aids inter-jurisdictional coordination, and greatly enhances the ability for a project to receive funding from sources such as state and federal grants.

Goal

*Identify, protect and preserve the transportation infrastructure and services needed for efficient multimodal movement of goods within and between the Core Area, Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area, and the regional transportation system.*
An efficient multimodal transportation system is vital to the operation and economic viability of the Port. It is important that existing infrastructure and services that support Port activities be maintained, and that adequate resources are available to improve the transportation system as needed to support future growth. The following policies supplement the guidelines and direction provided in the Transportation element, specifically to achieve the goal of continued development and improvement of transportation facilities and services needed to support port-related freight access and mobility.

Policies

CP-26 Regional Freight Truck Corridors
Figures 5 and 6 identify Regional Freight Truck Corridors, which the City has identified as critical to efficient movement of goods between the Core Area, Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area, and the regional highway system outside the city limits. Coordinate with state and local agencies to emphasize the importance of these corridors to state and local economic health, and support improvements planned on these corridors that enhance freight mobility. These corridors are those designated with a T-1 tonnage classification (carrying over 10 million tons of freight per year) by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)\(^5\) as well as the roads that connect the Port to the regional road System, i.e. first/last mile connector routes.

CP-27 Heavy Haul Routes
Figure 6 identifies the freight truck corridors that are designated as Heavy Haul Routes, as they are critical to efficient movement of goods within and between the Core Area and Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area. Improvements that are planned in these corridors will receive additional priority scoring under the “Enhance Freight Mobility” project prioritization criterion described in the Transportation element.

CP-28 Intermodal Connections
Support and encourage intermodal facilities and the transport of cargo via rail to help minimize the roadway traffic impacts related to growth in Port throughput.

CP-29 Mobility on Heavy Haul Routes
Emphasize freight truck mobility on Heavy Haul Routes (see Figure 6). Coordinate with the Port to develop strategies to minimize truck queues and other traffic elements that could interfere with mobility along these routes.

CP-30 Pavement Maintenance
Place high priority on preservation of existing roads that serve freight movement within the Core Area and Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area; and encourage the use of reinforced Portland Cement Concrete pavement along Heavy Haul Routes to maintain improved roadway conditions over longer periods of time.

CP-31 Freight Transportation System Management
Identify and prioritize improvements in efficiency to the roadway system, such as traffic signal timing and phasing improvements, which will improve roadway freight operations without requiring major capital investment.

CP-32 Key Freight Transportation Corridor Improvements
Support recommendations from the Tideflats Area Transportation Study (TATS), for improvements that will preserve and enhance freight mobility in the region.

CP-33 Intergovernmental Funding of Transportation Projects
Coordinate with state, regional and adjacent local jurisdictions to seek joint funding opportunities for projects that enhance freight mobility in the region, including the completion of SR 167 and the I5 – Port of Tacoma Road Interchange Reconfiguration project.
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Application #2014-08:
Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element
Planning Commission Recommendation Summary
May 7, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2014-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Planning and Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division (253) 591-5389 <a href="mailto:elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org">elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Amendment:</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan and Regulatory Code Text Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use Intensity:</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Area Zoning:</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Area:</td>
<td>City-Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>City-Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Council area:</td>
<td>City-Wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission Recommendations:
The proposed amendment would update the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element (OSHRE) of the Comprehensive Plan pursuant to ensuring that the Element reflects the community’s park, recreation and open space priorities, provides consistent and effective guidance on implementation, and maintains the City’s eligibility for grants. The amendments would reaffirm the vision and goals as developed in 2008, reflect progress and changing circumstances since its adoption, update inventories, and provide enhanced guidance on implementation. The proposal adds new sections intended to create a forum for the City Council and the public to better understand and, over time, provide additional policy direction on implementation priorities. The proposal also updates the City’s Transfer of Development Rights code.

The following is a summary of the proposed amendments, while details are shown in Exhibits A and B:

1. Update various sections of the Element, including the following: Open Space Definition; Open Space System; Vision; Community Gardens; Waterfront Open Spaces and Shoreline Access; Habitat Areas; Strategic Action Program; Partnerships; Acquisition and Management of Land and Facilities; and, Implementation, as well as minor refinements to other sections.

2. Create a new section titled Plans for Specific Areas, which will summarize recreation and open space plans that have been developed for specific locations.

3. Refine the City’s lists of Open Space Projects and Open Space Inventories, and incorporate them into the Element.

4. Update TMC 1.37 Transfer of Development Rights Program Administrative Code to clarify Tacoma Habitat Areas Sending Site qualifications and credit allocation.
The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014 and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to receive additional written comments. Oral testimony was received by one organization, three written comments were received regarding the proposal during the comment period, and staff proposed one change. The majority of comments were from Metro Parks Tacoma, whose staff collaborated closely with City staff on this proposal. In summary, comments addressed the Open Space System, canopy cover goal, community gardens program, habitat stewardship outreach and training, implementation and funding, Transfer of General Government Property, views, Plans for Specific Areas, Measuring and Reporting Progress, invasive species, and preventing encroachments into community natural areas. Based on the public testimony the Planning Commission directed that the following changes be made to the public review draft.

- Clarify the Open Space System section to note that the Port of Tacoma, Tacoma Public Utilities and other public agencies also manage open space and recreation assets.
- Modify Policy OS-GI-1 Green Neighborhoods to make the policy statement pertaining to achieving 30 percent citywide tree canopy cover by 2030 be consistent with the *Urban Forestry Policy Element* of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Update the Community Gardens section to reflect the evolving relationships between the City, Metro Parks Tacoma (MPT), and the Pierce Conservation District.
- Update Policy OS-HA-11 Habitat Stewardship Outreach and Training to reflect ongoing progress.
- Modify the Implementation and Funding section by describing the several City departments which collaborate to achieve the objectives of the OSHRE in partnership with MPT and other public agencies.
- Amend policy OS-CW-2 Transfer of General Government Property to reflect that properties deemed unnecessary for their current function shall be evaluated for designation as open space, and in some cases for transfer to MPT or other entities.
- Modify Policy OS-LF-12 Scenic Views-Private Benefit to indicate that tree topping shall not be allowed on public land for private view benefit, and tree removal on public land for such purpose shall not be allowed unless as part of a coordinated plan that achieves view, habitat, environmental, slope stability and other objectives.
- Modify Policy OS-LF-13 Scenic Views-Public Benefit to indicate that significant public views are described in the Urban Forest Policy Element.
- Add “Tollefson Plaza Enhancements” to Appendix I – Open Space Projects.
- Add the primary responsible City departments to the Open Space Inventory.

Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the *Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan* and *Tacoma Municipal Code 1.37 Transfer of Development Rights Program Administrative Code* as detailed in Exhibits A and B.

**Exhibit:**
A. Proposed Amendments to the *Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan*
B. Proposed Amendments to the *Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 1.37 Transfer of Development Rights Program Administrative Code*
Annual Amendment Application #2014-08
Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element Updates

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments May 7, 2014

*Note – These amendments show all of the changes to the existing policies of the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element. The sections included are only those portions that are associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that is deleted is shown in strikethrough.
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Section I – Introduction

Open Space Vision

The following is the purpose of the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Plan Element (OSHREPE). The policies and other guidance contained in the Plan are intended to support achievement of this vision:

Create an integrated system of habitat and recreation lands and facilities in Tacoma that defines and enhances the built and natural environment, supports and nurtures plant and wildlife habitat, offers a well-balanced range of recreation opportunities and enriches the lives of Tacoma’s current and future citizens.

The OSHREPE is both a plan for an environmentally “green” Tacoma, and for a livable and active Tacoma. As Tacoma’s green plan, the OSHRPOSHRE envisions the conservation, restoration and stewardship of the City’s invaluable habitat areas and enhancement of habitat functions city-wide. As Tacoma’s recreation and active living plan, the OSHRPOSHRE envisions a system of recreation lands and facilities that meet community expectations and promote healthy living. A balanced and well-developed system of habitat and recreation lands and facilities is an essential component of a prosperous, livable and sustainable Tacoma.

An Integrated Open Space Habitat and Recreation System

Tacoma benefits from invaluable natural assets including extensive shorelines, distinctive steep slopes and gulches, wetlands and streams and upland habitat areas, as well as a well-developed system of parks, playgrounds and recreational facilities. The City of Tacoma, Metro Parks Tacoma, other public and private organizations and Tacoma’s citizens have a long history of planning for the acquisition, conservation, enhancement and management of these assets.

The plan you are reading represents the latest update to a long line of parks and open space plans. In recognition of the need for a comprehensive guide for open space and recreation, the City of Tacoma and the Metropolitan Park District of Tacoma (in short, Metro Parks Tacoma or MPT) worked together to formulate the Recreation and Open Space Facilities Plan, which was adopted in 1983 and amended in 1989, 1994 and 2000. In 2006, Metro Parks Tacoma adopted its own stand-alone Strategic Plan, and the City amended the Recreation and Open Space Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. This Open Space Habitat and Recreation Plan Element (OSHREPOSHRE) is an element of the Comprehensive Plan which replaces and supersedes the Recreation and Open Space Facilities Element.

The OSHRPOSHRE was developed in close collaboration with MPT and in harmony with the MPT’s Strategic Parks and Program Services Plan, with active participation by community groups including the Green Tacoma Partnership. Metro Parks Tacoma and the City of Tacoma have long been partners and key providers of open space habitat and recreational lands and facilities. From the outset of this effort participants have recognized that, while playing a central role, the City, Metro Parks and other public agencies cannot bring about Tacoma’s open space vision by themselves. This plan seeks to build the framework for ongoing and broadening collaboration to bring about Tacoma’s open space goals.

The OSHRPOSHRE is Tacoma’s vision and plan for an integrated network of open space lands and facilities, including parks, habitat areas, trails, community gardens, shorelines and landscaped boulevards, as well as habitat connections provided by trees planted city-wide. The key premise of the OSHRPOSHRE is that, irrespective of their ownership, Tacoma’s open space lands and facilities are complementary to each other, serve multiple functions, provide numerous community benefits and form a cohesive system. The many public agencies, private parties and citizens managing open space in Tacoma can benefit from an integrated open space planning perspective.

The plan’s name was chosen to emphasize the importance of two key open space functions in Tacoma—space for recreation and for habitat.
These purposes are mutually supportive. Most open space lands provide habitat value as well as serving other open space functions. While some lands contain habitat for rare or endangered species, many lands with habitat value can also appropriately serve other open space functions. Likewise, lands being managed for other functions, such as stormwater retention or recreation, can also provide valuable habitat functions.

Parks, facilities and trails are more attractive, aesthetically pleasing and environmentally healthy when they are near or integrated with natural features and lands. Habitat areas, in turn, can benefit from appropriate access and low-impact recreation through increased community stewardship, safety, and a heightened sense of community ownership. The numerous functions provided by open space are a fundamental benefit contributing to a complete and livable urban environment.

Plan Objectives

This OSHREP is intended to be used in harmony with other elements of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, as well as Metro Parks Tacoma’s Strategic Parks and Program Services Plan (as updated), and will serve as a blueprint for achieving the vision and goals of Tacoma open space and in particular, the following objectives:

- Identify and communicate the City’s vision, goals and policy direction for open space.
- Call for development of coordinated strategies a Strategic Action Program to guide implementation, support partnerships and monitor progress.
- Provide a consistent and well-developed guide for future identification, acquisition, restoration and maintenance of public open space.
- Provide a clear basis to direct future capital projects and funding allocations intended to acquire, manage, maintain or restore a variety of open space lands and facilities.
- Foster active citizen involvement and community stewardship of habitat areas.
- Aid citizens in understanding the important issues, challenges and opportunities related to Tacoma’s habitat and recreation lands and facilities.
- Promote active living and foster livability through recreation lands and facilities that serve the needs and preferences of the citizens of Tacoma.
- Set a city-wide goal not only to reverse the decline of habitat functions and values, but to achieve the greatest possible net gain over the next 20 years.
- Designate Tacoma’s most valuable open space habitat areas as Habitat Corridors.
- Create a framework for wetland and stream mitigation required under the Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance to achieve greater positive habitat outcomes.
- Call for city-wide strategies that support healthy habitats, including planting and maintaining trees and low impact development stormwater techniques.
- Meet the intent and requirements of the Growth Management Act related to open space, recreation and environmental protection and restoration.
- Provide a plan which is compatible with the Washington State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan and satisfies the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office requirement to update the plan every six years to maintain eligibility for state funding.
- Maintain eligibility and improve competitiveness for funding sources including:
  o Pierce County – Conservation Futures Program
  o Department of Ecology – Hazardous Waste, Wetlands,
Open Space Definition

The term “open space” evokes a variety of connotations to different people. In its simplest, broadest definition, it is land which is unoccupied by buildings. For the purposes of this plan, and in collaboration with Metro Parks Tacoma’s Strategic Parks and Program Services Plan, “Open Space” refers to lands which are uncovered, unoccupied or undeveloped which perform one or more of the following functions:

- **Open Space for the Conservation of Natural Resources:** includes, but is not limited to, most natural areas regulated under the City’s Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance; areas used for the conservation of plant and animal life, including habitat for fish and wildlife species; areas used for ecologic and other scientific study purposes; rivers, streams, wetlands, bays and estuaries; forested areas, oak woodlands, meadows; areas providing important habitat connectivity, including utility easements and unimproved rights-of-way; and marine beaches, lake shores, banks of rivers and streams, and watershed lands.

- **Open Space for Public Health & Safety:** includes, but is not limited to, areas which require special management or regulation because of hazardous or special conditions such as steep slopes and unstable soil areas, floodplains and watersheds; areas required for the protection of water quality and water reservoirs; and areas required for the protection and enhancement of air quality.

- **Open Space for Outdoor Recreation:** includes, but is not limited to, areas of outstanding scenic, historic, cultural, scientific and/or educational value; areas offering a wide spectrum of high and low-impact recreation opportunities, including play and sports facilities; areas providing access to lake shores, marine beaches, and rivers and streams; areas providing a natural separation or buffer between land-uses;
areas serving as links between major recreation and open-space sites, including banks of rivers and streams, trails, and scenic highway corridors.

Open Space for the Managed Production of Resources: includes, but is not limited to, areas of importance for the production of food or fiber; areas required for recharge of groundwater aquifers; and, bays, estuaries, marshes, rivers and streams which are important for fisheries.

Open Space System

Functioning within a highly urbanized setting, the City of Tacoma and Metro Parks Tacoma together offer a system of open spaces ranging from low-impact, natural resource-driven habitat areas to recreation-oriented, high-impact parks and sport complexes. The open space system is integrated into the overall community fabric to provide recreation, conservation, aesthetic benefits and relief from urban development and the built environment. Though open space sites can be categorized according to this system, most of Tacoma’s open space sites provide a range of benefits and support the City’s integrated open space system.

This system of open space lands is made up of both public and private ownerships. On the public side, the City and Metro Parks are the primary owners of most of those lands categorized below. However, in addition, the Tacoma School District owns school properties that serve residents’ recreation needs during non-school hours. The Port of Tacoma, Tacoma Public Utilities and other public agencies also manage open space and recreation assets. This spectrum of publicly-owned open space is complemented by lands managed by private landowners, with whom the City will continue to partner.

Included below are the types of open space that make up the City’s open space system, ranging from low-impact to high-impact recreational use:

- **Open Space Habitat Areas**: Lands that support, nurture and preserve natural and wildlife habitats and native vegetation. Habitat lands usually contain natural resources, such as wetlands, streams, wildlife, native and forested habitats, that are managed for stewardship and conservation via best management practices. These lands often provide opportunities for environmental research and interpretative programs, in addition to low-impact recreational activities. Aside from the gulches, wetlands and other habitat areas managed by the City of Tacoma, Metro Parks Tacoma also manages “greenspace”, a sub-component of open space habitat, used mainly for conservation, environmental education and low-impact recreation purposes, such as walking and nature viewing.

- **Community Gardens**: Land gardened by a community group for food, plant or fiber production, either for personal or charitable uses. Community gardens provide access to fresh produce; encourage a connection to the environment; support general health and wellbeing through outdoor activity and the therapeutic benefits of gardening; include safety and beautification benefits; create healthy soil, which helps with stormwater management; and add to a neighborhood’s livability. Properly designed and managed, community gardens can greatly enhance a neighborhood’s vitality and can be created on their own or in coordination with neighborhood parks, playgrounds, housing developments or apartment complexes. Community gardens generally depend on local governmental support in terms of ownership, access and management.

- **Neighborhood Parks**: Neighborhood parks provide daily convenient, walking access to basic recreational opportunities for nearby residents living within a ¼-mile radius of the park. Generally small in size, neighborhood parks are a combination of playground and other amenities/facilities designed primarily for spontaneous, non-organized recreation activities. Properly designed and managed, these parks can enhance neighborhood identity, preserve neighborhood natural space, and improve the quality of life of nearby residents. Schoolyards offering playground opportunities often function as neighborhood parks to meet the recreational needs of the nearby residents.

- **Community Parks**: Designed to serve those residents living within a 1.5-mile radius of the park, community parks provide
a wider range of recreational opportunities to accommodate large group activities, structured recreation programs, and major outdoor recreation facilities, such as sports facilities. Community parks can enhance neighborhood and community identities, preserve natural and green space, and enhance the quality of life of community residents. Some community parks portray a design theme. These “signature community parks” have a wider community appeal and contribute to the identity of the larger community as a whole.

- **Regional Parks**: Regional parks provide visitors with access to unique features and attractions that will draw visitors from throughout the District and beyond. Regional parks often accommodate large group activities and have infrastructure to support special events and festivals. Regional parks enhance the economic vitality and identity of the entire City or region.

- **Urban Parks**: Urban parks provide visitors with access to open space in the downtown area, mixed-use centers and corridors, and high-density residential areas. Examples of urban parks include public squares, promenades, urban plazas and landscaped courtyards. Urban amenities, a subset of urban parks, include features such as landscaped boulevards, prominent public staircases, mini parks and enhanced sidewalk and landscaping features. Urban parks sometimes serve the neighborhood park needs of surrounding residents and often provide opportunities for community events. Urban parks can enhance the quality of life of the urban dwellers and workers, create an identity for the urban core and mixed-use districts, as well as promote tourism and economic development for the entire City. Open spaces on private property, such as downtown plazas associated with an office building, can serve roles similar to those of publicly owned urban parks.

- **Recreation Facilities**: Outdoor or indoor facilities offer opportunities for programmed activities to promote active living, an appreciation for nature and the environment, and to foster respect for culture and heritage amongst all ages. These facilities can be free-standing or sited within a community or regional park and are usually managed by Metro Parks Tacoma. Examples of recreational facilities include:
  - Multi-purpose centers
  - Mission-led specialty centers, such as sports complexes, athletic fields, golf courses, outdoor and indoor pools, boathouse marinas, nature centers, zoos and aquariums, wildlife parks, botanical conservatories, and historic interpretative centers.

- **Active Transportation and Trails**: Trails, sidewalks, bicycle facilities and other active transportation facilities are part of Tacoma’s recreation and active living system. Walking, bicycling, skateboarding and other non-motorized activities play a vital role in health and well-being. Furthermore, many recreation and open space areas serve a dual role as active transportation links. The City’s Open Space System links with multiple other systems and ownerships to provide this important service.
Section III – Open Space Vision and Goals

Vision: 20-Year and 100-Year

The following statements are intended to articulate Tacoma’s open space vision. The OSHRP plan horizon is 20 years, and the 20 year vision incorporates the specific strategies and objectives of the Plan. Progress in achieving the 20 year vision is, to a greater extent, measurable, and will be incorporated in ongoing monitoring and reporting. By contrast, the hundred year vision is beyond the current planning period and not tied to specific actions. However, the long term vision informs and motivates our actions today.

20-Year Vision: By the year 2028, Tacoma will be a more livable and green City through implementing the policies in this Plan. Significant progress will have been made toward conserving Tacoma’s habitat areas. Habitat restoration efforts will be well-established and active community stewardship will play a major role. The City as a whole will have more vegetation, supporting a healthy tree canopy coverage, while achieving a decrease in invasive species. Tacoma will have achieved a net gain in overall habitat health and a reduction in the City’s environmental footprint over 2014 conditions. Tacoma’s parks and recreation facilities will be assets within each neighborhood, including the downtown business district and shoreline areas. The City will have developed and improved its trail system and established links with regional trails. Tacoma’s parks and open spaces will support a high quality of life, a healthy environment and a vital economy.

100-Year Vision: One hundred years from now, Tacoma’s citizens will enjoy the benefits resulting from long-term sustained efforts to enhance our livability and environment. Tacoma’s habitat corridors will have been conserved and restored through ongoing stewardship, providing mature, high-quality habitat. New habitat connections will have been established between previously isolated areas. Natural ecological functions will be integrated into each neighborhood, reducing Tacoma’s impact on the environment and positioning Tacoma to respond to evolving expectations and conditions. A high quality of life, supported by excellent recreational opportunities, environmentally sound practices and a healthy urban forest will make Tacoma an excellent place to live and work and help to minimize the City’s environmental footprint.

Though it is unknown what opportunities and challenges will arise over the next century, the City of Tacoma, its partners and its citizens will continue to work toward this vision, ensuring that Tacoma remains a vibrant, sustainable and beautiful community today and for the generations to follow.

Tacoma’s Open Space Goals

The OSHRP Management Team conducted a needs assessment, including an analysis of plan assumptions, the community benefits provided by open space and Tacoma’s Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats related to open space. The policies of the OSHRP were developed in order to achieve Tacoma’s open space vision, based upon this needs assessment. A summary of the needs assessment is included below under Supporting Documents.

1. Create an interconnected system of open space lands and facilities
   A. Conserve corridors of habitat areas
   B. Create trails through, between and among open space areas
   C. Create efficiency of scale for land management
D. Provide recreational and educational benefits to citizens
E. Improve recreation lands and facilities to meet community needs

2. Protect environmentally significant areas
   A. Conserve contiguous habitat areas and protect wildlife corridors
   B. Protect habitat and species diversity
   C. Protect significant natural features
   D. Preserve shoreline, wetlands and streams
   E. Achieve a city-wide net gain in habitat functions

3. Foster active citizen involvement in Tacoma’s open spaces
   A. Provide education about the values, benefits, and opportunities of conservation
   B. Provide technical assistance and conservation incentives to landowners
   C. Keep citizens informed of conservation programs and opportunities
   D. Support community restoration activities

4. Promote citywide green infrastructure
   A. Engage in and promote tree and vegetation planting and maintenance
   B. Utilize and promote sustainable development practices
   C. Integrate open space and environmental considerations into design and development of public infrastructure

Section IV – Policies

Recreation Lands and Facilities

Intent
Recreational lands and facilities provide invaluable benefits to the citizens of Tacoma. The OSHRE goal is to locate, acquire, and manage or improve an equitable and optimal distribution of both neighborhood and communitywide recreational lands and facilities, which provide for a variety of recreational opportunities that are easily accessible. The City will continue to partner with Metro Parks Tacoma and others to plan, develop and manage Tacoma’s parks and recreational facilities.

The improvement or development of both neighborhood parks with features including open turf and informal play fields, play equipment, picnic facilities, pathways and trails, providing residents with close-to-home recreation opportunities, as well as of regional parks, major urban parks, athletic complexes, pools, indoor multi-purpose facilities, and signature attractions which draw users from across and outside the city, both greatly improve quality of life for Tacomans. Special events such as parades, and public events such as farmers’ markets, also add greatly to community vitality.
OS-R-1 Develop and Improve Recreation Opportunities
Acquire, improve and maintain land and facilities valuable for recreation purposes that support the goals of the OSHRPOSHRE, other elements of the Comprehensive Plan and Metro Parks Tacoma’s Strategic Parks and Program Services Plan.

OS-R-2 Meet Community Needs
Work with partners to provide a broad range of recreation opportunities to serve all citizens. Adopt a proactive approach to adapting to changing community preferences, while emphasizing key long term priorities such as enhancing waterfront access and Tacoma’s parks. Customize park design to address the diverse demographic needs of the community.

OS-R-3 Recreational Distribution
Design and locate appropriate recreational developments, facilities and services within areas demonstrating a need for such facilities and services taking care to serve all people fairly and equitably.

OS-R-4 Design and Development
Promote design and development of recreation and open space facilities that provide for play that will enhance Tacoma’s natural setting and that complement the ecology and unique features of the site or area.

OS-R-5 Multiple Use
Encourage compatible, multiple use of open space and recreation facilities.

OS-R-6 Scenic Sites and Vistas
Develop and maintain a system of scenic view sites and vistas in order to take advantage of the natural beauty of Tacoma and its siting in the Puget Sound Region, while respecting and conserving natural features and habitat areas.

OS-R-7 Bicycle Facilities
Locate and develop bicycle and pedestrian facilities that provide on- and off-road recreation for the community.

OS-R-8 Skating Corridors and Facilities
Develop new corridors and facilities for rollerbladers and skateboarders that do not conflict with other recreational uses.

OS-R-9 Public Events and Festivals
Partner with public and private entities to encourage, sponsor and support a range of public activities and events within appropriate open spaces, as well as within temporarily closed streets, such as markets, festivals and parades.

Multi-purpose Trails

Intent
Trails serve both a recreation and an non-motorizedactive transportation function. The OSHRPOSHRE incorporates planning for trails inasmuch as they are recreational facilities contributing to the City’s parks and open space system. TheA non-motorizedactive transportation issues associated with trails arais discussed in the Transportation Element.

Walking and bicycling provide many benefits to individuals as well as to the community. In Tacoma, trails provide opportunities for walking, bicycling, jogging, in-line skating, dog walking and wildlife watching. An integrated, safety-oriented multi-purpose trail increases mobility choices, reduces reliance on single-occupant vehicles, provides convenient access to schools, centers, transit, parks and other destinations, and encourages regular physical activity to enhance health and wellness.

The OSHRPOSHRE Map shows existing and planned trails within the City, as well as missing trail links that would provide valuable connections. Tacoma trails include both low-impact habitat area access trails and non-motorized corridors such as the Scott Pierson and Water Ditch Trails. In addition, the City will support development of segments of regional trails within Tacoma. More discussion of trails
and non-motorized policies can be found in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

OS-T-1  **Trail Corridors**
Develop or partner with others to provide trails and trail corridors both within open space lands and connecting destinations across the City, and create trail linkages with regional trail systems. Coordinate trail planning efforts with public agencies to ensure that city and regional trails connect with major destinations, such as community and regional parks, habitats areas, schools, libraries, business districts and Mixed-use Centers.

OS-T-2  **Non-Motorized Active Transportation System**
Design trails to support and link with the City’s non-motorized transportation system, whenever feasible and appropriate to habitat area sensitivity. Design multi-purpose trails to encourage walking, hiking, bicycling, skateboarding, rollerblading and similar modes of travel.

OS-T-3  **Trail Design**
Design specific trails according to the purposes served and the location. Trails developed primarily for low-impact access to or through habitat areas should be developed to minimize their impact to the environment through location choices, narrower width, and use of pervious surfaces. Pervious pavement and low impact development techniques are preferred, especially within habitat areas. Trails developed as non-motorized transportation corridors should be wide enough for the projected use and developed with a durable hard surface.

OS-T-4  **Hillside Pedestrian Pathways**
In areas where streets are separated by steep slopes which are not ideal for the development of streets, and where public rights-of-way are available, consider development of staircases or paths to create pedestrian connectivity while minimizing the impact on the slope and any natural features present. When appropriate, within downtown and mixed-use centers, pursue opportunities to incorporate urban amenities such as landscaping, plazas or architectural features and/or to incorporate such pedestrian connections as part of an urban park.

---

**Urban Parks in Downtown and Mixed-use Centers**

**Intent**
As the areas planned for the most intense and dense development within the City, downtown and the other mixed-use centers are home to many of Tacoma’s residents as well as where Tacoma residents work, shop, dine and recreate. Attractive, well-designed public parks and open spaces are essential assets to the community and economic vitality of these areas.

Urban parks should be well-designed and fitted to their unique locations. Urban parks and facilities are among the defining characteristics of their neighborhoods and the City as a whole. New recreational facilities in downtown and the centers should be designed to use land efficiently. Small but well-designed parks, plazas, gardens or other open spaces can provide invaluable relief from the built environment, as well as recreational and social opportunities.
Urban parks and open spaces serve multiple purposes and should be designed for flexible and creative uses. Open spaces in dense urban neighborhoods serve as parks, as well as providing viewpoints (such as Fireman’s Park in downtown), extensions of the pedestrian system (such as mid-block staircases or hill-climb assists), gathering places for public events like farmers markets, theatrical events and other functions. Urban park design should integrate building, landscaping, indoor, and outdoor pedestrian areas with easy access to the pedestrian network of the center, and should accommodate a diversity of activities.

Downtown and the centers also provide opportunities to pursue innovative approaches to parks and open space development. Because of the higher land values downtown and in centers, public-private partnerships may be a possibility. Given the complexity of issues within the centers, such projects should typically address multiple goals. In the downtown area, one significant issue is the separation from the waterfront caused by State Route 705. Some innovative examples of multi-functional open spaces include the open space and pedestrian connection between downtown and the Thea Foss Waterway via the Bridge of Glass and Seattle’s Convention Center which is built on top of Interstate 5.

Landscaped sidewalks and widened boulevards are important open spaces for pedestrians, shoppers, diners and others and should be developed attractively according to complete streets principles. Linear parks within streetscapes can be developed and improved with street furniture, gardens, court games, water features, public art and other amenities.

Streets are also valuable temporary open space areas for special events such as parades and farmers’ markets.

Private open spaces such as courtyards, balconies and rooftop gardens play a vital role. The City’s zoning regulations encourage private open space by offering development incentives for the private provision of open space and public amenities. Further discussion of downtown and Mixed-use Centers can be found in the Growth Strategy, Generalized Land Use and Downtown Elements.

**OS-UPMUC-1 Open Space within Centers**
Ensure open space is provided in the Mixed-use Centers as the population in the center increases.

**OS-UPMUC-2 Siting and Design**
Recognize the primary importance of urban parks and open spaces, and invest in well-chosen designs and locations. Provide a range of urban parks suited to their unique locations and accommodating a broad range of activities and park users, ranging from small plazas and gardens to large urban attractions. Park designs should connect with and provide easy access to the pedestrian network of the center.

**OS-UPMUC-3 Identify Open Space Needs within Centers**
Work with the Green Tacoma Partnership, Metro Parks Tacoma, Neighborhood Councils, business district associations, property owners, and residents to identify open space, park, and recreation needs within Mixed-use Centers. Identify potential locations and opportunities for further action and use innovative methods and partnerships to fund the identified needs.

**OS-UPMUC-4 Partner with Public Institutions and Private Landowners**
Recognize and collaborate with public and private organizations, including schools, universities and colleges, utilities, hospitals, churches, businesses and private landowners, some of which have a large footprint incorporating open space and pedestrian features. Explore options for public-private partnerships and other innovative approaches to providing open spaces within centers.

**OS-UPMUC-5 Mechanisms to Create Urban Parks**
Develop zoning incentives, controls and/or funding mechanisms, such as Transfer of Development Rights, to create highly functional urban parks and amenities within Mixed-use Centers, downtown and Planned Residential Developments.

**OS-UPMUC-6 Fee In Lieu Program**
Consider adopting a fee-in-lieu program that would allow development to contribute toward open space, park, community garden, or recreation space within a Mixed-use Center rather than providing on-site open space.
OS-UPMUC-7 Streets and Sidewalks as Temporary Open Space
Support and encourage the use of streets and sidewalks within centers as open space on a temporary or intermittent basis for a range of activities such as markets, festivals, shopping, dining and recreation, while ensuring safety and balancing street and sidewalk use for transportation.

OS-UPMUC-8 Public Streets as Linear Urban Parks
Seek opportunities, including joint ventures with public or private partners, to create a park-like environment within public rights-of-way, incorporating features such as widened sidewalks, street amenities and furniture, and landscape planting. Engage in a collaborative process to identify appropriate streets for such treatment, based upon factors including current uses and travel demand, maintenance issues, adjacent land uses and partnership opportunities.

OS-UPMUC-9 Reconnect the Waterfront
Seek opportunities to re-connect the waterfront to abutting neighborhoods, in particular downtown and the Thea Foss Waterway, through developing multi-functional open spaces, trails and/or recreational facilities that provide or enhance pedestrian connectivity between downtown or other centers and the waterfront.

Green Infrastructure
Intent
To achieve a greener Tacoma, the OSHRE calls for restoring and enhancing environmental functions throughout the City through planting and maintaining trees and landscaping, and reducing impacts from stormwater and environmental pollution. Enhanced vegetation along streets and freeways, as well as on private land, can help create habitat connections that support and expand the habitat areas. Vegetation, such as trees and shrubs, filter air pollutants, help to counteract climate change, produce oxygen, buffer noise, improve pedestrian safety and comfort, and provide beauty and shade. In addition, street trees add a human scale to the built environment and help soften affects of urbanization.

These strategies promote the overall health of the urban forest within which we live and improve the aesthetic experience and image of the City. Habitat areas provide cleaner air and water but their health is in turn affected by runoff, pollutants and other impacts. The benefits are very important to the health and well-being of Tacoma residents, the Puget Sound and the greater region.

These strategies require cooperation among various City departments and public agencies, as well as voluntary actions by businesses and individuals. In publicly-owned areas such as streets and utility easements, the City and its partners will lead by example. Volunteers can play a major role in planting, maintenance and habitat restoration.

Public streets and sidewalks constitute a large percentage of the City’s impervious surface, generating runoff and pollutants. Reducing the amount of impervious surface, implementing low-impact development (LID) stormwater techniques and increasing vegetation planting within City rights-of-way can assist in creating a greener Tacoma. Techniques to accomplish this include reducing the amount of pavement, utilizing pervious pavement, installing rain gardens, and installing traffic circles and medians which can be planted with vegetation. These techniques can also help to achieve traffic calming goals and a better balance.
between vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles, and are part of a “complete streets” approach.

“Complete streets” is a term used to describe streets designed to enable safe, attractive and comfortable access for all users. The City of Tacoma defines “green streets” as a subset of complete streets where implementation of green infrastructure practices such as reducing road widths, utilizing low impact development stormwater techniques and vegetation planting will be prioritized.

Interstate 5 and State Route 16 provide many visitors to Tacoma with their first impressions of the City. Attractive landscaping will greatly improve this impression by signaling to visitors the importance Tacoma places on the environment. Landscaping will provide a buffer from traffic impacts to nearby neighborhoods, as well as provide invaluable habitat functions. In addition to their primary function as transportation corridors, these routes can serve as green corridors connecting habitat areas across the City and beyond.

Other opportunities include engaging in habitat restoration on utility properties and corridors, and trail corridors. Often, utility properties can be maintained in a largely undeveloped state and still serve their utility function. Trail corridors may also include room for vegetation.

Additional discussion can be found in the Environmental Policy, Transportation, Land Use, Neighborhood and Capital Facilities Elements.

OS-GI-1 Green Neighborhoods
Establish an achievable goal to increase the forest canopy cover by 2028 to a citywide percentage that achieves Tacoma’s vision as an environmentally sustainable community. Determine the existing canopy coverage and develop a process to monitor progress toward achieving the identified goal. Amend the Comprehensive Plan to adopt the specific canopy goal once it is established. Achieve 30 percent citywide tree canopy cover by the year 2030, as called for in the Urban Forest Policy Element. Develop a process to monitor progress toward achieving the identified goal. Update the goal as progress is made.

OS-GI-2 Green Streets
Designate specific streets, trails and other public rights-of-way which are the most appropriate for implementation of green infrastructure practices, based on their location, width, traffic volumes, adjacent uses, prominence, potential to enhance habitat connectivity, contiguity with open space areas and/or other considerations. Prioritize those streets for implementation of such measures.

OS-GI-3 Green Corridors
“Green” Tacoma through citizen mobilization, outreach, and education working to identify, designate, and green corridors throughout the city. Provide connections between habitat areas and recreational opportunities through neighborhood green corridors. Use incentives and innovation to achieve canopy cover goals. Partner with local farms and nurseries to offer options for local residents to increase tree plantings in yards.

OS-GI-4 City Leadership
The city will lead by example and seek opportunities for pilot projects and innovative designs that reduce the footprint of construction or infrastructure projects and/or green the city.
OS-GI-5  Tree Planting and Maintenance
Actively engage in tree planting, maintenance of native and climate-adapted trees and plants, and preservation of large trees city-wide. Encourage and work with partners to conserve, plant and maintain trees and landscaping. Prioritize street and freeway rights-of-way, and include utility rights-of-way, parks, school sites, and other public property when appropriate. Trees and landscaping should be appropriate to the location and conditions, and seek to avoid or minimize conflicts with existing public infrastructure and/or utility facilities.

OS-GI-6  Encourage Voluntary Plantings
Develop an incentive and/or outreach program to encourage voluntary plantings of native and climate-adapted trees and plants on private property.

OS-GI-7  Sustainable Development Practices City-wide
Encourage and support sustainable development practices throughout the City, such as low impact development stormwater management, green building and complete streets. Review and update City regulations on an ongoing basis, as new information and opportunities become available, to better achieve outcomes in terms of green infrastructure goals.

OS-GI-8  Streetscape Improvements
Recognize that streets and sidewalks provide a vast amount of public space, and develop complete streets standards and low impact development street sections for creating a balance between pedestrians, bicycles and automobiles, making sidewalks pleasant and functional public spaces, and accommodating low impact development stormwater management.

OS-GI-9  Highway Planting
Partner Engage with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to initiate and convey the high priority Tacoma sets on the quality and timeliness of installing maintain landscape plantings along interstate and highway routes within the City. - It is very important that landscape installation, and ongoing maintenance, be effective in beautifying these vital gateways to Tacoma; enhancing natural function and connectivity within Habitat Corridors; providing effective screening from freeways for sensitive neighborhoods; and, making substantial progress to achieve Tacoma’s urban forestry goals through planting a mix of tree sizes and species, including large height and canopy trees. Prioritize highway planting as it offers a large opportunity for carbon sequestration as well as city beautification.

OS-GI-10  Stormwater Nexus
Recognize and leverage the role that natural open spaces play in achieving stormwater management and water quality goals.
Community Gardens

Intent

Community gardens are locations for individuals to grow food on public or communally held land—an innovative approach to incorporating small-scale agriculture into the lives of city dwellers. Such practices can support Tacoma’s open space goals in a number of ways, including bringing a positive community use to underutilized urban open spaces, adding to the City’s vegetation and green canopy, preventing undesired or illegal activities through fostering community ownership of open spaces, aiding stormwater management by improving soil quality, raising awareness of both urban open space and regional farmland issues, creating a sense of community, and improving health. Community gardens provide residents with access to fresh produce while supporting physical activity and general well-being. The effects of bringing residents together at a literal grassroots level results in a more closely knit, safer and more visually pleasing neighborhood.

Metro Parks Tacoma currently manages three community gardens—Kandle, Franklin and North 21st & Proctor—which at the time of this writing are filled to capacity. Other community gardens, such as Neighbors Park, are run by community groups, nonprofits or educational institutions—and the interest continues to grow.

Strong community interest and programmatic support from the City, MPT and the Pierce Conservation District has lead to a rapid increase in the number of community gardens. Tacoma is now (2014) home to more than 38 community gardens, including 11 on City-owned property. Gardens are managed by the City, MPT, Pierce Conservation District, churches, community groups, schools and other organizations. While demand has been met in some neighborhoods, in others current garden space is not yet sufficient to meet the community’s interest. The public agencies continue to develop the program, with a focus on increasing effectiveness through closer collaboration and shared resources. The Pierce Conservation District’s Harvest Pierce County Program is the primary interface for the public.

OS-CG-1 Community Gardens

Make Tacoma a model for city and community-supported Community Gardens. Support and develop existing and new community gardens within parks and on appropriate public and private lands. Consider Continue to enhance Tacoma’s existing gardens, and support creative approaches to managing community gardens, such as support by education institutions or volunteer management by community organizations.
Waterfront Open Spaces and Shoreline Access

Intent

Tacoma’s shorelines and waterfront areas are a source of economic activity, entertainment and recreation, as well as providing invaluable ecological and cultural functions. As such, the promotion of shoreline access and recreation is a major priority for Tacomans. Recognizing the multiple benefits and values of its shorelines, the City and others have made substantial investments to clean up environmental pollution and improve shoreline access, recreation and cultural opportunities. Major parks and open space improvements have been and continue to be made, including the Thea Foss esplanade and parks, Chinese Reconciliation Park, Ruston Way promenade, Point Defiance Park, Titlow Beach boardwalk, and other sites. Given the strong connection many people feel to shorelines, investments like these will provide benefits that will be enjoyed and appreciated by a great number of people, improving Tacoma’s livability and long-term prosperity.

Waterfront areas attract a variety of people and uses, from community events attracting thousands of people from Tacoma and the region, including the 4th of July and the Tall Ships Festival, to regular visitors seeking recreational and cultural opportunities. For others, shorelines are the site of daily life and a place to meet daily needs—a place where they live, work and travel. Recreation activities on and in the water, including fishing, SCUBA diving and boating, are also important, with marinas and boat launch facilities on the Thea Foss, Point Defiance Park, Titlow Beach and elsewhere. Shoreline areas are also highly valuable as community heritage sites and for the very important environmental and habitat functions they serve.

Shoreline open spaces and parks will only increase in importance as Tacoma grows. Tacoma has a legacy of industrial and railroad development along the shorelines that has reduced public access and environmental functions. At the same time, the Port of Tacoma and other industrial areas are major economic assets to the City. Continued partnerships with a range of stakeholders to reclaim shoreline areas for public access, recreation, educational and interpretive displays, public art, community events, habitat restoration and other open space purposes are important. Further discussion and policies and regulations for shorelines are contained within the City’s Shoreline Master Program (SMP).

To more effectively plan for and implement a unified network of waterfront open spaces, trail systems and recreation facilities, the City has developed a waterfront Public Access Alternatives Plan (PAAL). The PAAL should be utilized for coordinating public and private efforts, prioritizing waterfront public access projects, and guiding permit applications in accordance with the goals and policies of the Shoreline Master Program.

In addition, the Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines ensure that new waterfront access sites are designed with consideration given to the view, aesthetic, and design objectives of the Shoreline Master Program.

The Public Access Alternatives Plan and Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines are...
herein incorporated by reference as implementation strategies of the Comprehensive Plan.

**OS-SH-1 Prioritize Tacoma’s Shorelines and Waters**

Recognize the strong community connection to Tacoma’s shorelines and waters as cultural, historic, recreational, educational, economic, natural and aesthetic assets of tremendous value. Work with partners to undertake a broad range of activities that enhance Tacoma’s identity as a waterfront community, including designating and enhancing shoreline areas for public access, recreation, educational and interpretive displays, public art, community events, habitat restoration and other activities.

**OS-SH-2 Shoreline and Water Access**

Develop opportunities for public access to the Puget Sound for water-oriented recreation and enjoyment of shorelines, including public access to both natural and man-made waterfront features such as beaches, tidelands, wharfs, piers, esplanades, parks, heritage sites, and waterfront trails and paths.

**OS-SH-3 Shoreline and Water Activities**

Develop and enhance opportunities for swimming, boating including use of Tacoma’s water trails, fishing, SCUBA diving, educational activities, wildlife observation and other shoreline and water-dependent activities.

**OS-SH-4 Reconnect Shorelines and Uplands Habitat**

Recognize the critical habitat functions and the loss of historic habitat connectivity between shorelines and upland areas and water courses, and seek to re-create these connections through habitat conservation and restoration efforts.

**OS-SH-5 Shoreline Trail Connections**

Recognizing that many of Tacoma’s existing and planned trails follow the shoreline or connect shoreline and upland areas, partner to develop and maintain trails oriented to the shorelines, slopes and gulches. Development of trails should be coordinated with habitat restoration efforts.

**OS-SH-6 Shoreline Public Access Alternatives**

Implement the priority actions identified in the Shoreline Master Program Public Access Alternatives.

---

**Habitat Areas and Habitat Corridors**

**Intent**

**Open Space.** Habitat Areas are lands that support, nurture and preserve natural wildlife habitats and vegetation. Habitat areas can range in size from a few hundred square feet to many acres and provide a broad range of benefits to the people of Tacoma, including low-impact recreation; health benefits; storm water retention; waterfront access; bird and wildlife observation; climate regulation; increased property values; improved air and water quality; and, a greener, more livable city. Often referred to as “ecosystem services”, these are benefits that, without functional and healthy habitat areas, would not be available or would have to be provided by human actions. Ecosystem services provide not only local benefits, but also enhance the health of the Puget Sound by filtering stormwater and air.

Over time, fragmentation of habitat areas and proliferation of invasive non-native plants in those areas has diminished the value of Tacoma’s open space habitat lands. Non-native species of wildlife have moved in. This is not necessarily an irreversible condition. Over time,
with acquisition, restoration, backyard wildlife
efforts, native wildlife species can
reestablish themselves in urban Tacoma.

Habitat lands add to the quality of our lives in
economic, environmental and public safety
terms. Many open space habitat areas are
undeveloped because they are inherently less
developable. Steep slopes are not only more
expensive to build on, but are also susceptible to
slope failure. Wetlands and riparian corridors are
periodically subject to flooding. Leaving
geo-hazardous and flood-prone areas
undeveloped improves public safety, as well as
allowing the natural systems to perform
functions which benefit the environment.
Vegetation stabilizes steep slopes, reducing
erosion and slope failure. Plants absorb carbon
dioxide and supply oxygen, thus counteracting
human-caused climate change. Foliage captures
dust and airborne pollutants, cleaning the air.
The shade and transpiration of vegetation cools
air and stream temperatures.

Habitat areas, especially in highly developed
urban areas, are often treasured and can be the
focus of community building activities.
Undeveloped places within urban areas often
have groups loosely organized to advocate their
conservation or restoration – or they provide an
opportunity to coalesce such groups. They are a
focus for community building and for
strengthening relationships between neighbors
and public agencies responsible for acquiring,
managing and maintaining them.

Many of the functions and values provided by
habitat areas are dependent on connectivity with
other habitat areas. Habitat Corridors are
generally larger, geographically connected or
tiguous, defined areas that typically combine
multiple habitat functions and features (such as
streams, wetlands, slopes and larger contiguous
habitat areas). Tacoma's Habitat Corridors were
identified based on factors including the size of
the undeveloped area, the presence of
environmental features, potential connectivity
with other habitat areas, and current ownership
and land uses (see map Figures 1 and 2).

The Habitat Corridors contain Tacoma's most
valuable habitat lands. The vision is to conserve
and restore habitat for as much of these areas
as possible. Reflecting their greater degree of
habitat features and connectivity, the designated
Habitat Corridors are considered priority areas
for habitat-related open space programs,
including habitat acquisition and restoration.
Habitat-related open space projects within
Habitat Corridors, all things being equal, will be
given priority over similar efforts outside the
corridors. Habitat areas outside the designated
Habitat Corridors do provide valuable habitat
functions and should also be conserved when
possible. It should be noted that the Corridors
also encompass existing development—if
feasible, such sites should be managed to
enhance the habitat function of the overall
Corridor via vegetation planting and
maintenance and other approaches.

Critical areas regulations pertaining to
development proposals within the designated
Habitat Corridors should be evaluated. For
instance, currently, these regulations apply to
development impacts on steep slopes for
hazards such as slope stability, but do not
consider the habitat value of natural vegetation
and topography. Thus, vegetation removal and
slope stabilization can potentially lead to a
complete loss of habitat functions. The review
should consider regulatory and/or incentive-
based measures to provide greater protection to
undeveloped land within the Habitat Corridors.

OS-HA-1 Citywide Gain In Habitat Functions
Proactively seek not only to reverse the decline
but to achieve the greatest possible gain in
habitat functions city-wide over the next 20
years.
OS-HA-2  Habitat Corridors
Target habitat-related resources and programs within the designated Habitat Corridors—the City's priority areas for habitat conservation and stewardship depicted on the Open Space System Map.

OS-HA-3  Delineate High Value Habitat Lands
Work with the Green Tacoma Partnership and other partners to delineate and designate all habitat lands with high natural habitat values within the City, in order to guide their future land use and management.

OS-HA-4  Acquire, Conserve and Restore Habitat Areas
Acquire ownership or interest in all high value habitat lands depicted on the Open Space System map, or otherwise delineated, by 2028. Proactively seek permanent conservation and restoration. Lands acquired for their habitat functions and values, including new acquisitions and those currently owned by the City, shall be conserved as habitat lands in perpetuity, or in rare circumstances replaced by acquisition and conservation of habitat areas elsewhere in the City of greater habitat value.

OS-HA-5  Funding for Habitat Acquisition
Use innovative, creative methods to fund opportunities to conserve habitat areas. Consideration should be given to developing a fund that would provide match for any privately raised funds.

OS-HA-6  Low-impact Access and Recreation
Develop low-impact access and recreation/education opportunities within publicly-owned habitat areas, such as hiking, bird and wildlife observation, and waterfront access, when such access is desired by the public, appropriate to the habitat and site conditions and will minimize or avoid impacts to the habitat. Seek to prevent public access, including off-leash pets, that is harmful to habitat functions. Access is not appropriate to sites that contain endangered species or other similarly sensitive features.

OS-HA-7  Sustainable Development Practices for City Properties within Corridors
Strive to minimize development of new public infrastructure and improvements on valuable habitat lands within the designated Habitat Corridors. On-going maintenance, alterations and redevelopment of currently developed sites is acceptable. However, new development, with the exception of low-impact recreation or environmental education facilities such as interpretative signage and trails, of previously undeveloped city-owned habitat lands is strongly discouraged and should be considered only if other feasible alternatives are not available. When new development of such lands is deemed necessary, design and construct, to the extent feasible, to minimize the impacts to habitat functions through use of low impact development stormwater techniques, alternative routes and siting, green building techniques and other approaches.

OS-HA-8  Conserve Threatened Properties
Partner with non-profits, private parties and public agencies to conserve habitat areas from development both permanently and temporarily, until such time as they may be permanently conserved.
OS-HA-9  Habitat Area Acquisition Strategy

Habitat area acquisition strategy and alternatives ranking will place the highest priority on acquiring properties with the following characteristics:

- A high degree of habitat health and quality, location within Habitat Corridors, presence of threatened or endangered species or habitats, presence of wetlands, stream, lake or shoreline, and the probability of loss of the property.

- Also significant in ranking are the site’s habitat restoration potential, offered sale price, and manageability issues.

- Of lesser but still relevant significance are the site’s proximity to other protected sites, the presence of a volunteer restoration group, whether the site serves one or more valuable open space functions in addition to providing habitat, whether conservation of the site would support habitat health within or near a designated Wetland or Stream of Local Significance, and whether the site is within an area underserved by open space.

OS-HA-10  Habitat Restoration Strategy

Habitat restoration strategy and alternatives ranking will place highest priority on areas with the greatest potential to reach their target habitat community and condition, and will factor in costs, available resources, and the presence of a volunteer stewardship group. Restoration shall be completed according to applicable Best Management Practices.

OS-HA-11  Habitat Stewardship Outreach and Training

Continue to partner with other public and non-profit organizations to inform citizens of the stewardship needs of habitat areas, and to develop, offer and support habitat restoration training opportunities and practical information resources. Develop effective, innovative and collaborative programs with an emphasis on empowering volunteers by providing guidance, oversight, tools and support tailored to fostering volunteerism and achieving the desired habitat restoration outcomes.
OS-HA-12 Development Standards within Habitat Corridors
Identify potential regulatory and/or incentive-based approaches to providing greater protection for the habitat functions of habitat lands located within the designated Habitat Corridors. Update regulations, if appropriate.

OS-HA-13 Habitat Corridor Identity and Connections
Engage in and encourage activities that improve environmental connectivity, enhance the profile of, and encourage public access to Habitat Corridors, including converting landscaped areas on developed sites to native plantings and expanding such landscaped areas, and developing interpretive signage and thematic streetscape design features.

Critical Areas Preservation

Intent
The GMA requires that local jurisdictions adopt regulations based on the best available science that ensure there will be no net loss in critical areas functions and values, which the City has accomplished through adoption of the Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance (CAPO). Open space habitat areas often contain critical areas such as streams, wetlands, steep slopes, and animal and plant habitat. Thus, there is a strong link between the City’s environmental and open space goals and the CAPO.

The CAPO requires that activities that have impacts on wetlands or streams mitigate those impacts. However, mitigation options are often limited if the site is small or disconnected from other wetlands or streams. The designation of the Habitat Corridors creates the framework for allowing required mitigation to occur within an area that has been pre-identified as having a higher priority for mitigation. Thus, the positive benefits from the mitigation can be magnified by concentrating them within Tacoma’s most valuable habitat areas. This landscape approach can in certain situations be more effective than the standard approach which emphasizes onsite, in kind mitigation. Another application of this concept is a fee-in-lieu program for wetlands, which allows mitigation to occur offsite by collecting a fee which will be used to pay for mitigation in a pre-designated site within the Habitat Corridors.

Streamlining the permit process for voluntary restoration activities occurring within critical areas or their required buffers, and utilizing Best Management Practices, will facilitate such efforts while ensuring they are done right—without inadvertently harming sensitive environments.

In addition, the development of voluntary Habitat Management Plans (HMPs), which can be used in lieu of full permitting processes for habitat restoration activities, can help facilitate restoration. “Backyard Wilds” HMPs would focus on providing approved example plans for individual homeowners that wish to remove invasive vegetation and replant native vegetation within wetland, stream or fish and wildlife habitat conservation area buffers. Community HMP’s would focus on providing a process for larger, more complex plans to be adopted or approved through a formal process. Metro Parks or Municipal HMP’s would focus on formally designated, larger open spaces such as an entire gulch or stream corridor. The HMPs would incorporate streamlined permitting and provide ongoing guidance for restoration activities.

OS-CAPO-1 Advanced Mitigation of Wetland/Stream Impacts
Develop regulations to allow the use of advanced mitigation techniques, including offsite mitigation accomplished within pre-identified mitigation sites and mitigation banks.
OS-CAPO-2 Fee In Lieu Program
Develop a fee in lieu program, to include wetlands and their buffers, and riparian corridor areas of streams, that directs required mitigation eligible for fees in lieu to appropriate high value habitat areas within the Habitat Corridors. Funds collected shall be adequate to mitigate permitted impacts, and commensurate with those impacts.

OS-CAPO-3 Streamlined Permitting Process for Restoration
Continue to review regulations to identify opportunities to streamline permitting for restoration projects, including invasive species control, hazard tree removal, and other standard restoration activities, while ensuring that impacts to critical areas and their buffers are avoided. Update regulations, if appropriate.

OS-CAPO-4 Habitat Management Plans
Continue to develop regulations and a supporting review criteria and framework for Habitat Management Plans that support and streamline habitat restoration activities.

Administration and Operation

A key objective of the OSHRE is to provide guidance for public agencies responsible for acquiring, restoring, developing and/or managing open space lands and facilities. The following sections contain policy guidance on these administrative and operational issues. The policies apply most directly to Tacoma’s Open Space Program, but some are pertinent to the open space-related decisions of other City departments. The policies may also be useful for other public and private parties, in particular for City coordination with Metro Parks Tacoma.

Strategic Action Program/Implementation and Funding

Intent

The City’s Open Space Program is responsible for pursuing the achievement of the City’s open space goals, and administers funds dedicated to that purpose. Policy guidance is necessary in order to enable the Program to be consistently effective in terms of utilizing funds and resources, identifying new funding strategies, and prioritizing and scheduling implementation actions.

Several City departments work in collaboration to achieve the objectives of the OSHRE, in partnership with MPT, Pierce Conservation District and other public agencies. In general, MPT is the primary provider of parks and recreation amenities. Pierce Conservation District is in a primary role for Community Gardens. For the City’s part, the Environmental Services Department is in the lead for natural open space conservation and restoration, and the Planning and Development Services Department promotes active recreation. The City, Metro Parks and other agencies collaborate in multiple ways, and continue to explore collaborative approaches to better achieve Tacoma’s parks and open space vision and goals.

Furthermore, a structured approach to developing and cooperatively implementing a work program, and to monitoring progress, promises to greatly improve results. The following policies provide guidance on the creation, funding and administration of such an approach—the OSHRP Strategic Action Program. Further guidance is contained in Section V – Implementation.
OS-PF-1  **Strategic Action Program Collaborative Implementation**

Develop and implement a **Strategic Action Program collaborative strategy** that directs implementation of the OSHRPOSHRE, by identifying tasks and short-term objectives and specifying timing, funding and responsibilities for each. Develop an ongoing monitoring and reporting approach for progress in implementing the Program.

OS-PF-2  **Open Space Funding Allocation**

The City’s Open Space Fund will be utilized toward the achievement of the OSHRPOSHRE vision and goals. The Open Space Fund will be spent, as allocated in the OSHRPE Strategic Action Program, for the acquisition, restoration, development and management of open space lands and facilities, with a smaller portion allocated toward planning, outreach and education. The Wetland Mitigation Fund will be used to acquire property and/or enhance wetland and/or stream functions in order to achieve a net gain in such functions.

OS-PF-3  **Identify New Funding Sources**

Recognizing that an increase in funding is essential to the timely achievement of the goals of the OSHRPOSHRE, identify and pursue new funding sources and strategies. New funding sources may include new allocations of City funds, funding from other public agencies, public bond measures, grants, non-profit or private sources, and/or other sources, as well as innovative funding mechanisms such as a Transfer of Development Rights program.

OS-PF-4  **Leverage Funding**

Utilize City funds to leverage other funding sources whenever feasible, including funds from state and federal agencies, loans, foundation gifts, grants, and private donations.

OS-PF-5  **Capital Recommendations**

Potential acquisitions, development projects and other open space habitat and recreation investments should be evaluated using the following prioritization criteria: Consistency with the goals and policies of the OSHRPOSHRE and other Comprehensive Plan elements; responsiveness to City Council priorities; ongoing maintenance and cost impacts; citizen input; multiple benefits served by the project; the availability of special funding; affordability and cost/benefit analysis; positive neighborhood impacts; suitability of the site; the geographic distribution of similar features; long-term economic impacts; and, the possibility of losing a distinct opportunity.

OS-PF-6  **Surface Water Funds**

Dedicated funds generated through surface water fees will be utilized to conserve, restore and manage the City’s natural Open Space Inventory, pursuant to achieving surface water management goals.
Citizen Involvement, Public Outreach and Education

**Intent**
Citizen involvement in the provision and maintenance of open space is vital to a successful open space program. Involvement can occur in many different ways. Numerous committees, boards, and advisory groups provide citizen comment and review on a variety of related topics. Citizens are also involved in planning, stewardship, maintenance and security, fundraising and advocating, and of course visiting, utilizing and enjoying habitat and recreation lands and facilities. Community groups take a direct hand in open space conservation through volunteer work parties, donations and advocacy.

**OS-CI-1 Promote Citizen Involvement**
Foster and empower citizen involvement in planning, locating and utilizing recreational services and facilities in accordance with the needs and desires of those to be served, as well as in initiating, planning and participating in habitat restoration activities.

**OS-CI-2 Volunteer Stewardship**
Support and empower citizens and community groups to adopt local habitat areas in order to engage in restoration activities. Support existing and new volunteer stewardship programs including but not limited to those established by the Metro Parks Tacoma (CHIP-in!), Citizens for a Healthy Bay (Adopt-A-Wildlife Area program, Storm Water Education program, and Citizen Keeper program), City of Tacoma Adopt-A-Spot and Splash Grant programs, Washington State Department of Transportation Adopt-A-Highway program, and others.

Partnerships

**Intent**
Given the scarcity of funding and staff resources for open space purposes, there is a real need to develop cooperative approaches that allow pooling of those resources. No single agency, nor indeed the public sector as a whole, has sufficient resources to achieve the OSHRPOSHRE vision. For this reason, cooperative arrangements and partnerships between public, private and non-profit entities and individuals are necessary. Another reason for partnerships is that natural features and trail corridors often span jurisdictional boundaries as well as multiple public and private ownerships.

The City of Tacoma and Metro Parks Tacoma are two of many agencies, organizations and individuals involved with parks, recreation and habitat conservation and stewardship in Tacoma. The following is a representative list: There are state agencies (Departments of Fish and Wildlife, Ecology and Transportation, the Recreation and Conservation Office, the Washington State Historical Society); other local governments (Pierce County, Port of Tacoma, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department, Tacoma Public Utilities, Tacoma Housing Authority); educational institutions (Tacoma School District, Tacoma Community College, University of Puget Sound, Pacific Lutheran University, Evergreen State College, University of Washington Tacoma); non-profit organizations (Citizens for a Healthy Bay, Tahoma Audubon Society, Cascade Land Conservancy, Sierra Club, Puget Creek Restoration Society) and site specific neighborhood groups. Each has particular interests, resources and responsibilities.

Joint use and planning for achieving multiple purposes should be pursued whenever possible, while ensuring that activities are complementary and enhance habitat and recreation goals. Joint use and planning can provide opportunities to meet multiple goals on a single site, such as habitat enhancement within a high-impact recreation park or utility property. In many cases, such cooperation can lead to efficiency gains as well as helping to create vibrant, interesting and attractive spaces where a range of activities and facilities work together synergistically. Joint use and planning is not limited only to public agencies—private
organizations, businesses and land owners will be an integral part of the open space program.

Parks, habitat areas, trails and other features don’t typically end at the city limits. Habitat areas, in particular, follow the lay of the land rather than political boundaries or agency service areas. This highlights a need to coordinate with Tacoma’s neighboring jurisdictions and other political entities. The OSHRPOSHRE Map designates Habitat Corridors within the City, and also shows where those habitat areas extend across Tacoma’s borders into neighboring jurisdictions. The map also indicates opportunities for Tacoma to connect to regional trails.

Open Space Current Use Assessments are a program authorized by State law (RCW 84.34) to encourage and support private land conservation efforts. Current Use Assessments reduce the property tax burden on landowners who agree to conserve the open space qualities of their property. Only areas valuable as open space, and meeting state, county and local criteria, are eligible and the reduction is proportional to the public benefits of retaining the site as open space. High taxes can create a perverse incentive to develop open space properties. Current Use Assessments can be effective when public funds for conservation are limited and purchase of property or property rights is not currently possible. The cost to the public is relatively small and is proportional to the public benefits in each case. Thus, Current Use Assessments are a useful tool that can help retain open space until such time as it can be permanently conserved.

OS-P-1 Coordinate Efforts
Coordinate and cooperate with federal, state, regional and local governmental jurisdictions, non-profits and the private sector, as well as with other City departments, on the full spectrum of strategies to conserve, restore and manage our natural resources and to develop high quality recreation opportunities.

OS-P-2 Cooperation beyond Tacoma’s Borders
Work with adjacent jurisdictions, state and federal agencies, and non-profit organizations to conserve and restore habitat areas that transcend the City borders, to develop and connect to regional trails, and to explore opportunities to cooperate in planning and development of recreational opportunities.

OS-P-3 Green Tacoma Partnership
Work with the Green Tacoma Partnership and other partners to implement the habitat conservation and stewardship goals of the OSHRP.

OS-P-4 Private Organizations and Individuals
Encourage private citizens, landowners, businesses and organizations to provide recreation and open space lands or facilities for public purposes through the dedication of land or easements, private conservation efforts, donations to open space programs, sponsorship of recreational or habitat restoration activities and other actions.

OS-P-5 Joint Use for Habitat Restoration
Partner with public and private landowners to support and encourage habitat restoration on properties, such as utility corridors or sites with critical areas, which are intended to remain relatively undeveloped and can support significant habitat functions.

OS-P-6 Current Use Assessment
Encourage and support the use of the Open Space Current Use Assessment program for privately owned sites valuable as open space. Inform the public of the program and seek opportunities to streamline the review process.
Citywide Conservation Approach

Intent

The reality of habitat conservation efforts is that available funding and staffing resources rarely keep pace with the need. To illustrate this point, Tacoma’s 1965-1975 Open Space Plan indicated the City’s estimate of approximately 800 acres of open space for conservation. Though progress has been made today, the majority of those areas remain unprotected. Tacoma has a long way to go to conserve the majority of its most valuable habitat areas.

Fundamentally, the attempt to conserve Tacoma’s habitat areas is a race against the clock—development and other impacts, many of them effectively irreversible, are sure to continue as time goes on. Given this inherent urgency, efforts to remove barriers, reduce costs and streamline processes for open space acquisition, management and restoration are needed.

Some examples of practices and procedures that can have significant implications for open space habitat areas include street vacations, the surplus and sale of public property, subdivision requirements, the regulation of critical areas and utility fees. When appropriate, permit application fees could be waived for publicly beneficial permit applications. (This is already the practice with some affordable housing permit fees).

Stormwater utility fees that are charged to all property, including open space parcels, place a burden on limited funds, although habitat areas do not generate but rather infiltrate stormwater since they are undeveloped and vegetated.

Undeveloped properties located within designated Habitat Corridors in public ownership should be reviewed to determine whether such properties are important in meeting the mission of the department that owns title. If not, then the properties should be considered for inclusion in the Open Space Inventory and permanently conserved as habitat lands. Likewise, properties currently on the Open Space Inventory which are located outside the Habitat Corridors and/or provide little value as open space, could be transferred to another use or sold.

OS-CW-1 Street Vacation and Surplus Property Process

Recognizing that street vacation requests and City property identified as surplus often pertain to habitat areas, the City will take steps to ensure that such processes are reviewed in light of the goals of the OSHRE. Sites and properties located within the designated Habitat Corridors should, whenever feasible, be retained by the City and conserved as habitat areas.
OS-CW-2  **Transfer of General Government Property Designating Public Property as Open Space**

General Government properties located within the designated Habitat Corridors that are deemed unnecessary for the department holding title’s primary mission, should be considered for transfer to the Open Space Inventory for conservation and stewardship purposes. Easements and other encumbrances may be retained if necessary for onsite utilities or other reasons. Likewise, properties currently on the Open Space Inventory which provide little value as open space should be transferred to another use or sold.

City properties and public rights-of-way located within designated Habitat Corridors that are deemed unnecessary for the managing department’s primary mission, shall be evaluated for designation as open space. If the best use of such lands is as open space, then consideration shall be given to transferring management responsibility to the public entity best positioned to manage them for conservation and restoration purposes, including through transfer to the Open Space Inventory, to MPT, or another responsible entity. Easements and other encumbrances may be retained if necessary for onsite utilities or other reasons.

**OS-CW-3  Streamline Processes and Reduce Costs**

Given the scarcity of funds and resources available for habitat area acquisition, restoration and maintenance, City fees and processes should be reviewed and modified when feasible to ensure that the minimum administrative cost is borne by public funds intended for conservation and restoration.

---

**Acquisition and Management of Land and Facilities**

**Intent**

The following policies provide guidance for the acquisition, development, management and maintenance of open space lands and facilities—the range of actions for which open space lands and facilities managers are responsible. Such guidance is necessary in order to ensure consistency and effectiveness in the implementation of the City’s Open Space Program, and will also provide pertinent policy guidance to other City departments responsible for activities on or affecting open space lands and/or facilities. Finally, this guidance will be useful for other public and private parties seeking to effectively and consistently manage open space lands and facilities. These policies apply generally to all types of habitat and recreational lands and facilities managed under the OSHRP.

**Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)** is an innovative policy tool for achieving public goals, including conservation of open space. TDR uses a voluntary, market-based approach to move development rights from areas where growth is deemed less appropriate, such as farms, natural lands, historic sites, parks and recreation areas, into areas where infrastructure, roads, schools, parks and services are available to support development. Development rights are purchased from landowners in “sending areas”, in exchange for a covenant that prevents future development of the property. The development rights are then used to purchase an increase in development potential within “receiving areas,” such as urban centers where more growth is planned. Tacoma’s Generalized Land Use Element calls for Tacoma to cooperatively explore options for development of a TDR program, and indicates that if such a program is developed, the mixed-use centers are appropriate “receiving areas” for the transfer of development rights from other locations in the City, county and region. Such transfers could potentially occur within or between Mixed-Use Centers if appropriate sending sites are identified within them.

**OS-LF-1  Acquisitions**

Purchase or accept donations of land or interests in land suitable for habitat and/or recreation, according to the acquisition process and ranking criteria outlined in the OSHRPOSHRE and Strategic Action Program. Avoid accepting land that has little value as open space or carries management liabilities that outweigh the benefits to the public of City ownership.
OS-LF-2 Open Space Inventory
Maintain an official inventory of City-owned open space properties. Properties on this inventory shall, whenever feasible, be permanently conserved for open space purposes and managed according to the policies of the OSHRE. Properties shall not be removed from the inventory unless it is verified that they were added in error or determined that they do not provide significant open space benefits, they are being transferred to another party which will maintain them in permanent conservation or, in rare circumstances, they will be replaced by the addition of lands of significantly greater habitat or other open space value.

OS-LF-3 Long-term Additions to Publicly Beneficial Open Space
Develop zoning and other approaches to ensure the provision of publicly beneficial open space when redevelopment occurs.

OS-LF-4 Adaptive Management
Plan for ongoing land management at the land acquisition stage, incorporating the principle of adaptive management to allow for changing conditions or new information.

OS-LF-5 Best Management Practices
Develop and use Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the management and maintenance of habitat lands. BMPs will provide guidance on the full spectrum of issues pertinent to ongoing habitat land management. The City of Tacoma and its partners shall strive to fully implement the BMPs through management of publicly-owned habitat lands, and will support and encourage all property owners to implement them. BMPs will be updated according to advances in the field and science.

OS-LF-6 Coordinated Management Plans
Partner with public and private entities, including community groups, to develop coordinated management plans for specific habitat lands, incorporating a holistic approach to managing the unique challenges and opportunities for joint use, public access, habitat restoration and social issues. Such site-based plans may be integrated with Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance Habitat Management Plans when critical areas are present.

OS-LF-7 Renovation, Maintenance, and Security
Seek to ensure that Tacoma’s open space system provides a sense of security, safety, and well-being for its users. Partner with Metro Parks Tacoma and other stakeholders to address concerns. Proactively seek to eliminate illegal activities such as dumping, transient encampments, littering and graffiti by fostering positive community engagement in the area, application of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, and other means. Recognize that community engagement is the best way to ensure safety.

OS-LF-8 Historic, Cultural, and Art Resources
Pursue incorporation, preservation and, if appropriate, display of historic, cultural and art resources within open spaces. Adopt formalized policies, procedures and criteria for accepting, siting, and designing public art, interpretive displays, historical monuments, commemorative displays, or other cultural or artistic installations within publicly-owned open space and parks. The presence of historic and/or cultural features supports the conservation of an area as open space.

OS-LF-9 Site Amenities
Provide well-designed, barrier-free and appropriate access and amenities at parks and facilities intended for public access, such as lighting, seating, drinking fountains, trash receptacles, bicycle racks, and shelters. Provide internal pathways connecting park elements and features within high-impact recreational areas.
OS-LF-10 Accommodate Non-motorized Active Transportation
Design and develop recreation lands and facilities, as appropriate to each site, to accommodate and encourage non-motorized travel modes, including walking, hiking, bicycling, skateboarding and rollerblading. Accommodate non-motorized travel to and within recreation areas, and provide ample bicycle parking at high-impact recreation sites.

OS-LF-11 Way-Finding System
Provide consistent and easily understood “way-finding” features using common architectural elements, maps, and signage to connect trails, recreation facilities, and habitat corridors with public access. Where appropriate, develop interpretive displays reflecting the historic, cultural and ecological features of the site.

OS-LF-12 Scenic Views – Private Benefit
Topping of public trees for private view benefit shall not be allowed, or removal of public trees for the purposes of retaining or creating private views should not be allowed unless as part of a coordinated plan developed by the public landowner that achieves view, habitat, environmental, slope stability and other objectives. Limited reduction pruning that does not substantially impact tree health may be considered, but limited pruning may be allowed for this purpose. The selective thinning of limbs can allow a view of an object from a predetermined point by opening “windows” through trees for a view, but such pruning must be limited to less than 20 percent of any tree’s live crown within any five-year period, to preserve the health of the tree. No view pruning will be allowed in critical areas or their buffers unless as part of a coordinated approach resulting in net habitat enhancement for the area.

OS-LF-13 Scenic Views – Public Benefit
Preserve and enhance existing public scenic views, vistas and landscape panoramas as established in the Urban Forest Policy Element (Policy UF-SA-1) or other adopted policies. Involve the public in the ongoing refinement of this list. A public survey, or other suitable public involvement techniques such as comprehensive, shoreline, or neighborhood planning, should be used to identify and nominate additional public natural and/or scenic views. Seek mechanisms to protect significant public views when planning and reviewing public and private development proposals. New planting on public property should consider potential impact on public views and seek a balance between view and habitat restoration objectives.

OS-LF-14 Harvesting of Secondary Forest Products
Harvesting of secondary forest products from City-owned open space lands shall be for personal use only. Any harvesting that has a significant negative impact on habitat health is prohibited. Commercial harvesting on City-owned land is prohibited, unless as part of a City-sanctioned site management plan.

OS-LF-15 Transfer of Development Rights
Utilize the City’s TDR Program to conserve valuable city and regional assets, and continue to develop and enhance the program. Lands meeting the City’s criteria for conservation which are located within the designated Habitat Corridors, and lands achieving other open space goals of this Plan, are appropriate “sending areas” for the transfer of development rights to other locations in the City, county and region.

OS-LF-16 Landscape Conservation and Local Infrastructure Program
Implement LCLIP, a state authorized policy tool combining TDR with tax increment financing, to bring resources to bear that can support Tacoma’s conservation goals.
Plans for Specific Areas

Over time, the City and partners will improve the capacity to achieve the goals of this Element by developing plans for specific areas. This list is intended for larger, signature parks and open space sites. It is not exhaustive, and is intended to be updated regularly. Other public agencies, in particular Metro Parks Tacoma, maintain separate projects lists which should be consulted as well. The plans are available from the City Planning and Development Services Department.

Inclusion in this section is intended to convey the City Council’s support for and recognition of the policy direction in these plans, and to convey that they are planning and implementation priorities. Inclusion in this section lends support to applications for City approvals such as Conditional Use Permits, Rezones and Development Regulation Agreements meeting the intent of these plans, as well as the policies of the OSHRE. This section also provides a forum for the Council to refine their policy direction on a given site, in consultation with the Planning Commission and other stakeholders.

OS-SP-1 MPT Green Vision 2030
MPT’s 2012 update to their 2006 Strategic Plan provides the Parks District’s plans for their parks and open space system.

OS-SP-2 Point Defiance Park
MPT’s conceptual plan for their signature 768-acre park, referred to as Destination Point Defiance, was developed over multiple years with broad public input and support. It includes commercial, educational and recreational features (including the zoo, a lodge, eating establishments, gift shops, a visitor’s center, additional pavilion buildings, a farmers market, entertainment and educational facilities, and bike and kayak rental facilities) that broaden the use of the park and expand its function as a unique destination.

While the current (2014) Land Use Intensity Designation is Low, the City recognizes the unique role that Point Defiance Park plays as a citywide and regional destination. Therefore, or until the Land Use Designation changes, alternative review processes such as Development Regulation Agreements may provide an appropriate avenue for City review of more intensive, destination-oriented features within the park.

OS-SP-3 First Creek Action Plan
In 2011-12 the City collaborated with community stakeholders to develop a consensus vision and framework for action to improve East Tacoma’s 3.5 mile First Creek corridor. The plan identifies actions to be implemented by multiple stakeholders over a 5-10 year planning period.

OS-SP-4 Wapato Hills Conceptual Plan
In 2013 the City and MPT collaborated to update the 1996 conceptual plan for the 80-acre Wapato Hills. The final conceptual plan recognizes that Wapato Hills functions primarily as a natural area for recreational walking on a system of trails and viewpoints. The conceptual plan also includes the existing park in the southwest corner and a proposed visitor center on the eastern side.

OS-SP-5 Downtown Subarea Plans
From 2011 to 2014, the City has worked to develop the South Downtown, Hilltop and North Downtown Subarea Plans and EIS’s. The South Downtown Plan and EIS was adopted in 2013 and the others are scheduled for adoption in 2014. These plans provide thorough guidance on open space and recreation issues and priorities.

OS-SP-6 Shoreline Public Access Alternatives
In 2013 the City adopted updates to the Shoreline Master Program (SMP), including the Shoreline Public Access Alternatives. This plan thoroughly addresses open space and recreation issues and priorities in Tacoma’s Shoreline Districts.

OS-SP-7 Tacoma Landfill Land Use Plan
This 1998 plan represents incorporation of ideas gathered for the future uses of the closed portions of the City Landfill. The plan reports that over 151 acres will eventually be filled and capped. After landfilling ceases, much of the area may be utilized as a recreation and open space asset.

OS-SP-8 Port of Tacoma Public Access Plan
In 2013 the Port Commission adopted a public access plan to identify specific needs and opportunities to provide public shoreline access.
The plan will guide Port actions to meet the City of Tacoma’s SMP requirements for the Port to provide public access to shorelines.

OS-SP-9 Swan Creek Master Plan

Swan Creek Park is a 383-acre greenspace nestled on the boundary between East Tacoma and Pierce County with a salmon bearing stream, wooded canyon, upland forest, paved and natural trails, and a community garden. In 2011 MPT adopted a long-term vision and plan for future site development, stewardship, and programming.
Section V – Implementation

This section provides guidance for the development and implementation of the Strategic Action Program OSHRE.

The OSHRE is an action-oriented plan, and actions will be phased over the 20 year planning horizon. The OSHRE is somewhat distinct from most other Comprehensive Plan elements in that it is also the guidance document for a specific City program—the Open Space Program.

OSHRP Strategic Action Program

The City will collaborate, in coordination with multiple partners including Metro Parks Tacoma, the Green Tacoma Partnership, the Tacoma School District, the Pierce Conservation District and others to implement this plan and other partners will develop a Strategic Action Program to assist in achievement of the OSHRP goals. To make that collaboration effective, joint planning and coordination on many levels is warranted. The OSHRP is somewhat distinct from most other Comprehensive Plan elements in that it is also the guidance document for a specific City program—the Open Space Program.

The OSHRP is an action-oriented plan, and actions will be phased over the 20 year planning horizon. The OSHRP is somewhat distinct from most other Comprehensive Plan elements in that it is also the guidance document for a specific City program—the Open Space Program.

The OSHRP is an action-oriented plan, and actions will be phased over the 20 year planning horizon. The OSHRP is somewhat distinct from most other Comprehensive Plan elements in that it is also the guidance document for a specific City program—the Open Space Program.

The Strategic Action Program is the guidance document for the utilization of the City Open Space Fund, Wetland Mitigation Fund, and other funds allocated in the future. The Program will be reviewed and updated, typically on a biennial basis, by City staff in coordination with Open Space Program partners. This review will include a progress report summarizing success in completing the tasks identified in the Program for the 2 previous years.

While the Strategic Action Program will incorporate activities related to the full range of open space goals, the primary focus of the City’s Open Space Program is on habitat-related efforts. The Strategic Action Program will be coordinated with MPT’s Strategic Plan, which serves as the primary guidance for implementation of recreation-related goals.

Measuring and Reporting Progress

The OSHRP is both a long range and a results-oriented plan for the shorter term. Therefore, in order to gain an understanding of its effectiveness, the OSHRP calls for ongoing monitoring and reporting of progress. This practice will provide invaluable feedback to be used to refine the approach and improve
results. In addition, monitoring and reporting on both successes and challenges will increase the accountability of the City and its partner agencies, and help build public knowledge and understanding of issues, goals and challenges.

A “progress report card” approach will be used to measure success and effectiveness in implementing OSHRPOSHRE goals for habitat areas. The report card will summarize the most important outcomes, i.e., acres of habitat areas placed in conservation status, acres of habitat areas restored, and provision of low-impact recreation and access to habitat areas. The progress report card will also report on achievement of city-wide green infrastructure strategies, trail development, code updates and other goals. Finally, the progress report should also report on achievements in developing the Open Space Program’s organizational capacity, including development of partnerships, education and outreach efforts, and new or leveraged sources of funding.

Volunteer Coordination and Management

Volunteers have long played a major role in Tacoma’s habitat restoration, community gardens, park cleanups and other efforts. That role is expected to grow. The OHSRP is based on the premise that public agencies alone cannot achieve the goals and vision. The City recognizes that public agencies alone cannot achieve the goals and vision. One of the major purposes of the OSHRP, and will strive to provide support and direction to empower volunteer efforts, and to ensure that volunteer restoration is accomplished according to the appropriate best management practices. Active volunteer restoration activities have additional benefits, including increased community presence and sense of ownership of habitat areas, discouragement of unwanted or illegal activities, and building an active constituency in support of open space issues.

Volunteer coordination, training and management is a key function under the OSHRP Strategic Action Plan. The City, Metro Parks Tacoma and the Green Tacoma Partnership will work together to provide leadership and support to existing and new volunteer groups.

Education and Outreach

Public education and outreach is a very important strategy to promote open space goals, another core function identified under the OSHRP Strategic Action Program. Education can include training of volunteer stewards who help maintain or restore habitat value to open space properties. Environmental education can be a full time job, as well, coordinating with schools, writing curricula and organizing educational opportunities and programs. The City, Metro Parks Tacoma and the Green Tacoma Partnership all conduct this activity and should formulate a coordinated approach. In addition, the open space partners should coordinate with ongoing efforts from other departments and agencies, including the City’s EnviroChallenger program and Metro Parks Tacoma’s Environmental Education Program, the Zoological and Environmental Education Program, and the Surface Water Utility Public Education Program.
The **Green Tacoma Partnership**, or a future organization filling a similar function, is the ideal organization well positioned to coordinate education and outreach programs for the habitat-related functions of the **OSHRE**, as well provide the support and training functions for a coordinated stewardship program. The GTP could support restoration activities *in multiple ways, including* by creating a library of education and outreach materials for use by local stewardship groups. This can conserve resources that are better spent on other projects and will help to create a unified image for the coordinated programs.

### Ongoing Review of the OSHRP Strategic Action Program

The **OSHRP Management Team** is an inter-agency and inter-departmental work group which has led the effort and done the work of crafting this plan. The group includes key staff from the Green Tacoma Partnership, Metro Parks Tacoma and the City of Tacoma. As such, the team has a unique familiarity with the issues and expertise in the pertinent fields. In particular, the group should provide key input into updates to the **Strategic Action Program**, and coordinate regularly on the work tasks currently underway.

It is very important to provide effective forums for stakeholders to provide input. The City and partners should coordinate through the Green Tacoma Partnership and other avenues to solicit public input. In addition, printed and web-based materials should be developed to inform and engage the public. Consideration may be given in the future to other approaches, such as supporting a community-based advisory group, will be vital to future plan amendments and **Strategic Action Program** updates. The Green Tacoma Partnership is an ideal forum to provide that input. The GTP represents a broad spectrum of community groups and professionals and has a broad expertise and perspective on open space issues. The GTP, or a future organization filling a similar function, will serve on an ad hoc basis, providing input and guidance as needed on policy and program issues. The coordinating body of the GTP, the **GTP Steering Committee**, will coordinate opportunities for GTP review and participation.

### Section VI – Open Space Maps

The maps on the following pages depict the City of Tacoma's open space system. The maps are based on an inventory updated and maintained by the Community and Economic Development Department.
This map shows Tacoma’s existing and planned system of open space lands and facilities. The areas indicated are public open spaces valuable for the habitat and/or recreation benefits they provide - including recreation lands, habitat areas and restoration sites, schools and community gardens. Also shown are private cemeteries and golf courses, recreation facilities, and existing, planned and potential trails, including water trails. The Habitat Corridors contain the City’s most valuable undeveloped habitat areas - generally areas that are larger, connected or contiguous to other habitat areas, and combining multiple valuable functions and features (such as wetlands, streams, slopes and forests). Potential Joint Habitat Planning Areas are areas where habitat features span the City’s borders, calling for inter-jurisdictional planning and coordination.
Designated Habitat Corridors contain the City’s most valuable undeveloped habitat areas - generally areas that are larger, connected or contiguous to other habitat areas, and combining multiple valuable functions and features (such as wetlands, streams, slopes and forests). Habitat Corridors will be the priority areas for Tacoma’s habitat conservation and stewardship efforts. The vision is to conserve and restore habitat functions within the Corridors and, where appropriate, foster low-impact access and recreation. Restoration sites in shoreline and marine habitat areas are also shown. Potential Joint Habitat Planning Areas are areas where habitat features span the City’s borders, calling for inter-jurisdictional planning and coordination.
Figure 3 - Recreation Lands and Facilities Map

This map shows Tacoma's existing and planned open space recreation assets - including parks, schools, community gardens, recreation facilities, and existing, planned and potential trails, including water trails. Also shown are private cemeteries and golf courses.

NOTE: This map is for reference only.
Section VII – Supporting Materials

Open Space Needs Assessment

Background

Tacoma benefits from invaluable natural assets including extensive shorelines, distinctive steep slopes and gulches, wetlands and streams, upland habitat areas, as well as a well-developed system of parks, playgrounds and recreational facilities. The City of Tacoma, Metro Parks Tacoma, other public and private organizations and Tacoma’s citizens have a long history of planning for the acquisition, conservation, enhancement and management of these assets.

Our parks, playgrounds and habitat lands are essential components for the quality of life enjoyed by Tacoma’s citizens, and to the environment. Today we benefit from the foresight of early civic leaders, who conserved and enhanced some of the City’s jewels like Wright Park and Point Defiance Park. The City’s earliest plans, dating from over one-half century ago, have emphasized the importance and value of open spaces to the citizens of Tacoma. Building upon those strong beginnings, the City now counts over 450 acres in its open space inventory as well as many parks and recreational facilities, and Metro Parks Tacoma manages approximately 2,700 acres of parks, greenspaces and recreation lands. The Tacoma Public School District, colleges and universities are also major providers of recreational facilities and open space. In addition, other public agencies, private enterprises and individual citizens provide open space on private properties that augments the public open space and parks network.

To build upon Tacoma’s successes, much work remains in order to restore and manage existing open space habitat areas, to connect fragmented public ownership and to enhance and expand our system of parks and recreation facilities. Open space and parks and recreational facilities require active management in order to function properly and serve the community well.

Over the years, many habitat areas have been developed, and as Tacoma continues to grow, pressure on remaining undeveloped land will only increase. In addition, an open space management issue has become critical: Many open space areas are rapidly declining in habitat quality due to invasive species such as English ivy, blackberry, laurel and holly that prevent the regeneration of native species. Recent studies show that, without a concerted restoration effort, Tacoma will lose significant forested canopy and biodiversity within the next 20 years. Also, these habitat areas often contain sensitive features such as wetlands and streams, which continue to be impacted by urbanization and invasive species.

Assumptions

The following list of assumptions form the basis for the OSHRP’s goals and policies.

Open space habitat and recreation lands and facilities are important, necessary, and beneficial to residents’ physical and mental health, as well as to the long-term livability and prosperity of our community.

Urban vegetation and open space plays an important role in addressing environmental challenges including climate change and stormwater runoff management.

Metro Parks Tacoma and the City of Tacoma are the primary providers of public parks and open space and will continue to work together to meet open space goals.
The natural setting and features of the city will become more valuable as urban growth and development occurs, and demand will increase for access to and conservation of open spaces throughout the City.

Due to the importance of habitat connectivity, the identification and protection of habitat corridors is important to the survival within the City of many wildlife species.

Though the OSHRP does not apply to privately-owned recreational facilities, educational institutions, or to any land or parcels owned by the Puyallup Tribe of Indians, the plan acknowledges that these entities play a key role in meeting the community’s open space and recreational needs and aspirations.

Community Benefits of Open Space

Open space plays a significant role in an urbanized city like Tacoma. Open space, ranging from high-impact to low-impact uses, contributes to the creation of livable cities in the following ways:

Functions and Benefits of Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat and Recreation Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For economic development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Raise property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to attracting residents, businesses and tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For non-motorized transportation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open spaces can link with an integrated pedestrian and bicycle system, increasing mobility choices and reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For nurturing arts, culture and heritage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide opportunities for cultural and artistic events, which can play an integral role in community revitalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preserving historic assets within city parks can create continuity with the past.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For community engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Build a sense of community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide opportunities to interact in a shared environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Channel positive community participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks can help revive distressed areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For green infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Preserve essential ecological functions and protect biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Help define the urban form and buffer incompatible uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce public costs for stormwater management, flood control and other built infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For climate change management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Moderate artificially higher temperatures and precipitation anomalies from the urban heat island effect through shading and evapo-transpiration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance local wind patterns in cities (cooler air over parks replaces warmer air in adjacent city neighborhoods).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sequester carbon and other pollutants that may otherwise alter local and global atmospheric composition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For reduction of natural hazards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce hazards in environmentally sensitive areas such as steep slopes, flood plains, shorelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For habitat conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Help preserve natural habitats including wetlands, streams, forestlands and native habitats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For creating safer neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as gathering spaces where neighbors form social ties that produce stronger, safer neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For helping children learn and grow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Offer children a direct experience with nature and opportunities to play, explore, socialize and engage in physical activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foster a sense of place, self-identity and being part of their community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**For smart growth**

- Enhance mixed-use development and redevelopment strategies, offsetting high density concerns with accessibility to green space.
- Strengthen the urban core, revitalize the inner city, and protect the fringe from over-development.

**For food, plant and fiber production**

- Community gardens and certain open space can be a good source for native plant, food and fiber production.
- Growing locally can help reduce carbon footprint, promote active living through gardening, and bring neighborhoods together.

**For improving personal and public health**

- Provide spaces to relieve mental fatigue and reduce aggression.
- Connect people with nature, known to confer certain health benefits and enhance well-being.
- Help increase activity level, reduce obesity and promote physical health.
- Reduce climate, air and water pollution impacts on public health.

---

**SWOT Analysis**

As part of this update, the OSHRPOSHRE management team conducted an analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT analysis). Citizen input from public meetings helped to provide information for the analysis along with input from the management team, data gathered as part of the open space inventory, and from other sources. This analysis provided the basis for development of the OSHRPOSHRE goals and policies.

**Strengths:**

- Tacoma’s Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance provides protection of critical areas including fish and wildlife habitat, wetlands and streams, and provides some protection for steep slopes.

- Tacoma’s existing recreation lands and facilities provide a range of high and low-impact recreation opportunities as well as habitat benefits.

- The City benefits from dedicated citizen and volunteer groups that help with maintenance and improvement of existing open spaces.

- Collaboration between MPT and Tacoma Public School District—school properties provide indoor and outdoor recreational opportunities for Metro Park Tacoma’s programs.

- The City has been doing open space planning for several decades and has built organizational capacity and expertise.

- Several related City efforts, including but not limited to Tacoma’s Clean up And Revitalization Efforts (CARES) which helps improve and maintain open space areas through clean-up and enforcement efforts, a recent update to City’s Surface Water Management Manual to encourage Low Impact Development techniques, and the Green Ribbon taskforce for Climate Change create a supportive framework for open space efforts.
Weaknesses:

- Current regulations do not fully protect vegetation and habitat in steep slope areas.
- Lack of connectivity/trail linkages between parks, schools, open spaces, neighborhoods and mixed-use centers.
- Lack of street trees and boulevards and overall tree canopy coverage.
- The City’s Open Space Program is in need of better operational guidance and understanding of conditions in order to prioritize actions.
- According to a needs assessment done by MPT, there is a need for more parks and recreational facilities in some areas.
- Funding and staff resources are limited and subject to many competing demands and needs.
- Lack of coordination between and within public agencies in open space efforts.

Opportunities:

- There is strong community interest in tree and landscape plantings to create green corridors along freeways, streets and boulevards city-wide.
- Dedicated volunteer groups and non-profits continue to work to restore degraded habitat areas with non-native plants.
- Implement Green Ribbon Task Force recommendations supporting open space goals.
- Update the baseline open space data to provide an accurate picture of open spaces in Tacoma.
- Empower City employees and citizens to safely and efficiently remove non-native invasive plant species.
- Seek grant opportunities to pursue achievement of Tacoma’s open space goals.
- Utilize Tacoma’s extensive waterfront to provide public access to the Puget Sound for water-related recreation and trail uses.
- Use MPT’s Strategic Plan to assist with siting, design and building necessary facilities.
- Partner with other public agencies to provide needed recreation programs.
- While resources are limited, there are numerous stakeholders with common open space goals who can work together.

Threats and Challenges:

- Ongoing development within open space areas not under public ownership.
- Ongoing harm to habitat areas resulting from invasive species and other threats.
- Environmental and health issues posed by loss of natural habitat areas, including impacts to air, water, stormwater runoff, and human health.
- Reduced community livability, prosperity and health in areas underserved by recreational opportunities.
- Due to limited resources and funding, these ongoing impacts may outpace achievement of open space goals.

This SWOT analysis informed the development of the OSHRPOSHRE and was utilized to target the efforts of the City and its partners through the OSHRP Strategic Action Program. Based upon this assessment, the OSHRP proposes a collaborative approach that is responsive to the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.
This appendix is a compilation of selected information from the Capital Facilities Program 2009-2014, as applicable to the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element. It provides the recreation and open space facilities inventories, demand and need analysis, and the capital improvement program to meet the eligibility requirements for local, state and federal funding. Additional information is available in the complete Capital Facilities Program.

The City’s open space inventory and projects are listed here, along with information on programs that are closely related and supportive of open space goals. However, it should be noted that the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element contains policies calling for partnerships with and voluntary cooperative actions by various City departments, Tacoma Public Utilities, other public agencies and private parties. While it is impractical to list such actions here, they do implement the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element.

Specifically, the appendix contains the following sections of the Capital Facilities Program 2009-2014:

- Cover
- Ordinance No. (adopted on December , 2008)
- Chapter 1 – Introduction
- Chapter 2 – Capital Facilities Program
  - Community Development – Summary of Project Expenditures
    - Economic and Community Improvement
  - Municipal Facilities and Services
    - Community and Human Service Facilities
  - Parks, Recreation and Cultural Facilities
    - Parks and Open Spaces
  - Transportation Facilities
    - Non-motorized Transportation and Streetscape
- Chapter 3 – Six-Year Spending Plan Summary
- Chapter 4 – Inventory of Public Facilities
  - Community Development
    - Economic and Community Improvement
  - Municipal Facilities and Services
    - Community and Human Service Facilities
  - Parks, Recreation and Cultural Facilities
    - Parks and Open Spaces
  - Transportation Facilities
    - Non-motorized Transportation and Streetscape
APPENDIX I: Parks, Recreation and Open Space Projects

A. High Priority Projects:

The following projects and sites are high and/or short-term implementation priorities due to the important role they will play in achieving the City’s parks, recreation and open space vision. The City will seek to allocate available resources and pursue additional funding and support to implement these projects, as feasible. Other priorities are included in the plans of partner agencies, particularly Metro Parks Tacoma, and priorities change as implementation progresses and in response to community input. Therefore, this list should not be considered exhaustive, and should be updated on a regular basis.

High Priority Projects List (in alphabetical order):

- Chinese Reconciliation Park
- Community Gardens Program
- Dome To Defiance (including Foss Esplanade, Schuster Parkway Promenade, Ruston Way promenade)
- First Creek corridor
- Garfield Gulch
- Julia’s Gulch
- Mason Gulch
- Pipeline Trail
- Point Defiance Park
- Prairie Line Trail
- Schuster Slope
- Wapato Hills
- Water Ditch Trail

B. City of Tacoma Parks, Recreation and Open Space Projects:

The following consolidated projects list constitutes the City's recommended parks, recreation and open space projects. These projects have been identified through multiple planning and policy development efforts. This list is intended to serve as an implementation tool in support of further project prioritization and refinement. Implementation is resource-dependent and may involve one or more public agencies. This list reflects information currently available and is intended to be regularly updated.
## Proposed new section to be added to the OSHRE:

**APPENDIX I-B: City of Tacoma Parks, Recreation and Open Space Projects**

The following consolidated projects list constitutes the City's recommended parks, recreation and open space projects. These projects have been identified through multiple planning and policy development efforts. This list is intended to serve as an implementation tool in support of further project prioritization and refinement. Implementation is resource-dependent and may involve one or more public agencies. This list reflects information currently available and is intended to be regularly updated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Core Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Downtown Subarea Plan Element</strong></td>
<td>The South Downtown Subarea Plan envisions an integrated system of habitat and recreation lands that enriches the lives of Tacoma current and future residents, enhances the environment, and nurtures habitats. As the South Downtown area grows in population and employment, open space will be critical in maintaining a vibrant, walkable, mixed-use community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Line Trail</td>
<td>Non-motorized trail</td>
<td>This project will provide open space and non-motorized connectivity through UWT campus and the Brewery District.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foss Waterway Esplanade</td>
<td>Open space connector</td>
<td>Long-term vision is a 1.5 mile Esplanade running from head of the Waterway to Thea’s Park at its end.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>0.7 acre vacant waterfront property at 1147 Dock Street will become the site of a new “Central Park.” Park is not yet designed.</td>
<td>FWDA</td>
<td>3,930,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterway Park</td>
<td>Open Space Waterfront Access</td>
<td>Planned for the FWDA property located adjacent to D Street at the head of the Waterway.</td>
<td>FWDA/COT/ MPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge to the Foss</td>
<td>Pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>A bridge located near the former A Street crossing restore pedestrian connectivity to the Waterway and would provide much more convenient access from the Brewery District. *Discussions with the BNSF Railroad for a crossing easement are underway.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>Listed as &quot;Proposed or Planned&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWT Central Open Space and Grand Stairs</td>
<td>Open space/ pedestrian connector</td>
<td>The 2008 UWT Master Plan Update proposes a central open space integrated with pedestrian hill climb extending from the existing 19th Street Grand Stairs up to the corner of Tacoma Avenue and 17th Street.</td>
<td>UWT</td>
<td>Long-term priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holgate Shared-use Street

Shared-use street

The 2010 Brewery District Development Concept Study proposed catalyst redevelopment projects on several sites located around Holgate Street between 23rd and 25th Streets. This concept included turning Holgate into a shared use street and farmers market location.

Hillside-to-Brewery-District Pedestrian Corridor

Pedestrian corridor

One possible alignment would be along 23rd Ave. This alignment would allow for integration with future redevelopment on the vacant City-owned properties adjacent to 23rd Av between Tacoma and Jefferson Avenues. It could also be extended across Pac. Ave. and under the I-705 overpass to connect with future pedestrian bridge to Thea Foss Waterway.

B Street "Gulch"

Green space corridor

The B Street Gulch is a swath of vacant land in and around the former East B Street right-of-way between Puyallup Ave and E 26th Street, and continuing to the south beneath I-705 interchange ramps. The location is opportune for a green space corridor with natural drainage features.

C Street Green Street

Green Street

East C Street between East 27th Street and Puyallup Avenue is an opportune site for a green street, as proposed in the 2008 Tacoma Dome District Development Strategy Update.

The Water Ditch Trail

Trail

Connecting to South C Street and running parallel to Tacoma Way to the southwest and beyond the Subarea.

Ped/Bike trail on the east side of Foss Waterway

Ped/Bike trail

On the east side of the Foss Waterway from the D Street bridge south to the Center for Urban Waters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Core Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLK Subarea Plan</td>
<td>The purpose of the MLK Subarea Plan is to anticipate, promote and guide the long-term redevelopment of the MLK subarea including the district core, hospitals, and residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peoples Community Center Plaza</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Redevelop the green space in front of People's Community Center into more formal plaza type park with active features such as picnic shelters, tables, benches, splash fountain, and play equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples Community Center Pool</td>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>Resolve a financial source of funds to finish refurbishment, retrofit, and expansion of the existing facility to include indoor leisure pool elements, party rooms and concessions as proposed in the People’s Community Center master plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways</td>
<td>Greenways, open space, conservation corridors</td>
<td>Designate a system of coordinated open spaces, conservation corridors, greenways and green streets to link MLK parks and community facilities, and connect the MLK district to adjacent neighborhoods, the Prairie Line Trail, UW Tacoma and the Thea Foss Waterway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>Community garden</td>
<td>Plant community or pea patch gardens on vacant sites as well as other available lands within MLK. In some cases to serve as temporary uses on sites waiting for redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native habitat</td>
<td>Open spaces, street corridors</td>
<td>Plant street trees, reforest open spaces, remove invasive species, and promote use of native and drought resistant plants to restore wildlife habitat in and around MLK’s public facilities and within MLK’s green, urban, and parkway street corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water</td>
<td>Green infrastructure</td>
<td>Develop rain gardens, green roofs and walls, bio-filtration swales, and other green development features in and around the MLK subarea’s public facilities and within the MLK area’s green and urban streets as well as in new project developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfields</td>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>Identify all known sites of hazardous materials including former gas stations and laundries, develop appropriate mitigation strategies, and create a funding source for proactively mitigating the sites to support redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Plan

**Core Vision**

**2013-2018 Capital Facilities Program**

The City has conducted ongoing review and development of its Open Space Inventory in order to improve accuracy and completeness, as part of continuing efforts to improve open space management. Metro Parks Tacoma and the Tacoma School District also keep their own inventories. Efforts to improve accuracy and completeness of the City’s Open Space Inventory will be an ongoing process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Reconciliation Park Phase III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>4 Acre Ruston Way Chinese Garden/Reconciliation Park, Phase II includes construction of perimeter fencing, interpretive and way finding signage, parking, lighting, a multicultural pavilion, a gate, restrooms, a reflection pond, additional landscaping and irrigation systems, and various garden features with Chinese motif.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,895,166</td>
<td>Grants, private contribution, Capital Projects Fund, Open Space Fund.</td>
<td>Near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1 Park Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>This project will provide picnic tables, benches and signage for the Thea Foss Site 1 Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterway Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>This project includes planning, design, permitting, remediation and construction of the future Waterway Park and rowing center on the Foss Waterway.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,930,000</td>
<td>Debt financing, Foss Waterway Development Fund, Potential Grant, State Grant, Unidentified.</td>
<td>Near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman’s Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>This project will construct safety improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Capital Projects Fund</td>
<td>Near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Dock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Town Dock Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,609,000</td>
<td>Debt Financing, Capital Projects Fund, MPT</td>
<td>Near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Access Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and development of trails, viewpoints and other access improvements within City open space areas citywide. Activities may include acquisition trail maintenance or construction, signage, lighting, trailheads, pedestrian furniture or other improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>Open Space Fund, unidentifiable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisitions of open space that meets the City’s conservation objectives. Activities may consist of fee simple purchase or the purchase of development rights. Larger individual acquisitions are listed separately in the CFP.</td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>Open Space Fund, unidentifiable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shoreline Trails - West Slope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Tacoma Wetlands Conservation Area Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a shoreline trail from the City’s southern boundary at Lemons Beach Rd and West 27th Street north to Titlow Park and extending from HWY 16 to Point Defiance Park. This trail will require use of City of Tacoma right of way along Seashore Drive as well as Burlington Northern Railroad right of way, with some segments traversing the slopes along the Tacoma Narrows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition for open space conservation purposes of as much as possible of a 14-acre target area within the South Tacoma Wetlands Conservation Area. The 14 acres are located between two large block of City open space and form and important habitat linkage between them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Potential Grant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Tacoma Wetlands Conservation Area Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Core Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoreline Public Access Alternatives Plan</strong></td>
<td>The purpose of the Plan is to implement the policies of the TSMP and State SMA and guide the development of new public access opportunities along the shoreline and to increase public access to the shoreline over time. This Plan will allow for more efficient use of public and private resources by providing alternative mechanisms in addition to the standard permit requirements to provide public access to the shoreline and the public waters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1a Shoreline District: Western Slope South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Trail Access Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Slope Trail-Crystal Springs Creek Segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-1b Shoreline District: Western Slope South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Slope Trail-Crystal Springs Creek Segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2 Shoreline District: Western Slope Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Boat Launch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>COT/MPT</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Slope Trail—Titlow Park</strong></td>
<td>Linear Trail/View</td>
<td>The trail will use the Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way and the Titlow Park trail system to the War Memorial trail near Hwy 16.</td>
<td>COT/MPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Slope Trail—War Memorial Park Segment</strong></td>
<td>Linear Trail/View</td>
<td>The trail will require use of the Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way and traverse the steep slopes above. In addition, the trail will extend to a trailhead at War Memorial Park.</td>
<td>COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Slope Trail—Gold Creek Gulch Segment</strong></td>
<td>Linear Trail/View</td>
<td>This trail segment will extend from the boundaries of Point Defiance Park to the Tacoma-Lake Cushman Transmission Line south of Gold Creek Gulch. The proposed trail will form a loop by using a portion of the Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way and traversing the steep slopes above. In order to accomplish this, a public access easement or dedication for the purpose of trail right-of-way needs to be pursued with Burlington Northern. In addition, the corridor trail will follow Gold Creek through the gulch to a trailhead at Narrows Drive.</td>
<td>COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View Platforms</strong></td>
<td>View</td>
<td>In conjunction or in advance of trail development, provide viewing platforms along the West Slope that will facilitate public views of the Tacoma Narrows.</td>
<td>COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S-3 Shoreline District: Western Slope North</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S-4 Shoreline District: Pt. Defiance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi</strong></td>
<td>Nonmotorized Transportation</td>
<td>Develop a low impact terminal for water taxi or passenger only ferry access that could connect Point Defiance to other shoreline areas, including the Foss Waterway.</td>
<td>MPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guest Moorage</strong></td>
<td>Boating-Motorized</td>
<td>Provide additional capacity for guest moorage to serve the needs of recreational boaters.</td>
<td>MPT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S-5 Shoreline District: Pt. Defiance**

**S-15 Shoreline District: Point Ruston/Slag Peninsula**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peninsula Park</th>
<th>Trail/View/Gathering Space</th>
<th>Construct a public park on Slag Peninsula that will take advantage of the unique viewing opportunities and provide a large gathering and recreation area for the public. The park could include an amphitheater to promote outdoor events.</th>
<th>COT/MPT</th>
<th>Mid-term Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transient Moorage</td>
<td>Boating - Motorized</td>
<td>Expand capacity for transient/guest moorage. Moorage should be clearly signed and identified for water-craft.</td>
<td>COT/MPT</td>
<td>Long-term priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Ruston Promenade</td>
<td>Linear Trail/View/Gathering Places</td>
<td>Construct a public promenade averaging 100’ in width, the length of the Point Ruston development site, connecting the Ruston Way promenade to Slag Peninsula and Point Defiance.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Old Town Dock | Fishing/View | Replace the pilings, structural elements, dock surface, ramps, and floats. Improve the landscaping around the dock and accessibility of the dock. | COT/MPT | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | Near-term priority |
| Mason Gulch Trail | Pedestrian Trail | Trail or viewpoints providing visual and/or pedestrian access to portions of the gulch and from the gulch to the Ruston Way shoreline. | COT | Mid-term Priority |
| Puget Gulch Trail | Pedestrian Trail | Provide pedestrian access to the gulch and from residential areas and Puget Park to Ruston Way. | COT | Mid-term Priority |
| Garfield Gulch Trail | Pedestrian Trail | Provide pedestrian access to the gulch and from residential area at the top of the slope to the Schuster Parkway. | COT | Mid-term Priority |
| Buckley Gulch Trail | Pedestrian Trail | Provide visual and/or pedestrian access to portions of the gulch and from the gulch to the Ruston Way shoreline. | COT | Long-term priority |
| Transient Moorage | Boating - Motorized | Expand capacity for transient/guest moorage along the Ruston Way shoreline. Moorage should be clearly signed and identified for water-craft. | COT | Long-term priority |
| Underwater Park | Scuba Diving | Enhance existing in-water area for scuba diving and underwater recreation. Include signage and provide amenities necessary to support scuba diving, such as a facility to rinse equipment. Could include underwater trail system. | COT | Long-term priority |
| Chinese Reconciliation Park | Gathering Space/Educational | The Chinese Reconciliation Park is a planned 3.9 acre park that is located at the southern end of the 1.5-mile Ruston Way waterfront along Commencement Bay, and is in the proximity of the early Chinese settlement that was burned down during the tragic expulsion. The park design is a mixture of traditional Chinese scholar’s style gardens and beautiful natural waterfront setting. Construction COT and The Chinese Reconciliation Park Foundation Estimated to cost $12,000,000 $5,000,000 in funding has been secured. Additional funds have not been identified at this time. | COT/MPT | Near-term priority |
of the park will proceed through IV Phases. Two phases are nearing completion.

### S-6/7 and S-7 Shoreline Districts: Schuster Parkway and Schuster Parkway Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>COT</th>
<th>Design and Construction</th>
<th>Near-term priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esplanade/ Boardwalk</td>
<td>Linear Walkway/ Views</td>
<td>Construct 15’ waterside or overwater public esplanade/boardwalk that will serve pedestrians, roller skaters, bicyclists and provide lighting, street furniture, landscaping and supporting utilities.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Same as previous.</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayside Trail</td>
<td>Linear Trail/ Connector</td>
<td>Improve the Bayside Trails to provide a natural trail parallel to the shoreline with connecting access from upland residential areas to shoreline paths.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Same as previous.</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuster Parkway Multi-modal Train</td>
<td>Transportation non-motorized</td>
<td>Construct a 10-12’ multi-use path to replace existing sidewalk. Path will require slope stability measures as well as design treatments such as bollards, rest areas, wayfinding signage, and lighting.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Same as previous.</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Gulch Viewpoint</td>
<td>View</td>
<td>Construct a viewpoint/overlook at the top of the bluff in Garfield Gulch, connecting to the Bayside Trail and Garfield Gulch trail systems.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Same as previous.</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuster Parkway Overlook</td>
<td>View</td>
<td>Develop pedestrian overpass linking the improved trail to the waterside of Schuster Parkway and a scenic viewpoint overlooking Commencement Bay and with views of existing industrial users.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Same as previous.</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S-8 Shoreline District: Thea Foss Waterway

#### West Foss Shoreline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>COT</th>
<th>Design and Construction</th>
<th>Near-term priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend Esplanade</td>
<td>Linear Walkway/ Views</td>
<td>Construct public esplanade that will serve pedestrians, roller skaters, bicyclists and provide lighting, street furniture, landscaping and supporting utilities.</td>
<td>COT/FWDA</td>
<td>Same as previous.</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair Esplanade</td>
<td>Linear Walkway/ Views</td>
<td>Repair and replace deteriorated public esplanade to serve pedestrians, roller skaters, bicyclists and provide lighting, street furniture, landscaping and supporting utilities.</td>
<td>COT/FWDA</td>
<td>Same as previous.</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Agency</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Foss Central Park</strong></td>
<td>Gathering Space</td>
<td>Acquire and develop a 1 acre park and recreation area for large events on the central Foss Waterway.</td>
<td>COT/FWDA</td>
<td>Mid-term Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21st Street Park Boat Launch and Public Float</strong></td>
<td>Boating-Nonmotorized</td>
<td>This project will construct a kayak float on the west side of the Thea Foss Waterway, south of the State Highway 509 bridge and includes an aluminum gangway, upland concrete work, gates and landscaping.</td>
<td>COT/FWDA</td>
<td>Estimated to cost $3,000,000. Near-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15th Street Gateway- Prairie Line Trail</strong></td>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>This project will design and construct a Class 1 trail along the BNSF railroad track through downtown Tacoma. The new trail segment will connect the Foss Waterway to the Water Ditch Trail project along South Tacoma Way.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11th Street Gateway- Murray Morgan Bridge</strong></td>
<td>Nonmotorized access</td>
<td>This project will improve wayfinding and install design details to create a gateway from 11th street to the Foss Waterway, including improvements to the Murray Morgan Bridge.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fireman’s Park Hill Climb</strong></td>
<td>Nonmotorized Transportation</td>
<td>Improve the Municipal Dock site to accommodate the necessary infrastructure for a passenger-only-ferry that could serve both local water taxi and regional POF service.</td>
<td>COT/FWDA</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Foss Shoreline</strong></td>
<td>Gathering Space</td>
<td>Develop a park and recreation area at the 3.7 acre Berg Scaffolding site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delin Docks View Platforms</strong></td>
<td>View</td>
<td>Improve signage, design elements and capacity of the Delin Docks access view point. Investigate potential for incorporation of Heritage Trail element.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Near-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11th Street ROW Boat Launch</strong></td>
<td>Boating – motorized and nonmotorized</td>
<td>Improve existing public right-of-way to accommodate a recreational and/or commercial boat launch</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Mid-term Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Bridge</strong></td>
<td>Linear Walkway/connector</td>
<td>Explore opportunities to develop a pedestrian and bicycle bridge across the Wheeler-Osgood that would connect future walkway improvements and create a more direct route across the waterway and a scenic viewpoint.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Johnny’s Dock Waterfront Walkway</strong></td>
<td>Linear walkway/ pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>If Johnny’s Dock redevelops, pursue an easement for a waterfront walkway that will enhance pedestrian access and views of downtown Tacoma.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Long-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Walkway</td>
<td>Linear walkway/ pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>As an alternative to the Wheeler-Osgood pedestrian bridge, establish a walkway adjacent to the waterway, connecting the north and south ends of the Foss Waterway. Walkway would connect the Wheeler-Osgood Waterway to the Murray Morgan Bridge. Investigate opportunities to incorporate Heritage Trail elements.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Mid-term Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Plane Float</td>
<td>Guest Moorage</td>
<td>Construct a moorage float designed to accommodate sea planes, to support diverse forms of transportation and recreation.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Long-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Foss Central Park</td>
<td>Gathering Space</td>
<td>Seek acquisition of BNSF property at the mouth of the Wheeler-Osgood for development of a nature park and open space.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Long-term priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S-9 Shoreline District: Puyallup River**

| Puyallup River Levee Trail | Linear Trail/Habitat Observation | Construct 2.5 mile trail along the Puyallup River levee, from the City limits with Fife to 11th Street. | COT | Construction cost estimate is $670000. | Long-term priority |

**S-10 Shoreline District: Port Industrial Area**

| NE Tacoma Trail Network-Segment 1 | Natural Train/View | Construct 6 mile trail along the slope top of Marine View Dr. from Slayden Rd. to Norpoint Way, with an extension from Browns Pt. Blvd. to Northshore Parkway and a connector between Crescent Heights and Alderwood Parks. | COT | Estimated cost is $1631000 | Long-term priority |
| East Peninsula Viewpoint | View | Provide viewpoint on City of Tacoma property at the head of the Foss Peninsula, as well as public amenities, including seating, waste bins, and signage. | COT | | Mid-term Priority |
| Blue Trail Access Point | Beach Access/Boating - nonmotorized | Develop a blue trail access point where beach grade is conducive, for kayak and hand launch craft. | Unidentified | | Mid-term Priority |
| Middle Waterway | Habitat Observation | Construct a habitat viewing platform with associated educational signage and seating area. Site could be located at head of Middle Waterway on publicly owned properties near the Fire Station or along Middle Waterway Road. | COT | | Near-term priority |

**S-11 Shoreline District: Marine View Drive**

| Blue Trail Access Point | Beach Access/Boating - nonmotorized | Develop a blue trail access point where beach grade is conducive, for kayak and hand launch craft. | Unidentified | | Near-term priority |
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#### S-12 Shoreline District: Hybelos Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marine View Drive Viewpoint</th>
<th>View/Turnout</th>
<th>Improve a turnout and scenic viewpoint for automobiles along Marine View Drive. Provide signage and public amenities.</th>
<th>COT</th>
<th>Mid-Term Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE Tacoma Trail Network-Segment 2</td>
<td>Natural Train/View</td>
<td>Construct 6 mile trail along the slope top of Marine View Dr. from Slayden Rd. to Norpoint Way, with an extension from Browns Pt. Blvd. to Northshore Parkway and a connector between Crescent Heights and Alderwood Parks.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td>Estimated to cost $1631000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| View Platform | View | In conjunction or in advance of trail development, provide view platforms along the top of the bluff and along the shoreline where possible to facilitate public views of the water. Provide wayfinding and educational signage where appropriate. | COT | Mid-Term Priority |

#### S-14 Shoreline District: Wapato Lake

| Wapato Park | Gathering Places | Improve existing facilities and expand capacity for recreational uses, including trails, picnic areas, non-motorized boating, and viewpoints. | MPT | Near-term priority |

### Plan Core Vision

**First Creek Action Plan**
The purpose of the Plan is to provide a framework for community action to establish First Creek as a healthy, valued natural asset and center of community in East Tacoma. The plan is a collaborative effort to help realize a shared vision of a healthy First Creek.

### Projects Summary

Within the Plan are a set of detailed actions for implementation by a variety of stakeholders, including the City of Tacoma, the Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Tacoma Housing Authority, community stewards and residents, and more. The actions include both long-term (10 year) and short-term (immediate) goals. The action items are organized by plan objectives: access, safety, identity, habitat, water, community, and education.

A complete list of the action items can be found starting on page 11 of the First Creek Action Plan. Each action item varies from under $10000 to over $50000.

### Community Gardens

A thriving Community Garden culture that brings people and neighborhoods together through gardening and food – to share, grow, and celebrate secure, healthy and happy communities.

### Projects Summary

Tacoma is home to more than 38 community gardens, including 11 on City-owned property. Gardens are managed by Metro Parks, churches, community groups, schools and universities, and many other organizations.

Pierce Conservation District Community Garden Program
### Plan Core Vision

**Open Space Program-Active Recreation**

The Planning and Development Services Department manages a range of active use park and open space amenities, and provides planning and funding for access improvements such as trails.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Summary</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plan Core Vision

**Open Space Program-Natural Areas**

The Environmental Services Department manages the City's Open Space Inventory, and supports conservation and restoration efforts for Tacoma’s natural areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Summary</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plan Core Vision

**City-managed Urban Parks and Amenities**

The City maintains a system of urban parks and amenities located primarily within downtown Tacoma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tollefson Plaza</td>
<td>Pacific &amp; S. 17th St</td>
<td>Urban Plaza</td>
<td>Urban design and other enhancements to the plaza befitting its prominent location, to promote the public’s use and enjoyment.</td>
<td>COT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plan Core Vision

**Tacoma Landfill Land Use Plan**

This plan is the incorporation of ideas for the future uses of the closed portions of the City Landfill. These include parks, recreation and open space amenities.

### Partner Agencies' Plans

**Agency**

**Metro Parks Tacoma**

**Green Vision 2030**

Green Vision 2030 envisions a sustainable community by focusing on 4 goals: fostering active and healthy lifestyles, stewardship, appreciation of culture and heritage, and to be an accountable agency in order to contribute to a livable city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Summary</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Included in Green Vision 2030 is the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which is one of the tools to implement the plan. The CIP was developed with extensive consultation with the public through workshops and webpage updates held in January 2012. Included in the CIP is a detailed list of 58 projects to take place over the next seven years, ranging from regional parks sites to neighborhood parks and community center sites.</td>
<td>For the complete list of CIP projects see Chapter Seven of Green Vision 2030, page 57.</td>
<td>The total capital outlay is estimated to be in excess of $53 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Projects Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Core Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port of Tacoma</td>
<td>Shoreline Public Access Plan</td>
<td>This plan is meant to be implemented over time consistent with the Port of Tacoma’s Strategic Plan 2012-202, the Port’s Port-Wide Habitat Strategy, and City of Tacoma’s Shoreline Master Program. The Shoreline Public Access Plan has identified 3 goals: to provide a streamlined and predictable permitting process, provide shoreline access in appropriate and desirable locations, and to increase public awareness of the port.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to meet the three goals of this plan, this plan examines each goal and identifies steps to reach them. Some of these include working closely with the City to create a streamlined permit process through an inter-local agreement. Another is conducting public outreach in order to better understand where public shoreline access is appropriate and desirable. The Port plans on realizing their final goal through signage at key locations, social media, e-newsletters, community events/booths and tours. The Port also lists priorities and policies that will help reach the goals of the Plan.

For the complete list of priorities and policies of the Plan see pages 3-5.

Unidentified.
## Appendix II. Parks and Open Space Inventory

### City-Owned Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Size or Capacity (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34th Street Gulch</td>
<td>S. 34th St. &amp; Pacific Ave.</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9th &amp; Mason</td>
<td>S. 9th and Mason Ave.</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bantz Drumlin</td>
<td>SR 16 &amp; S. 12 St.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bayside Trail</td>
<td>Schuster Slope</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Blix Green Space</td>
<td>E. Howe St. &amp; E. 40th St.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Buckley Gulch</td>
<td>N. 21st St. &amp; Oakes St.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Center Street</td>
<td>Center St. &amp; S. “J” St.</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Crystal Springs</td>
<td>6th Ave &amp; Crystal Springs</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dome Slope</td>
<td>East of Tacoma Dome</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eastside Slope</td>
<td>E. 34th St. &amp; Fairbanks St.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fern Hill Gulch</td>
<td>S. Park St. &amp; E. 82nd St.</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>First Creek</td>
<td>East Tacoma</td>
<td>18.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Garfield Gulch/Trail</td>
<td>Schuster Pkwy &amp; Boroughs</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Harbor Ridge Plat</td>
<td>Northeast Tacoma slope</td>
<td>10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hylebos Creek</td>
<td>E. 47th St. &amp; E. 57th Ave.</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Julia’s Gulch</td>
<td>Northeast Tacoma slope</td>
<td>36.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Marine View Drive</td>
<td>Northeast Tacoma slope</td>
<td>46.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mason Circle</td>
<td>S. 40th &amp; Mason Loop Rd</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mason Gulch</td>
<td>N. Stevens St. &amp; 37th St.</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>McKinley Slope</td>
<td>McKinley Way &amp; E. F St.</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>McMurray Road Slope</td>
<td>Northeast Tacoma slope</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mullen Wetland</td>
<td>S. Mullen St. &amp; 52nd St.</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Narrows Slope</td>
<td>Narrows Br. &amp; west slope</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Northeast Tacoma</td>
<td>Northeast Tacoma slope</td>
<td>88.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Northshore &amp; Norpoint</td>
<td>Northeast Tacoma</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Oakes Street Slope</td>
<td>S. 76th St. &amp; Oakes St.</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parkside Plat</td>
<td>West slope – Parkside Lane</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Puget Gulch</td>
<td>N. Proctor St. &amp; 31st St.</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rhone-Poulenc</td>
<td>Port of Tacoma Rd.</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ruston Way Slope</td>
<td>North slope</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>South Tacoma Way</td>
<td>South Tacoma &amp; Tacoma Av</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Swan Creek</td>
<td>East Tacoma</td>
<td>15.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tacoma &amp; Eastern Gulch</td>
<td>E. E St. &amp; E. 43rd St.</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Titlow Beach</td>
<td>Tidelands at Titlow Beach</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Trafton Slope</td>
<td>S. Trafton St. &amp; S. 70th St.</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Tyler Street Slope</td>
<td>Tyler St. south of S. 41st St.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Wakefield Drive</td>
<td>S. Tacoma Way &amp; S. J St.</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Wapato Hills</td>
<td>S. 56th St. &amp; Tacoma Mall</td>
<td>70.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Wapato Lake</td>
<td>S. Asotin Court – north of</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>West Slope</td>
<td>West Slope – various</td>
<td>26.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Westridge Plat</td>
<td>Day Island Bridge Rd.</td>
<td>17.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Woodland Glen</td>
<td>Ash St. &amp; S. 93rd St.</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total   466.42 Acres

The City departments with primary management responsibility for these properties include Public Works - Real Property Services and Environmental Services.

---
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# 2014 Parks and Open Spaces

## City-Owned Urban Parks and Urban Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Size or Capacity (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bayside Park</td>
<td>2217 Ruston Way</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ben Gilbert Park</td>
<td>Market St &amp; St Helens Ave</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broadway Plaza</td>
<td>Broadway S 9th St to S 15th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Reconciliation Park</td>
<td>1741 Schuster Pkwy</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Division Ave Mini Park</td>
<td>1505 S 5th St.</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fern Hill Playground</td>
<td>S 84th &amp; Park Ave</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fireman’s Park</td>
<td>803 A St</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Frost Memorial Park</td>
<td>S 9th St &amp; Pacific Ave</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gas Station Park</td>
<td>S 48th St &amp; Park Ave</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gateway Park</td>
<td>N 30th St &amp; Starr St</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gunderson Point</td>
<td>S 9th &amp; St Helens (NE corner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hamilton Park</td>
<td>2319 Ruston Way</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harbor View Park</td>
<td>929 Fawcett Ave</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jack Hyde Park on Commencement Bay</td>
<td>1743 N Schuster Pkwy</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Janelle’s Pond</td>
<td>6th Ave &amp; Pearl St (SE corner)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jefferson Ave Mini Park</td>
<td>S 17th St &amp; Jefferson Ave</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ledger Square</td>
<td>S 7th &amp; St Helens (SE corner)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Marine Park &amp; Les Davis Pier</td>
<td>3427 Ruston Way</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mason Avenue Median</td>
<td>Mason Ave N 9th to N 28th St.</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>McCormick Park</td>
<td>Fawcett Ave &amp; Ct E, 9th &amp; 11th</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Norton Memorial Park</td>
<td>Tacoma Ave &amp; S 1st St</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>People’s Community Center</td>
<td>1619 Martin Luther King Jr Way</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Point Defiance Park</td>
<td>N Pearl St &amp; N Park Ave</td>
<td>647.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ray C. Roberts Memorial Park</td>
<td>802 E Division Lane</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ruston Way Tidelands</td>
<td>Ruston Way</td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ruston Way Slope</td>
<td>Ruston Way</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>South 23rd &amp; Alaska</td>
<td>South 23rd &amp; Alaska</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>South End Neighborhood Playfield</td>
<td>7801 S Sheridan St</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Spanish Steps</td>
<td>701 Broadway</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tollefson Plaza</td>
<td>S 17th St &amp; Pacific Ave</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Union Avenue Median</td>
<td>Union Ave from 9th &amp; 30th St</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>View Point Park</td>
<td>Norpoint Way &amp; Marine View Dr</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>War Memorial Park</td>
<td>6th Ave &amp; N Jackson Ave</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Water Ditch Trail</td>
<td>South Tacoma</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 704.03 Acres**

*The City departments with primary management responsibility for these properties include Public Works - Real Property Services and Street Operations Divisions, and Planning and Development Services.*
These proposed amendments include modifications to the following sections of Chapter 1.37 of the Administration and Personnel Code:

TMC 1.37 TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

1.37.020 - Definitions
1.37.030 - Sending Areas
1.37.050 - Sending Area TDR Allocation

Note: These amendments show proposed changes to existing Land Use regulations. The sections included are only those portions of the code that are associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that has been deleted is shown as strikethrough.

1.37.020 Definitions

***

“TDR Manager” is an employee of the Tacoma Community and Economic Development Planning and Development Services Department tasked with accomplishing the duties specified by this chapter.

***
1.37.030 Sending Areas.

The following five categories of land or structures qualify as sending areas:

A. Pierce County Farm Land: Farm land designated as Agriculture Resource Land (ARL) in unincorporated Pierce County situated in Pierce County’s Puyallup Valley (Alderton-McMillin or Mid County Community Planning Areas).

B. Pierce County Forest Land: Forest land designated as Forest Land (FL) situated in unincorporated Pierce County.

C. Resource lands in King County and Snohomish County.

D. Tacoma Habitat: Lands providing high habitat and natural value located within, or in proximity to, designated Habitat Corridors in the Comprehensive Plan, and lands providing exceptional habitat and natural value located within the City and outside of the designated Habitat Corridors.

E. Tacoma Landmarks: Structures designated as a landmark as identified in the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

***

1.37.050 Sending Area TDR Allocation.

Upon recordation of a qualifying easement, TDRs shall be issued to the participating sending area property owners as follows:

***

C. For Tacoma Habitat sending areas:

1. For residential zones: one TDR for each forgone dwelling allowed by the property’s current zoning.

2. For nonresidential or multifamily zones: one TDR for each 8,000 square feet of potential but foregone floor area allowed by the property’s current zoning.

3. In determining development potential for this purpose, the TDR Manager shall make a reasonable estimate of the actual number of dwelling units or square feet of floor area buildable on the sending area under its current zoning restrictions and all other applicable land use and environmental controls (e.g. applicable setback or wetland regulations). The net development potential will be used, typically assuming that 25 percent of the total area would be utilized for roads and infrastructure. The TDR Manager may further reduce this estimate, up to an additional 25 percent, if specific site characteristics substantially limit development potential (including steep slopes, critical areas, or the absence of access or utilities in the vicinity).
Proposed Amendments
Recommended by the Planning Commission

Application #2014-09:
Sustainability Code Amendment
2014 Annual Amendment Application No. 2014-09
Sustainability Code Amendments

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
May 7, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2014-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Planning and Development Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Stephen Atkinson, Planning Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Amendment:</td>
<td>Regulatory Code Text Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use &amp; Zoning:</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location &amp; Size of Area:</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Council area:</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Amendment:</td>
<td>Amend the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.06 Zoning to further advance the City’s goals for sustainable development and greenhouse gas emission reductions, and for the promotion of public health and active living.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission Recommendations:

This proposal includes amendments to the Land Use Regulatory Code to further advance the City’s goals for sustainable development and for the promotion of public health and active living.

Electric vehicle parking and infrastructure provision: The proposed amendment would add design and location standards for new electric vehicle parking and charging stations, including requirements for accessibility, as well as establish off-street electric vehicle parking quantity requirements for non-residential uses that will ensure a supply of level 2 charging facilities at commercial and institutional uses.

Bicycle start and end of trip infrastructure: The proposed amendment would de-couple the bicycle parking requirements from the auto parking requirements and establish new minimum bicycle parking requirements in-line with the City’s goals for urban design, healthy living, transportation mode shifts, and greenhouse gas reduction. Further, the amendments would distinguish between short and long term bicycle parking, as envisioned in the Mobility Master Plan, and require shower and changing facilities at trip destinations when a specified amount of long-term bicycle parking is required.

Setback and height exception for exterior insulation: The proposed amendment would provide a setback and height exception for insulation added to the exterior of a structural frame to improve energy efficiency and to better facilitate the retrofit of existing structures to reduce energy demands.

Low impact development barriers: The proposed amendment includes minor code revisions that will remove barriers within the zoning code to using low impact development techniques, specifically pervious pavement and rainfall catchment systems, and to identify code sections that are supportive of low impact stormwater management, consistent with Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) guidance, and to amend the purpose and intent statement of specific code sections to reflect this support.
The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014 and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to receive additional written comments. The Planning Commission received considerable support for the proposed amendments, but also concerns relating to the application of electric vehicle parking requirements to residential uses. As a result, the Planning Commission modified the proposed amendments to encourage, but not require, multifamily development to provide electric vehicle infrastructure. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.06 Zoning, as set forth in Exhibit A.

Exhibit:

A. Proposed Amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code TMC 13.06 – Sustainability
The proposed code amendments include the following key elements:

**Electric vehicle parking and infrastructure provision:**
Design and location standards for new electric vehicle parking and charging stations, including design considerations for accessibility.
Off-street electric vehicle minimum parking quantity requirements for non-residential uses.

**Bicycle start and end of trip infrastructure:**
Minimum bicycle parking requirements in-line with the City’s goals for urban design, healthy living, transportation mode shifts, and greenhouse gas reduction.
A distinction between short and long-term bicycle parking, as envisioned in the Mobility Master Plan.
Requirement for shower and changing facilities at trip destinations when a specified amount of long-term bicycle parking is required.

**Setback and height exception for exterior insulation:**
Setback and height exceptions for insulation added to the exterior of a structural frame to improve energy efficiency and to better facilitate the retrofit of existing structures to reduce energy demands.

**Low impact development barriers:**
Removes barriers within the zoning code to using low impact development techniques including pervious pavement and rainfall catchment systems.
Amends the purpose and intent statement of specific code sections that are supportive of low impact development.
Note: These amendments show all of the changes to existing Land Use regulations. The sections included are only those portions of the code that are associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that has been deleted is shown as strikethrough.

** **

13.06.140 PRD Planned Residential Development District.
A. Intent. The PRD Planned Residential Development District is intended to: provide for greater flexibility in large scale residential developments; promote a more desirable living environment than would be possible through the strict regulations of conventional zoning districts; encourage developers to use a more creative approach in land development and stormwater management; provide a means for reducing the improvements required in development through better design and land planning; conserve natural features and retain native vegetation; and facilitate more desirable, aesthetic, and efficient use of open space.

The PRD District is intended to be located in areas possessing the amenities and services generally associated with residential dwelling districts, and in locations which will not produce an adverse influence upon adjacent properties.

Land classified as a PRD District shall also be classified as one or more of the regular residential zoning districts and shall be designated by a combination of symbols (e.g., R-3-PRD planned residential development district).

B. Procedures.

C. General requirements.

12. Subject to width variations, all vehicular accessways within the PRD District, both public and private, shall be constructed and improved to meet or exceed minimum City of Tacoma standards; except that all public and private vehicular accessways shall be paved with an impervious surface hard surface with necessary base preparations, in accordance with City of Tacoma standards.

G. Parking regulations. Off-street parking space shall be provided in accordance with Section 13.06.510. Required off-street parking for dwellings shall not be located more than 100 feet from the dwelling or dwellings it is intended to serve unless otherwise permitted by the Hearing Examiner or the Director.

Required parking spaces shall be surfaced with an impervious a hard surface.
13.06.145 Small-lot single-family residential development.

A. Purpose. These regulations are intended to supplement and amend the regulations pertaining to single-family detached residential development by providing criteria for small-lot single-family detached development in the R-1, R-2, R-2SRD, HMR-SRD, R-3, R-4, R-4-L and R-5 Districts. These regulations are intended primarily to promote residential infill development within the City to be consistent with the mandate of the State Growth Management Act and the City’s Comprehensive Plan, to encourage growth within urban areas, and to minimize sprawl. Residential infill within already urbanized areas is increasingly recognized as a regional stormwater management best management practice by encouraging a more compact urban form and reducing the development footprint within sensitive watersheds and greenfield areas. These provisions are designed to provide a mechanism to create new lots and develop existing lots that have a smaller area and/or width than the standard lot size requirements in the R Districts. However, in allowing for the creation of and development on these smaller lots, additional design standards are applied to better ensure that new single-family development on such lots is compatible with the desired character of the City’s residential areas.

B. Lot size standards.

1. New lots that are up to 10% smaller than the applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D shall be allowed, without variance, in the R-1, R-2, R-2SRD, HMR-SRD, R-3, R-4, R-4-L and R-5 Districts, subject to the following standards and provided that all new dwellings meet the design standards in Section 13.06.145.E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-2SRD</th>
<th>HMR-SRD</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4</th>
<th>R-4-L</th>
<th>R-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Area</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. New lots that are more than 10% smaller than the applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D shall only be allowed with approval of a variance (see Section 13.06.645), and provided that all new dwellings meet the design standards in Section 13.06.145.E and F.

C. Building envelope standards. New single-family dwellings on small lots shall be subject to the standard building envelope requirements for single-family dwellings in the applicable zoning district (see Section 13.06.100.D).

D. Design standards - Applicability.

1. New single-family dwellings on new lots that are up to 10% smaller than applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D shall be subject to the design requirements found in Section 13.06.145.E.

2. New single-family dwellings on new lots that are more than 10% smaller than applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D (such lots can only be created by approval of a variance) shall be subject to the design requirements found in Sections 13.06.145.E and 13.06.145.F.

3. New single-family dwellings on pre-existing lots that are smaller than applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements shall be subject to the design requirements found in Section 13.06.145.E.

E. Design Standards – Level 1. The following design standards shall be met for all new single-family dwellings on new lots that are up to 10% smaller than the applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D, and on all pre-existing lots that are smaller than the current, applicable minimum lot size and/or width requirements in Section 13.06.100.D:

1. Clear building entries. Dwellings shall provide a clearly defined building entrance that faces the street and provide weather protection that is at least 4 feet deep along the width of the building entry. A porch may serve to comply with this provision.

2. Garages:
**13.06.300 Mixed-Use Center Districts.**

A. District Purposes. The specific purposes of the Mixed-Use Center Districts regulations are to:

1. Increase the variety of development opportunities in Tacoma by encouraging greater integration of land uses within specific districts in a manner consistent with the Growth Management Act, the Regional Plan: Vision 2020, the County-Wide Planning Policies for Pierce County, and the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

2. Strengthen the City’s economic base by encouraging more efficient use of existing infrastructure and limited land supply through mixed-use, density, and design, as well as transit and pedestrian orientation in specified centers.

3. Allow and encourage a variety of housing options within mixed-use centers, including residences over businesses that can promote live-work arrangements which reduce demands on the transportation system.

4. Help provide employment opportunities closer to home and reduce vehicular trips for residents of the City and surrounding communities by encouraging mixed-use development.

5. Create a variety of suitable environments for various types of commercial and industrial uses, and protect them from the adverse effects of inharmonious uses.

6. Allow commercial and industrial growth in specified centers and/or districts while minimizing its impact on adjacent residential districts through requirements of buffering, landscaping, compatible scale, and design.

7. Accommodate and support alternative modes of transportation, including transit, walking, and bicycling, to reduce reliance on the automobile by making specified centers more “pedestrian-oriented” and “transit-oriented” through the provision of street amenities, landscaping, windows, continuous building frontages, limited curb cuts, and direct pedestrian entrances adjacent to the right-of-way and/or public sidewalk.

8. Locate and design parking to be consistent with the overall intent of providing a pedestrian and transit-supportive environment that encourages human-oriented design instead of vehicle-oriented design and promotes alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles. Examples include building location at the street, parking location behind or within buildings, adequate screening, avoidance of pedestrian-vehicle conflicts, and conveniently located transit stops.

9. Within Centers, the core areas of the district are the central hub and focus for the greatest level of growth and activity. Within these core areas, enhanced standards and design flexibility is appropriate to ensure that they are developed consistent with the community vision and goals for these areas, as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.

10. To promote and attract dense infill development that may otherwise have resulted in the expansion of the region’s urban footprint into sensitive greenfield areas within the watershed, and to achieve a compact land use pattern that promotes air and water quality, healthy watersheds, and the reduction of regional stormwater runoff.
13.06.510  Off-street parking and storage areas.

* * *

F. Electric vehicle parking requirements.

The purpose of this section is to proactively plan for and accommodate an adequate supply of electric vehicle parking and charging facilities to support the continued growth of electrical vehicle usage, to improve the cost effectiveness of future electric vehicle charging station installations, support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the continued growth of electric vehicle use, and to promote improved air quality and the public health. Multifamily development is encouraged, but not required, to provide electrical capacity and dedicated conduit/raceway from an electrical panel or electrical room to a junction box in a central location within each floor of a parking structure or adjacent to a surface parking area, to facilitate the future installation of level 2 electric vehicle charging stations.

1. Application: The following requirements apply to all new development and alterations that, within a two-year period, exceed 50 percent of the value of existing development or structures, as determined by the Building Code, unless specifically exempted herein. The standards do not apply to remodels that do not change the exterior form of the building. However, if a project involves both exterior and interior improvements, then the project valuation shall include both exterior and interior improvements.

2. The uses identified in Table 1 of this subsection shall be required to provide electric vehicle infrastructure and a level 2 charging station for the specified percentage of parking spaces provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Minimum Development Size</th>
<th>% Parking Stalls with Level 2 Charging Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3% of parking provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3% of parking provided, up to 6 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>At least 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3% of parking provided, up to 6 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Shopping Center</td>
<td>At least 15,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1% of parking provided, up to 8 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium, stadium, and theater</td>
<td>At least 500 seats</td>
<td>1% of parking provided, up to 12 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the formula for determining the number of electric vehicle parking spaces results in a fraction, the number of required electric vehicle parking spaces shall be rounded to the nearest whole number, with fractions of 0.50 or greater rounding up and fractions below 0.50 rounding down.

3. Location and Design Criteria for Off Street Electric Vehicle Charging Stations.

a. Where provided, parking for electric vehicle charging purposes is required to include the following:

(1) Signage. Each charging station space shall be posted with signage indicating the space is only for electric vehicle charging purposes. Days and hours of operations shall be included if time limits or tow away provisions are to be enforced.

(2) Maintenance. Charging station equipment shall be maintained in all respects, including the functioning of the charging equipment. A phone number or other contact information shall be provided on the charging station equipment for reporting when the equipment is not functioning or other problems are encountered.
(3) **Accessibility.** Where charging station equipment is provided within an adjacent pedestrian circulation area, such as a sidewalk or accessible route to the building entrance, the charging equipment shall be located so as not to interfere with accessibility requirements of WAC 51-50-005.

(4) **Lighting.** Where charging station equipment is installed, adequate site lighting shall exist, unless charging is for daytime purposes only.

b. **Parking for electric vehicles** should also consider the following:

(1) **Notification.** Information on the charging station, identifying voltage and amperage levels and any time of use, fees, or safety information.

(2) **Signage.** Installation of directional signs at the parking lot entrance and at appropriate decision points to effectively guide motorists to the charging station space(s).

(3) **Data Collection.** To allow for maintenance and notification, the local permitting agency will require the owners of any private new electric vehicle infrastructure station that will be publicly available to provide information on the station’s geographic location, date of installation, equipment type and model, and owner contact information.

4. **Accessible Electric Vehicle Charging Stations**

a. **Where electric vehicle charging stations are provided in parking lots or parking garages,** accessible electric vehicle charging stations shall be provided as follows:

(1) **Accessible electric vehicle charging stations shall be provided in the ratios shown on the following table.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of EV Charging Stations</th>
<th>Minimum Accessible EV Charging Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-250</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-300</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) **Accessible electric vehicle charging stations** should be located in close proximity to the building or facility entrance and shall be connected to a barrier-free accessible route of travel. It is not necessary to designate the accessible electric vehicle charging station exclusively for the use of disabled persons. Below are two options for providing for accessible electric vehicle charging stations.

**Figures: Off-Street Accessible Electric Vehicle Charging Station Options**

**Option 1**

Accessible electric vehicle charging stations may be more cost effectively installed by using an existing end parking stall or where a clear area is already maintained.

Photo source: Green Car Reports
Comment: The illustrations above show two options for providing accessible EV charging stations. Option 1 is a likely scenario for installation in existing parking lots. By using an existing wider end parking stall or restriping, an accessible EV charging station may be more cost effectively installed. Where feasible, a wider clear area around the equipment (60”) is preferable. Additionally, this location away from the near building prime parking has a better likelihood of being available for disabled persons, since the accessible charging station is not exclusively reserved for disabled persons. Option 2 provides a location that has a shorter travel distance for disabled persons and can be easily installed in a new parking lot. This option may allow the installer to provide a wider, more fully-compliant aisle.

While other options, depending on the specific layout of the new or reconfigured parking area, are likely, at a minimum, an accessible EV charging station should be located within accessible reach of the barrier-free access aisle (minimum 44-inch width) and the electric vehicle and connect to a barrier-free route of travel. However, because the charging station facility is not a parking facility, the accessible charging station does not need to be located immediately adjacent to the building entrances or reserved exclusively for the use of disabled persons.

Fashion Island Shopping Mall, Newport Beach, CA.
This location has a shorter travel distance for disabled persons. Photo by LightMoves
13.06.512  Pedestrian and bicycle support standards.

A. General Applicability.

B. Walkways (Illustrated).

C. Street Furniture.

D. Bicycle Parking. To support transportation choices, including biking, the following standards shall be met for more visible and secure locations for bicycle parking.

1. Quantity in T, C-1, C-2, HM, and PDB. Minimum 2 percent of the requirement for automobile parking spaces for the first 300 car stalls and 1 percent of car stalls in excess of 300. A minimum of 2 bike spaces is required, except sites requiring 5 or fewer car stalls are exempt from bike parking. Adjacent public bike racks can be counted toward this requirement.

2. Quantity in Mixed-Use Center Districts. Five percent of the requirement for automobile parking spaces for the first 300 automobile stalls and 1.5 percent of automobile stalls in excess of 300, but no less than 2 bicycle stalls. Sites requiring 5 or fewer automobile stalls are exempt from this requirement, except for sites exempted from parking requirements due to their location along core pedestrian streets in neighborhood mixed-use centers (see Section 13.06.510.A.1 Table 2), where the number of required bicycle parking stalls shall be based on the amount of parking that would’ve been required for the project if it were not exempted. Adjacent public bike racks can be counted toward this requirement. Any form of vehicle storage, including auto dealers, counts only customer and employee parking to determine bike parking requirement.

3. For park and recreation uses where no vehicular parking is required, a minimum of 2 bike spaces for every 500 feet of street frontage is required in all residential, commercial or industrial zones; in Mixed-Use Center zones a minimum of 2 bike spaces for 250 feet of street frontage is required. The amount shall be no less than 2 bike spaces. Adjacent public bike racks can be counted toward this requirement.

4. Location. Bicycle parking shall be located within 50 feet of the primary building entrance for individual sites. Bicycle parking may be grouped near an owner-designated primary entrance in shopping centers. Bicycle parking may be shared at a common location on the same block and same side of the street, provided, the quantity meets the total requirement and is no more than 100 feet from any site served. Bicycle parking shall not block pedestrian use of a walkway and shall be located where there is sufficient space to allow bicycle maneuvering and allow access to the rack without moving another bicycle.

5. Design. Bicycle parking facilities, such as racks and lockers, shall be consistent with any applicable, adopted business area improvement plan or streetscape design plan. Racks and lockers shall also be securely anchored and designed to accommodate the required number of bicycles, support bicycles upright, and allow for the frame and at least one wheel to be secured with a standard U-lock. See examples below.

D. Short and Long Term Bicycle Parking.

Purpose: To promote bicycling as an important and integral mode of transportation, which enables healthy lifestyles, is affordable, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions, and to provide the necessary bicycle parking facilities for a bicycle friendly community. The following requirements and standards are intended to provide for safe and efficient bicycle parking at the trip destination.
origin and destination and to serve the needs of specific uses that generate bicycle traffic by residents, customers, guests and employees.

1. Bicycle parking shall be provided as follows:

a. The minimum number of off-street parking spaces for bicycles required for specified uses is set forth in Table 13.06.512.D.7. In the case of a use not shown on Table 13.06.512.D.7, there is no minimum bicycle parking requirement.

b. After the first fifty cumulative (50) spaces for bicycles are provided, additional spaces are required at one half (1/2) the ratio shown in Table 13.06.512.D.7, except for rail transit facilities, passenger terminals, and park and ride lots. Spaces within dwelling units or on balconies do not count toward the bicycle parking requirement.

c. Vehicle parking spaces, other than spaces required for electric vehicles and accessible parking, shall be permitted to be used for the installation of required long-term bicycle parking spaces.

2. Location of short-term bicycle parking facilities:

a. Short-term bicycle parking shall be located within 50 feet of, and visible from, the primary building entrance for individual sites.

b. Short-term bicycle parking may be shared at a common location on the same block and same side of the street, provided the quantity meets the total requirement and is no more than 100 feet from any site served, except as provided in subsection 6 below.

c. Where directional signage is provided at the main building entrances, short-term bicycle parking shall be permitted to be provided at locations not visible from the main entrance.

d. Short-term bicycle parking may be grouped near an owner designated primary entrance in shopping centers.

e. Short-term bicycle parking shall not block pedestrian use of a walkway and shall be located where there is sufficient space to allow bicycle maneuvering and allow access to the rack without moving another bicycle.

f. Short-term bicycle parking shall be located at the same grade as the sidewalk or at a location reachable by ramp or accessible route.

g. Short-term bicycle parking serving parks and open space/natural areas may be located and distributed throughout the park to serve multiple access points and outdoor recreation facilities.

3. Design of short-term bicycle parking facilities:

a. Bicycle parking facilities shall be consistent with any applicable, adopted business area improvement plan, streetscape design plan, or other applicable design guidelines.

b. If the location is not currently lighted, it shall be provided with illumination of not less than 1 footcandle at the parking surface. Lighting is not required for park and open space/natural areas where the use is limited to daylight hours.

c. It shall have an area of not less than 24 inches by 60 inches for each bicycle.

d. It shall be provided with a rack or other facility for locking or securing each bicycle in an upright position and to allow for the frame and at least one wheel to be secured with a standard U-lock.

e. To increase visibility to pedestrians, racks should have a minimum height of 33 inches or be indicated or cordoned off by visible markers.

f. Examples of short-term bicycle parking (from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines):
4. Location of long-term bicycle parking facilities:
   a. Long-term bicycle parking facilities for residential uses shall be located on site.
   b. Non-residential long-term bicycle parking shall be located on-site or within a shared bicycle parking facility within three-hundred (300) feet of the lot, except as provided in subsection 6 below.
   c. Long-term bicycle parking shall be in a secure location where access to the bicycles is limited and is not available to the general public.
   d. Bicycle parking facilities may include, but are not limited to, the following:
      (1) Designated indoor bike room with locking system;
      (2) Bike cage with locking system in a parking garage;
      (3) Uncaged bike parking in a garage or area with 24-hour secured access (protect bike parking areas not in a cage from autos with bollards, curbs, or other means);
      (4) Individual bicycle lockers with locking system, provided the lockers are partially transparent or include a view hole to discourage improper use;
      (5) Designated bike space with racks inside an office area which can be locked when it is not occupied.
      (6) Limited access areas and areas monitored by a security camera, with weather protection.
   e. If garage racks are accessible to the general public they must be directly adjacent to an attendant booth that is occupied 24-hours a day.
5. Design of long-term bicycle parking facilities:
   a. The following rack types are acceptable for long-term bicycle parking:
      (1) Post and Ring
(2) Inverted U (single or fastened in series)

(3) Wall-Mounted Racks with fixed attachment points

(4) Wheel well - Secured, with arm or feature that supports frame

(5) Modified Coat hanger

(6) Two-Tier, or Double-Decker

b. Long-term bicycle shall be provided with a permanent cover including, but not limited to, parking structure, roof overhang or awning.

c. A minimum 3 feet parallel spacing between conventional ground-level bicycle racks (e.g. inverted-U racks) to allow access to bicycles parked adjacent to each other.

d. A minimum 5 feet perpendicular access aisle between rows of bicycle parking to allow users to safely move and park their bicycles.

e. A minimum 2 feet 6 inches perpendicular spacing between a row of conventional ground-level bicycle racks (e.g. inverted-U racks) and walls or obstructions to allow the bike to be placed correctly on the rack.

f. Allow 24” minimum clearance for user access between a wall or other obstruction and the side of the nearest parked bicycle (may use 18” minimum for some rack types such as wall-mount).

g. Provide at least 25% ground-level bicycle parking spaces, to allow for use by those unable to lift their bicycles to higher racks and those with bicycle types that may not fit in upper-level or wallhanging racks (e.g. recumbents, folding bicycles, cargo bicycles, or those with trailers).

h. For in-building bicycle parking facilities and where more than five (5) long-term bicycle parking spaces are required, lockable clothing/gear storage lockers must also be provided. However, facilities that already provide personal lockers are not required to provide additional locker space for bicycle clothing/gear.

i. Examples of long-term bicycle parking facilities:

6. Bicycle parking for non-residential uses may be located in a facility within three hundred (300) feet of the lot that is not a shared bicycle parking facility, if the Director determines that safe, accessible and convenient bicycle parking accessory to a nonresidential use cannot be provided on-site or in a shared bicycle parking facility within three-hundred (300) feet of the lot without extraordinary physical or financial difficulty.
Table 13.06.512.D.7: Minimum Quantity Requirements for Short and Long-Term Bicycle Parking

Bicycle parking shall be provided at the following rates.

For uses identified with an * (asterisk), bicycle parking quantity requirements shall be applied at one-half the rate identified below when the use is located outside of designated Mixed-Use Centers and Downtown.

Minimum Requirements: Identified uses shall provide no less than 1 long-term and 2 short-term bicycle parking space, except that no long-term bicycle parking is required on a site where there is less than 2,500 square feet of gross building area and where indicated below. Where the calculation results in a fraction, the fraction shall be rounded to the nearest whole number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Business and professional offices*</td>
<td>1 per 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 40,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medical and dental clinics*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 40,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lodging*</td>
<td>1 per 20 rentable rooms</td>
<td>2 per business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shopping Center*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 8,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Eating and Drinking establishments*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Retail*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Multi-family dwellings with 5 or more units</td>
<td>1 per unit</td>
<td>1 per 20 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Retirement homes, apartment hotels, residential clubs, fraternities, sororities, and group living quarters of a university or private club</td>
<td>1 per 20 residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Libraries, museums, art galleries</td>
<td>1 per 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 2,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Religious Assembly*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 40 seats or 1 per 1,000 sq. ft. of non-seat area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Elementary schools</td>
<td>1 per classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Secondary (middle, junior and high) schools</td>
<td>2 per classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. College and university</td>
<td>A number of spaces equal to ten (10) percent of the maximum students present at peak hour plus five (5) percent of employees</td>
<td>1 per 40,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hospitals*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 40,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warehouse/Industrial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Warehousing*</td>
<td>1 per 40,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Industrial/Manufacturing*</td>
<td>1 per 15,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Auditoriums, stadiums, theaters</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>10, or 1 per 40 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Miniature golf course*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Skating rink and bowling alley*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Public dance halls and private clubs*</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Marina</td>
<td>1 per 40 slips</td>
<td>At least 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Open Space/Habitat Areas with Trailhead or Passive Recreation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 per 10 acres, but not less than 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Active Parks</td>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Active Parks</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Type</td>
<td>Minimum Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Urban Park</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Park</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Community center</td>
<td>1 per 12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Other recreation facilities not listed</td>
<td>1 per 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Facilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Rail transit station and passenger terminals</td>
<td>At least 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Principal use parking and park and ride lots</td>
<td>1 per 40 auto spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Day-care centers*</td>
<td>1 per 10,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Changing and shower facilities

At a minimum, a single shower and changing facility shall be provided when a new use is required to provide at least ten (10) long-term bicycle parking spaces. Additional shower and changing facility shall be provided for each additional twenty (20) required long-term bicycle parking spaces, according to Table 13.06.512 E 8.

Where more than one changing and shower facility is required, separate facilities shall be provided for each sex. Multifamily residential and transportation facilities are exempt from this requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Long Term Bicycle Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Number of Changing and Shower Facilities Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81+</td>
<td>No additional facilities required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.06.602 General restrictions.

A. This section contains general provisions for use, height, area, setbacks and yards. The following provisions apply to all zoning districts, except as hereinafter provided, and except where modified by the provisions of Chapter 13.06A relating to Downtown Districts, Chapter 13.10 relating to Shoreline Management, and other sections of the TMC:

1. No new subdivision, parcel or lot shall be created that prevents compliance with the standards of this or any other applicable Code, Title or standard of the City of Tacoma.

2. Use. Any building, structure, premises, or part thereof, shall be erected, raised, moved, reconstructed, extended, enlarged, or altered; or any land shall be used or occupied; only for the uses or purpose of accommodating the uses permitted in the district in which such building, structure, premises, or land is located, and then only after applying for and securing all permits and licenses required by law and city ordinances. While listed uses may not be varied, dimensional and/or design requirements contained in the additional regulations listed in the use tables may be varied; however, this does not allow uses to be varied.

3. Height. Any building, structure, or portion thereof, hereafter erected, shall not exceed the height limits established for the district wherein such building or structure is located except:

a. As provided in Section 13.06.640 relating to conditional uses.

b. As provided in Section 13.06.645 relating to height variances for residential structures located in the View-Sensitive Districts.

c. Schools, libraries, structures for religious assembly, colleges. In districts with a height limit of 35 feet, these facilities, when permitted as a use, are allowed at a maximum 45 feet in height.

d. Structures, above height limits. Chimneys, tanks, towers, cupolas, steeples, flagpoles, smokestacks, silos, elevators, fire or parapet walls, open railings, and/or similar necessary building appurtenances may exceed the district height limit provided all structural or other requirements of the City of Tacoma are met and no usable floor space above the district height limit is added.

e. Shipping cranes or other freight moving equipment are exempt from height limits.

f. Solar panels/collectors are allowed to exceed the maximum height limit provided they do not extend more than 12-inches above the surface of the roof, as measured to the upper side of the solar panel, and on pitched roofs do not extend above the ridgeline (see examples below).

g. For the purpose of adding insulation to the exterior of the existing building structural frame the maximum allowable roof height may be increased by up to 8 inches, only. Existing buildings not conforming to development standards shall not exceed the maximum allowable height limit by more than 8 inches. This exception is not applicable within view-sensitive districts.
m. Projections into required setbacks and yards. Every part of a required setback or yard shall be open, from the ground to the sky, and unobstructed, except for the following:

(1) Accessory building in the required rear yard setback.

(2) Ordinary building projections such as cornices, eaves, belt courses, sills, or similar architectural features, may project into any required yard or setback not more than 24 inches.

(3) Chimneys may project into any required setback not more than 24 inches.

(4) Uncovered balconies, decks, or fire escapes whose surface is greater than 8 feet above the surrounding grade may project over a required front or rear yard setback four feet or over a required yard two feet.

(5) Uncovered terraces, platforms, and decks whose surface is greater than 30-inches but not more than 8 feet above the surrounding grade may project or extend into a required front or rear yard setback not more than eight feet or into a court not more than six feet.

(6) Uncovered, ground level decks (deck surface no more than 30-inches in height from surrounding grade) may occupy up to 50 percent of a required setback and may also extend into required side yard setbacks to within 3-feet of the property line.

(7) An uncovered landing which does not extend above the level of the first floor of the building may project or extend into a required side yard setback not more than three feet.

(8) Mechanical equipment may encroach 8-feet into the required rear yard setback and may encroach 8-feet into the functional rear yard setback on double-frontage lots (see Section 13.06.100.F.5 regarding “functional rear/front yards”). Mechanical equipment may not be located within a required side yard setback or yard space. The location of mechanical equipment shall not be used in the calculation of average setbacks.

(9) Covered porches which are open on three sides and do not extend above the level of the first floor may project 8-feet into the required front yard setback.

(10) Bay windows, garden windows and fireboxes may extend up to 24-inches into required side yard setbacks, as long as the total of such features does not exceed 25% of the side wall area.

(11) For the purpose of adding insulation to the exterior of an existing building structural frame the required setback distance from adjacent property lines may be decreased by a maximum of 4 inches, where allowed by building code and where a minimum 3’ clearance from the lot line is maintained for fire and emergency access. Existing buildings not conforming to development standards shall not extend into a required setback by more than 4 inches.

(12) Rainfall catchment systems, which may include rain barrels, tanks or cisterns as well as associated piping, may extend into a required yard according to the following:

(a) Rainfall catchment tanks no greater than 600 gallons shall be allowed to encroach into a required setback if each tank is less than 4’ wide (as measured perpendicular from the side of the house or principal structure), a minimum 3’ clearance from the lot line is maintained, and provided that the cumulative coverage of the tanks does not exceed 10% of each yard area.

(b) Rainfall catchment tanks larger than 600 gallons may be permitted in required yard setbacks provided that they do not exceed 10% coverage in any required yard, and they are not located closer than 3’ from a side or rear lot line, or 15’ from the front lot line. If located in the front, the rainfall catchment tank must be screened.

(c) Rainfall catchment tanks may not impede requirements for lighting, open space, minimum usable yard space, and fire protection or egress.

(d) The rainfall catchment system shall not obstruct any escape window and shall not create a surcharge on an existing retaining wall.

n. Lot area modifications for mobile home parks, multiple-family dwellings, retirement homes, apartment hotels, and residential hotels. In the case of a lot which abuts more than one street, computation of lot area may include one-half the area of the second and additional streets so abutting for the purpose of determining the number of mobile
13.06.700 Definitions and illustrations.

Bicycle parking. Stationary rack that accommodates a lock securing the frame and wheels, or a lockable enclosure with the quantity accommodated determined by manufacturer’s specifications.

Bicycle parking, short-term: parking meant to accommodate visitors, customers, messengers and others expected to depart within two hours; requires approved standard rack, appropriate location and placement, and weather protection.

Bicycle parking, long-term: parking meant to accommodate employees, students, residents, commuters, and others expected to park more than two hours. This parking is to be provided in a secure, weather-protected manner and location.

Electric vehicle charging stations. A public or private parking space that is served by battery charging station equipment that has as its primary purpose the transfer of electric energy (by conductive or inductive means) to a battery or other energy storage device in an electric vehicle.

1. “Accessible electric vehicle charging station” means an electric vehicle charging station where the battery charging station equipment is located within accessible reach of an access aisle for a designated accessible parking space (minimum 44-inch width) and the electric vehicle.

2. “Battery charging station” means an electrical component assembly or cluster of component assemblies designed specifically to charge batteries within electric vehicles, which meet or exceed any standards, codes, and regulations set forth by chapter 19.28 RCW and consistent with rules adopted under RCW 19.27.540.

3. “Charging level” means the standardized indicators of electrical force, or voltage, at which an electric vehicle’s battery is recharged. Levels 1, 2, and 3 are defined by the speed of charging and typically have the following specifications:

   a. Level 1 – slow charging. Typically 15- or 20-amp breaker on a 120-volt alternating current.
   b. Level 2 – medium charging. Typically 40-amp to 100-amp breaker on 208- or 240-volt alternating current.
   c. Level 3 - fast or rapid charging [station]. Typically 60-amp or higher dedicated breaker on a 480-volt or higher three-phase circuit with special grounding equipment.

4. “Electric vehicle” means any vehicle that operates, either partially or exclusively, on electrical energy from the grid, or an off-board source, that is stored on-board for motive purpose. “Electric vehicle” includes: (1) a battery electric vehicle; (2) a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle; (3) a neighborhood electric vehicle; (4) a medium-speed electric vehicle, (5) electric scooters and motorcycles.

5. “Electric vehicle infrastructure (EVI)” means the site design must provide electrical, associated ventilation, accessible parking, and wiring connection to transformer to support the additional potential future electric vehicle charging stations pursuant to National Electrical Code (2008) Article 625.

6. “Electric vehicle parking space” means any marked parking space that identifies the use to be exclusively for the parking of an electric vehicle.

7. “Rapid charging station” means an industrial grade electrical outlet that allows for faster recharging of electric vehicle batteries through higher power levels and that meets or exceeds any standards, codes, and regulations set forth by chapter 19.28 RCW and consistent with rules adopted under RCW 19.27.540.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2014-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Planning and Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division (253) 591-5389 <a href="mailto:elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org">elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Amendment:</td>
<td>Regulatory Code Text Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use Intensity:</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Area Zoning:</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Area:</td>
<td>City-Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>City-Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Council area:</td>
<td>City-Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Amendment:</td>
<td>Repeal the current Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) 13.06.502 Landscaping and/or Buffering Standards and replace the section with revised code language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission Recommendations:

This proposal includes amendments to the Land Use Regulatory Code to improve trees and landscaping regulations applicable to development activities, with a focus on achieving such policy intents as incentives, flexibility, quality, and tree health. The emphasis of this project is on achieving more urban forestry benefits through landscaping required in association with development activities, as one component of a multi-faceted City effort to implement the policy objectives of the Urban Forest Policy Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Key changes include requiring street trees with major street improvements; enhancing standards on plant selection, installation and maintenance to promote tree health; and, incorporating incentives to promote larger tree species and other urban forestry goals.

Specifically, the proposal is to repeal the current TMC 13.06.502 Landscaping and/or Buffering Standards, and replace the section with revised code language. While a substantial amount of the existing code would be retained, the proposal includes reorganizing the section for greater clarity. Therefore, it is more readable to present the proposed new code language without track changes format. In addition, supportive changes are proposed to TMC 13.06.700 Definitions, and to TMC 13.06A Downtown Tacoma, which are shown in track changes.

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014 and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to receive additional written comments. Oral testimony was received by one organization, six letters were received regarding the proposal during the comment period, and Planning and Development Services added a comment during internal staff review. In summary, comments raised issues related to tree removal in public areas; plant species selection; street tree requirement thresholds;
tree and utility conflicts; tree variety; tree retention; the proposed self-managed agency option; and, landscaping code exemptions. Based on the public testimony and the Commission’s further review of the proposal the following amendments have been made and are recommended.

- Revise TMC 13.06.502.B.2.b to better define the circumstances where street trees are required in associate with street and sidewalk construction.

- Amend TMC 13.06.502.C.2.e.(2) to clarify that trees under power lines shall have varieties that do not exceed 25 feet in height at 25 years of age.

- Amend TMC 13.06.502.D.2 to remove the minimum 6-inch requirement for tree retention credit and allow trees of the same size for equal credits.

- Refine TMC 13.06.502.D.6 to make the process a more straightforward incentive tool for self-managed agencies to engage in urban forest planning, and to indicate that landscaping planted in alternative sites must be located within the City of Tacoma.

- Modify TMC 13.06.502.E to exempt Park and Open Space uses from the Overall Site Landscaping requirement, to allow alternative planting plans that meet the intent of providing a substantial vegetated buffer, and to clarify that single, two and three-family developments in association with short plats of 5-9 lots would not be exempt from landscaping requirements.

- Modify TMC 13.06.502.C.2 and 13.06.502.C.3 to allow required minimum planting distances to be reduced, with additional staff review, provided trees will be healthy and infrastructure conflicts will be avoided.

- Modify TMC 13.06.502.C to require native plant selection as follows: Within designated Habitat Corridors – at least 50% native species; adjacent to Habitat Corridors (within 20 feet) – at least 25% native species; and, to allow flexibility from these species requirements if needed to follow adopted plans to address slope stability, habitat health, streetscape or area-wide plans.

Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.06.502, 13.06.700, and 13.06A Downtown Tacoma detailed in Exhibit A.

**Exhibit:**
A. Proposed Amendments to the *Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.06.502, 13.06.700, and 13.06A Downtown Tacoma.*
Chapter 13.06 - Zoning
13.06.502 – Landscaping and/or Buffering Standards
13.06.700 – Definitions

Chapter 13.06A – Downtown
13.06A.070

Note: These amendments show all proposed changes to existing Land Use regulations. The sections included are only those portions of the code that are associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that has been deleted is shown as strikethrough.

In this case, the proposed new Landscaping Code section is shown in black, since the proposal is to repeal the current section and replace it with the new one.
13.06.502 Landscaping and/or buffering standards.

A. General requirements. The landscaping section is divided into five sections, with one each specifically addressing the landscaping requirements for development in Residential Zoning Districts, Commercial Zoning Districts, Mixed-Use Zoning Districts, Industrial Zoning Districts, and Shoreline Zoning Districts. In addition to the standards outlined in each of those tables, the general requirements contained herein and the landscaping types outlined in subsection G apply to all districts.

1. Intent. The landscaping requirements, as a whole, are intended to contribute to the aesthetic environment of the City; provide green spaces that can support the urban citywide tree canopy; wildlife, such as birds, in the urban environment; help reduce storm water runoff; filter pollution; and buffer visual impacts of development.

2. Applicability. Unless specifically exempted, landscaping shall be provided consistent with this section for all new development, including structures and/or parking lots, as well as alterations to existing development, as outlined below.

   a. Alterations. Three thresholds are used to gauge the extent of landscaping standard compliance on alterations to existing development:

      (1) Level I alterations to a site include all remodels and/or additions within a two-year period whose cumulative value is less than 50% of the value of the existing development or structure, as determined by the Building Code, excluding purchase costs of the property and/or structure. The requirement for such alterations is only that the proposed improvements meet the standards and do not lead to further nonconformance with the standards. For example, for an expanded parking area, landscaping would be required for the new parking area, but the applicant would not be required to bring an existing parking area into conformance with these landscaping standards.

      (2) Level II alterations to a site include all remodels and/or additions within a two-year period whose cumulative value ranges from 50% to 200% of the value of the existing development or structure, as determined by the Building Code, excluding purchase costs of the property and/or structure. All standards that do not involve repositioning the building or reconfiguring site development shall apply to Level II.

      (3) Level III alterations to a site include all remodels and/or additions within a two-year period whose cumulative value exceeds 200% of the value of the existing development or structure, as determined by the Building Code, excluding purchase costs of the property and/or structure. Such developments shall be brought into conformance with ALL of the applicable landscaping standards.

      (4) The standards do not apply to remodels that do not change the exterior form of the building. However, if a project involves both exterior and interior improvements, then the project valuation shall include both exterior and interior improvements.

      (5) No alteration shall increase the level of nonconformity or create new nonconformities to these standards.

3. Required landscape plans shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect, certified nursery professional, or certified landscaper. Exempted developments:

   a. Residential developments with less than 7 units.

   b. Non-residential and mixed-use developments featuring less than 500 square feet of landscaping.

4. Native landscaping. The retention and use of new native landscaping is encouraged and permitted for any and all landscaping. New landscaping materials shall include species native to the Puget Sound lowland region of the Pacific Northwest or non-invasive naturalized species that have adapted to the climatic conditions of the region in the following minimum amounts:

   a. 50 percent of trees.

   b. 75 percent of ground cover and shrubs.

5. Landscaping, visibility and safety. Except in cases where required landscaping is intended to provide dense visual buffers, trees and shrubs shall be selected and maintained to maximize visibility at eye level for safety. To meet this requirement, shrubs shall be chosen and maintained at no taller than 3 feet. Trees shall be selected and pruned (once tall enough) to maximize views below 7 feet in height. Limited flexibility in the selection of trees and shrubs shall be allowed to address unique circumstances such as unusual topography, existing features, or where strict adherence to this standard is not necessary to meet the intent. This provision does not apply to buffers required along property lines that abut residentially-zoned property and to Landscaping Type A.

6. Street trees.
a. Street trees shall be compatible with other trees in the vicinity by variety, species, and planting pattern. Trees and any associated grates must comply with any applicable, adopted business area improvement plan, streetscape design plan, and/or the City’s Tree Planting Program.

b. Street trees should generally be evenly spaced to create or maintain a rhythmic pattern, but can be provided with variations in spacing and/or grouped to accommodate driveways, building entrances, other streetscape amenities, etc. To achieve consistency with an existing, well-established pattern of tree spacing, the quantity of required street trees may be reduced.

c. Street trees shall, when possible, be planted within the right-of-way adjacent to the curb and between the pedestrian lane/sidewalk and curb. When this is not possible, street trees may be located within the right-of-way and behind the sidewalk. If neither of these preferred locations is possible, such as when existing infrastructure prevents trees from being planted within the right-of-way, trees located within 10 feet of the right-of-way may be counted as street trees.

d. In cases where street trees are provided adjacent to a required buffer, the trees provided as street trees may be used to reduce the number of trees required in the buffer area.

7. General tree size standards. Unless specified otherwise, trees provided to meet the landscaping requirements shall be consistent with these minimum size standards. For deciduous trees, at least 50% of the trees provided shall be a minimum 2-inch caliper at the time of planting, with the remaining deciduous trees a minimum 1½-inch caliper. The caliper of deciduous trees shall be measured 1/2 feet above the root ball or grade (diameter at breast height, or DBH). For evergreen trees, at least 50% of the trees provided shall be a minimum of 6 feet tall at the time of planting, with the remaining evergreen trees a minimum of 5 feet tall at the time of planting. Evergreen trees provided to meet these requirements shall also be species with the ability to develop a minimum branching width of 8 feet within 5 years. In all cases, trees that are provided that are above and beyond the landscaping requirements can be smaller.

8. General tree variety standards. In order to improve and protect the health, aesthetic quality, and sustainability of the City’s urban forest, projects shall provide a mix of trees. For projects that involve the planting of between four and ten trees, at least two different kinds (genera) of trees shall be included. For projects involving the planting of more than ten trees, at least three different kinds (genera) of trees shall be included.

9. General shrub size standards. Unless specified otherwise, shrubs provided to meet these requirements shall be from a minimum 3-gallon container.

10. Landscaping quantity calculations. When a specified amount or number of trees or plants is specified, that shall be the minimum number required. Any requirement resulting in a fraction, when applied, shall be rounded up or down to the nearest whole number. In cases where the minimum is expressed as a ratio of a number of trees or shrubs per a specified amount of area or length of site frontage or buffer (such as 3 trees per 100 feet of street frontage), the number of required trees or shrubs shall be calculated by applying the ratio to the square footage of the area or length of the associated frontage or buffer. For example, under a street tree requirement of 3 trees per 100 feet of street frontage, a site with 50 feet of street frontage would require 1.5 trees (50 x 3/100 = 1.5), which rounds up to 2 and a site with 90 feet of street frontage would require 2.7 trees (90 x 3/100 = 2.7), which rounds up to 3. The same planting may satisfy more than one requirement, unless specifically noted otherwise.

11. Minimum landscaped area – overall site. Where a minimum amount of landscaped area is identified for an entire site, that percentage shall be considered the minimum requirement. More specific requirements that also apply, such as buffering or parking lot landscaping, may necessitate more landscaping than this minimum.

12. Credits for retaining existing trees and shrubs. These requirements are provided to encourage tree preservation because of the greater visual and ecological benefits of mature plantings.

a. The following tree planting credits are available for existing trees, provided an arborist’s or landscape architect’s appraisal determines that the tree(s) is healthy and can be saved. If retained trees are damaged during or after construction, replacement shall be based upon the same ratios.

- One required tree for every retained tree of at least equal size;
- Two required trees for every retained tree that is 8 inches to 20 inches in diameter (measured at breast height);
- Three required trees for every retained tree 20 inches to 32 inches in diameter (measured at breast height);
- Four required trees for every retained tree over 32 inches in diameter (measured at breast height).

b. Existing shrubs, which comply with the minimum plant size specifications of this table, may count towards the required landscape plantings. Invasive plants, such as blackberry and scotch broom, shall not count towards the required plantings.

13. Minimum unpaved planting area per tree. Trees shall be provided with the following minimum planting areas:

- Minimum of 5 feet tall at the time of planting, with the remaining evergreen trees a minimum of 5 feet tall at the time of planting. Evergreen trees provided to meet these requirements shall also be species with the ability to develop a minimum branching width of 8 feet within 5 years. In all cases, trees that are provided that are above and beyond the landscaping requirements can be smaller.
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a. Parking lot trees and other trees on private property; 60 square feet, 5-foot minimum width.

b. Street trees in the right-of-way; 24 square feet; 4-foot minimum width.

c. Street trees in right-of-way with tree grates; 16 square feet; 4-foot minimum width.

14. Minimum tree trunk setbacks. Trees shall be planted a minimum of 2 feet from a sidewalk or curb, 5 feet from a structure, and 10 feet from pedestrian light standards or parking lot light standards. However, limited flexibility in the placement of trees shall be allowed to address unique circumstances such as unusual topography or where other required or existing features limit the ability to strictly meet this standard.

15. Installation. Landscaping meeting the standards of this section shall be installed by the time of final occupancy.

16. Maintenance. Landscaping shall be maintained in a healthy, growing, and safe condition, and replaced or repaired as necessary, during the plant establishment period and for the life of the project. Pruning of required trees or shrubs shall be for the purpose of maintaining the tree or shrub in a healthy growing condition and/or to enhance its natural growing form. Trees and shrubs shall not be excessively pruned such that it adversely affects the healthy living condition of the plant, significantly damages the natural growing form of the plant, or eliminates or significantly reduces the purpose for the planting. Modifications to the landscaping shall be in conformance with these standards and subject to approval of the City.
### Section 13.06.502.B
#### Residential District Landscaping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-1, R-2, R-2 SRD, HMR SRD, R-3, R-4, R-4 L, R-5, R-1 PRD, R-2 PRD, R-3 PRD, R-4 PRD, R-4 L PRD, R-5 PRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Exemptions

- Single family detached, two family, and three family dwellings are exempt from all landscaping requirements contained in this table.
- Parking lots of 20 stalls or less, located behind buildings and accessed by alleys, are exempt from the perimeter strip, buffer and interior landscaping distribution requirements below.
- Parking lots of 20 stalls or less and loading areas are exempt from the interior landscaping distribution requirements to allow flexibility in placement of required landscaping.
- Park and recreation uses are only required to meet the Overall Site and Planting Requirements of this table. Passive open space areas of such uses are exempt from all landscaping requirements of this table.

#### Minimum Landscaping Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Site</th>
<th>In R-4 L, R-4, and R-5 Districts, and for conditional uses permitted in Section 13.06.640, a minimum of 5 percent of the entire site, minus the area covered by structures, shall be planted with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site perimeter strip</td>
<td>Perimeter strips may be broken for primary structures, vehicle and pedestrian access crossings, and to allow limited access to and use of utility services located in alleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum 5-foot wide site perimeter strip shall be provided on sides with abutting street trees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Buffer Planting Areas

In addition to the intent of the landscaping requirement noted above, buffer planting areas are intended to provide substantial vegetative screening between dissimilar districts to soften visual and aesthetic impacts (unless exempted above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile home/trailer courts abutting R-1, R-2, and R-3 districts.</th>
<th>A wall, fence, vegetated wall, evergreen hedge, or other suitable enclosure of minimum height four and one half feet and maximum height of seven feet placed at least five feet from the side and rear lot lines. The area between such enclosures and the property lines shall be landscaped to form a permanent screening area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A landscaped screening area at least five feet in depth must be provided along the street frontage on a non arterial street forming a boundary between a mobile home park site and an R-1, R-2, or R-3 District and must be located between the street curbline and a line five feet inside and parallel with the front lot line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No signs shall be permitted on any part of a screening enclosure or within a screening area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Director may waive the requirement for a screening enclosure and/or screening area if equivalent screening is provided by existing parks, parkways, recreation areas, or by topography or other natural conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Planting Requirements

These requirements are intended to provide trees of sufficient maturity at planting to provide more immediate mitigation to the site, to provide trees adequate space to avoid damage and continue growth, and to visually break up parking lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree size and quantity</th>
<th>A minimum of 1 tree per 1,000 square feet of parking lot area shall be provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For parking areas behind buildings of 20 stalls or less that are shielded by buildings from public street view, a minimum of 1 tree per 2,000 square feet of parking lot area is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If more trees are needed to meet distribution or street tree requirements, that total is the minimum requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Interior landscaping distribution
- Trees and planting areas shall be at aisle ends and evenly distributed throughout the parking lot with no stall more than 50 feet from a tree trunk.
- At least 1 tree shall be located within 10 feet of required walkway for each 40 feet of said walkway.

### Street trees
- 3 trees per 100 feet of site street frontage shall be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 13.06.502.C Commercial District Landscaping</th>
<th>T, C-1, C-2, HM, PDB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single-family, two family, and three-family dwellings are exempt from all landscaping requirements contained in this table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking lots of 20 stalls or less, loading areas, and fueling stations are exempt from the Interior Landscaping Distribution requirements contained in the Planting Requirements section of this table, to allow flexibility in placement of required landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking lots of 20 stalls or less, located behind buildings and accessed by alleys, are exempt from the Perimeter Strip, Buffer and Interior Landscaping Distribution requirements below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• C, T, HM, or PDB property across an arterial street or highway from R-District property is not required to provide a Buffer Planting Area along the affected property line abutting the arterial street or highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park and recreation uses are only required to meet the Overall Site and Planting Requirements of this table. Passive open space areas of such uses are exempt from all landscaping requirements of this table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Landscaping Area (unless exempted above)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall site</td>
<td>A minimum of 10 percent of the entire site, minus the area covered by structures, shall be covered with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site perimeter strip</td>
<td>Perimeter strips may be broken for primary structures, vehicle and pedestrian access crossings, and to allow limited access to and use of utility services located in alleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum 7-foot wide site perimeter strip shall be provided on sides without abutting street trees. The required perimeter strip shall be reduced to 5 feet for parcels of 150 feet or less in depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum 5-foot wide site perimeter strip shall be provided on sides with abutting street trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The perimeter strip shall be covered with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Buffer Planting Areas.** In addition to the intent of the landscaping requirements noted above, buffer planting areas are intended to provide substantial vegetative screening between dissimilar zoning districts to soften visual and aesthetic impacts (unless exempted above).

- A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 15 feet and contains Type A Landscaping shall be provided on the property, along the boundary with the R-District.
- Where the property required to provide a buffer is 150 feet or less in depth, measured perpendicularly from the residential parcel, the buffer can be reduced to the minimum 7-foot wide buffer listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, T, HM, or PDB District property abutting R-District property</th>
<th>C, T, HM, or PDB District property across the street or alley from R-District property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 15 feet and contains Type A Landscaping shall be provided on the property, along the boundary with the R-District.</td>
<td>● A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 7 feet and contains Type B or C Landscaping shall be provided on the property, across from the R-District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Where the property required to provide a buffer is 150 feet or less in depth, measured perpendicularly from the residential parcel, the buffer can be reduced to the minimum 7-foot wide buffer listed below.</td>
<td>● Buffer planting areas may be broken only for vehicle and pedestrian access crossings and to allow limited access to and use of utility services located in alleys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planting Requirements.** These requirements are intended to provide trees of sufficient maturity at planting to provide more immediate mitigation to the site, to provide trees adequate space to avoid damage and continue growth, and to visually break up parking lots (unless exempted above).

- A minimum of 1 tree per 1,000 square feet of new parking lot area shall be provided.
- For parking areas behind buildings of 20 stalls or less that are shielded by buildings from public street view, a minimum of 1 tree per 2,000 square feet of parking lot area is required.
- If more trees are needed to meet distribution or street tree requirements, that total is the minimum requirement.

**Tree size and quantity**

- Interior landscaping distribution
  - Trees and planting areas shall be at aisle ends and evenly distributed throughout the new parking lot with no stall more than 50 feet from a tree trunk.
  - At least 1 tree shall be located within 10 feet of required walkway for each 40 feet of said walkway.

**Street trees**

- 3 trees per 100 feet of site street frontage shall be provided.
### Section 13.06.502.D

**X-District Landscaping**

| RCX, NCX, CCX, UCX, UCX-TD, CIX, URX, HMX, NRX |

#### Exemptions

- Single-family detached dwellings are exempt from all landscaping requirements contained in this table.
- Parking lots of 15 stalls or less, loading areas, and fueling stations are exempt from the Interior Landscaping Distribution requirements contained in the Planting Requirements section of this table, to allow flexibility in placement of required landscaping.
- Parking lots of 15 stalls or less, located behind buildings and accessed by alleys, are exempt from the Perimeter Strip, Buffer and Interior Landscaping Distribution requirements below.
- Property across an arterial street or highway from R-District property is not required to provide a Buffer Planting Area along the affected property line abutting the arterial street or highway.
- Park and recreation uses are only required to meet the Front Yard and Planting Requirements of this table. Passive open space areas of such uses are exempt from all landscaping requirements of this table.

#### Minimum Landscaping Area (unless exempted above)

| Overall site | For single-purpose residential developments, a minimum of 15 percent of the entire site, minus the area covered by structures, shall be covered with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants.  
| Exception: Requirements for developments with structured parking are relaxed based on the percentage of structured parking to the total number of on-site parking spaces. For example, if 50 percent of the parking is structured, then the amount of required overall site landscaping is reduced by 50 percent (to 7.5 percent). |
| Green roofs and roof gardens may be used to meet up to one-third of the landscaped area requirements.  
| Planting strips within street rights-of-way shall not be counted toward this requirement. |

| X-District property abutting R-1, R-2 or R-2SRD District property | A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 15 feet and contains Type A Landscaping shall be provided on the property, along the boundary with the R-District.  
| Where the property required to provide a buffer is 150 feet or less in depth, measured perpendicularly from the residential parcel, the buffer can be reduced to 10 feet in width. |

| X-District property across the alley from R-1, R-2 or R-2SRD District property | A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 7 feet and contains Type B or C Landscaping shall be provided on the property, across from the R-District.  
| Buffer planting areas may be broken only for vehicle and pedestrian access crossings and to allow limited access to and use of utility services. |
### Front Yard
- **Front Yard Landscaping**

  - In areas where buildings are not located adjacent to the sidewalk, the area between the public sidewalk and building frontage shall incorporate expanded sidewalk space, seating, outdoor seating, plazas, and landscaping with a combination of trees, shrubs, and ground cover plants. The landscaped area may also include the stormwater facilities that provide access for pedestrians.

  - **Foundation Planting**
    - All street-facing elevations must have landscaping along the exposed foundation. The landscaped area must be at least three feet wide and be adjacent to the building facade that provides access for pedestrians.
    - Ground cover plants must be used along the outer edge of a porch instead of the foundation. This landscaping requirement does not apply to portions of the building facade that provide access for pedestrians.

### Foundation Planting Requirements

1. The landscaped area must be at least three feet wide.
2. Ground cover plants must be used along the outer edge of a porch instead of the foundation.
3. This landscaping requirement does not apply to portions of the building facade that provide access for pedestrians.

### Planting Requirements

These requirements are intended to provide trees of sufficient maturity at planting to provide more immediate mitigation to the site, to provide trees adequate space to avoid damage and continue growth, and to visually break up parking lots (unless exempted above).

### Street Trees

- Street trees shall be provided at a ratio of 3 trees per 100 feet of street frontage.

### Parking Lot Landscaping

1. **Perimeter parking lot landscaping**
   - Streets: 10-foot wide planting strip with Type C landscaping.
   - Side and rear yards: 10-foot wide planting strip with Type B or C landscaping. Where the subject property is 150 feet or less in depth, the perimeter strip can be reduced to 5 feet in width.
   - Perimeter strips may be broken only for vehicle and pedestrian access crossings and to allow limited access to and use of utility services located in alleys.

2. **Internal parking lot landscaping**
   - Planting areas with trees are required at all parking aisle ends.
   - Long rows of parking shall be broken by islands or peninsulas with trees such that there are no more than eight parking stalls in a row.
   - Type C landscaping shall be used for internal parking lot landscaping.
   - Bioretention cells or swales may be incorporated into required planting areas.

---
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### Section 13.06.502.E
Port Maritime and Industrial District Landscaping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-1, M-2, PMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Exemptions

- Single-family, two-family, and three-family dwellings are exempt from all landscaping requirements contained in this table.
- Required landscaped perimeter strips may be substituted with central landscaping, except where necessary to screen an outdoor storage or industrial use from an R-District property. Central landscaping is in equal proportion to that which would have been required and can be provided with variations in spacing and/or grouped to accommodate driveways, building entrances, etc. Required landscaped perimeter strips are those not otherwise exempted by the provisions in this section.
- Required landscaped perimeter strips and street trees may be exempted if demonstrated that such requirement would interfere with adjacent or intersecting railroads, including private spur railroads, existing storm water ditches, or national security requirements.
- When there is a 20-foot vertical grade difference between M or PMI District property that is abutting R-District property, no buffer is required along the affected property line if such grade difference is demonstrated to provide comparable protection.
- When there is a 20-foot vertical grade difference between M or PMI District property that is located across the street or alley from R-District property or adjacent to R-District property within a mixed-use district center, no buffer is required along the affected property line if such grade difference is demonstrated to provide comparable protection.
- Park and recreation uses are only required to meet the Minimum Landscaping Area—Overall site requirements and the Planting Requirements of this table. Passive open space areas of such uses are exempt from all landscaping requirements of this table.

#### Minimum Landscaping Area (unless exempted above)

- **Overall site**: Five percent of parking areas over 20,000 square feet of gross lot area shall be planted with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants. Not more than five percent is required for such parking areas, but this requirement is separate from the required site perimeter strip or buffer plantings.
- **Site perimeter strip**: Perimeter strips may be broken for primary structures and vehicle and pedestrian access crossings.
  - A minimum 5-foot wide perimeter strip that is covered with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants shall be provided along arterial street frontages.

#### Buffer Planting Areas

In addition to the intent of the landscaping requirements noted above, buffer planting areas are intended to provide substantial vegetative screening between dissimilar zoning districts to soften visual and aesthetic impacts, (unless exempted above).

- **M or PMI District property abutting R-District property**: A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 15 feet and contains Type A Landscaping shall be provided on the property, along the boundary with the R-District.
  - Where the property required to provide a buffer is 150 feet or less in depth, measured perpendicularly from the residential parcel, the buffer can be reduced to the minimum 7-foot wide buffer listed below.

- **M or PMI District property across the street or alley from R-District property**: A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 7 feet and contains Type B or C Landscaping shall be provided on the property, across from the R-District.
  - Buffer planting areas may be broken only for vehicle and pedestrian access crossings and to allow limited access to and use of utility services.
  - In cases where there is a demonstrated site constraint, the minimum buffer width may be reduced to a minimum 4 feet, with the integration of a continuous site obscuring fence or vegetated wall.
### Planting Requirements

These requirements are intended to provide trees of sufficient maturity at planting to provide more immediate mitigation to the site, to provide trees adequate space to avoid damage and continue growth, and to visually break up parking lots, (unless exempted above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree size and quantity</th>
<th>A minimum 1 tree per 1,000 square feet of parking lot area shall be provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If more trees are needed to meet distribution or street tree requirements, that total is the minimum requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior landscaping distribution</th>
<th>Trees and planting areas shall be at aisle ends and evenly distributed throughout the new parking lot with no stall more than 50 feet from a tree trunk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least 1 tree shall be located within 10 feet of required walkway for each 40 feet of said walkway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Street trees | In M-1 Districts, 3 trees per 100 feet of site street frontage shall be provided. |

### Section 13.06.502.F

**Shoreline District Landscaping**

**Applicability**

Landscaping shall be provided consistent with this table for all new surface parking lots as outlined below. In addition to these standards, the specific shoreline landscaping requirements and standards contained in Section 6.7 of the Shoreline Master Program also apply to all shoreline districts.

### Minimum Landscaping Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall site</th>
<th>Surface parking shall be separated from any roadway or property line by a landscaped area at least six feet wide. This parking lot perimeter strip may be broken only for vehicle and pedestrian access crossings. Such landscaped area shall be counted toward the requirements below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking lots that are less than 20,000 square feet in area shall contain a minimum of 15 percent landscaping of the parking area (including the interior).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking lots that are 20,000 square feet in area or greater shall contain a minimum of 20 percent landscaping of the parking area (including the interior).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If parking areas cannot be located on the street/landward side of the building, or within a structure, a minimum landscaped buffer of 10 feet adjacent to the shoreline shall be provided and maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the S-8 Thea Foss Waterway Shoreline District, landscaping shall additionally be consistent with the Thea Foss Waterway Design Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Planting Requirements.** These requirements are intended to provide trees of sufficient maturity at planting to provide more immediate mitigation to the site, provide trees adequate space to avoid damage and continue growth, and to visually break up parking lots (unless exempted above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree size and quantity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Parking lots shall contain one medium-growing tree for every 1,500 square feet of parking area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parking lots shall be landscaped with canopy-type trees and predominantly evergreen shrubs and groundcover plants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In the S.8 Thea Foss Waterway Shoreline District, landscaping shall additionally be consistent with the Thea Foss Waterway Design Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 13.06.502.G
Landscaping Types

Landscaping Type A—A dense landscaping screen separating different uses. Specifically:

a. For landscaping strips 10 to 15 feet wide:
   i. At least one row of evergreen trees, minimum 8 feet in height at the time of planting and 10 feet maximum separation.
   ii. Shrubs at a rate of one shrub per 20 square feet of landscaped area. In addition to being from minimum 3-gallon sized containers, shrubs shall be at least 16 inches tall at planting and have a mature height of at least 3 feet.
   iii. Groundcover plants.
   iv. Bioretention cells or swales can be incorporated into these landscaping strips.

b. For landscaping strips wider than 15 feet:
   i. A minimum of one evergreen tree for every 150 square feet arranged in a manner to obstruct views into the property.
   ii. Shrubs and groundcover as required above.
   iii. Bioretention cells or swales can be incorporated into these landscaping strips.
Landscaping Type B – A moderately dense and naturalistic vegetation screen to offer visual relief and integrate built elements into the natural environment. Specifically:

a. For landscaping strips less than 15 feet wide:
   i. Informal groupings of evergreen and/or deciduous trees. At least 50 percent of the trees must be evergreen. At least one tree per 500 square feet of landscaped area. Trees to be spaced at an average of 20 feet on center, but may be grouped in asymmetrical arrangements.
   ii. Shrubs at a rate of one shrub per 20 square feet of landscaped area.
   iii. Groundcover plants.
   iv. Bioretention cells or swales can be incorporated into these landscaping strips.

b. For landscaping strips wider than 15 feet:
   i. At least one tree per 300 square feet of landscaped area. At least 50 percent of the trees must be evergreen.
   ii. Tree species, shrubs, and groundcover as required above.
   iii. Bioretention cells or swales can be incorporated into these landscaping strips.
Landscaping Type C—Landscaping provides visual relief in parking areas and along roadways where both a canopy of trees and visibility is required.

a. For landscaping strips 5 to 20 feet wide:
   i. Trees at 20 feet on center.
   ii. Shrubs at a rate of one shrub per 20 square feet of landscaped area.
   iii. Groundcover plants.
   iv. Bioretention cells or swales can be incorporated into these landscaping strips.

b. For landscaping strips wider than 20 feet:
   i. At least one tree per 300 square feet of landscaped area or 20 foot separation (on average). Place trees to create a canopy in desired locations without obstructing necessary view corridors.
   ii. Tree species, shrubs, and groundcover as required above.
   iii. Bioretention cells or swales can be incorporated into these landscaping strips.

Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Landscaping Code (May 7, 2014)
Landscaping Type D—A decorative landscaped display with colorful flowers or foliage as a focal setting for signs, special site elements and/or high visibility or pedestrian areas. Specifically:

a. Shrubs, at least 50 percent of which must exhibit decorative floral or foliage, shall cover at least 50 percent of the landscaped area within 3 years.

b. The remaining 50 percent of the landscaped area may be planted with trees, shrubs, perennials, groundcover plants, or cultivated flower beds.
Landscaping Type E—Enhancing natural areas to better integrate developments into existing conditions. Specifically:

a. Landscaping shall consist of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants that are native to the Puget Sound and are appropriate to the conditions of the site.

b. Arrangement of plants shall be asymmetrical and plant material shall be sufficient in quantity to cover the soil in one growing season.

c. Minimum 20 feet in width if used as a screen or required front yard treatment.
13.06.502 Landscaping and buffering standards.

A. Intent. The landscaping requirements, as a whole, are intended to contribute to the aesthetic environment of the City; enhance livability and foster economic development by providing for an attractive urban setting; provide green spaces that can support the urban citywide tree canopy; wildlife, such as birds, in the urban environment; help reduce storm water runoff; filter pollution; buffer visual impacts of development; and, contribute to the planting, maintenance, and preservation of a stable and sustainable urban forest.

B. Applicability. Unless specifically exempted, landscaping shall be provided consistent with this section for all new development, including structures and/or parking lots, as well as alterations to existing development, and street improvements, as outlined below.

1. Alterations. Three thresholds are used to gauge the extent of landscaping standard compliance on alterations to existing development (in Downtown Districts, the thresholds of TMC 13.06A shall apply):
   a. Level I alterations to a site include all remodels and/or additions within a two-year period whose cumulative value is less than 50% of the value of the existing development or structure, as determined by the Building Code, excluding purchase costs of the property and/or structure. The requirement for such alterations is only that the proposed improvements meet the standards and do not lead to further nonconformance with the standards. For example, for an expanded parking area, landscaping would be required for the new parking area, but the applicant would not be required to bring an existing parking area into conformance with these landscaping standards.
   b. Level II alterations to a site include all remodels and/or additions within a two-year period whose cumulative value ranges from 50% to 200% of the value of the existing development or structure, as determined by the Building Code, excluding purchase costs of the property and/or structure. All standards that do not involve repositioning the building or reconfiguring site development shall apply to Level II.
   c. Level III alterations to a site include all remodels and/or additions within a two-year period whose cumulative value exceeds 200% of the value of the existing development or structure, as determined by the Building Code, excluding purchase costs of the property and/or structure. Such developments shall be brought into conformance with ALL of the applicable landscaping standards.
   d. The standards do not apply to remodels that do not change the exterior form of the building. However, if a project involves both exterior and interior improvements, then the project valuation shall include both exterior and interior improvements.
   e. No alteration shall increase the level of nonconformity or create new nonconformities to these standards. Existing landscaping that is above and beyond the current requirements may be removed, provided that the quantity is not reduced below the current requirements for the use on the site. All required landscaping shall be preserved in a healthy and thriving condition or replaced as necessary to maintain conformance with the applicable code requirements herein.

2. Street trees. In addition to the thresholds identified above, street trees are required when:
   a. Street or sidewalk improvements are required in association with a Preliminary Plats or Short Plats with 5 or more lots; or
   b. Constructing new permanent roadways, excluding residential Local Improvement Districts; alterations to the width of existing permanent roadways; constructing new sidewalk; replacing more than 50% of an existing sidewalk along a site’s frontage (when 50 linear feet or more is being constructed). In the case of sidewalk replacement, street trees shall be required proportionate to the linear footage of sidewalks replaced.
   c. If street trees are required in the applicable zone, then existing street trees shall be preserved in healthy condition per the tree preservation requirements of this section and the technical specifications of the UFM, or replaced, in association with street improvement projects.

C. General Landscaping Requirements applicable to all required landscaping.

1. Process and procedural requirements.
a. Landscape Plans and Landscape Management Plans demonstrating compliance with the installation, plant material, area and location, and maintenance requirements of this Section shall be submitted for all development proposals with landscaping requirements.

(1.) Landscape Plans and Landscape Management Plans, when required, shall be prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, Certified Landscape Technician, or Certified Professional Horticulturalist, unless otherwise approved by the City, and shall be submitted in a form specified by the City.

(a.) Landscape Plans must be drawn to scale and show all of the following:

- Plant species names (common and scientific);
- Plant stock sizes, condition, and quantity;
- Installation location of plant materials;
- Existing and proposed utilities;
- Existing and proposed bus stops (as applicable);
- Existing trees planned to be retained;
- Finished grade; and,
- Required irrigation systems (if applicable).

(b.) Landscape Management Plans shall address the following:

- Entity responsible for maintenance of the landscape during the establishment period (3 years following planting); and
- A schedule of maintenance activities, including, but not limited to, pruning, watering, fertilization, and inspection and replacement of dead and/or damaged plant materials.

(2.) Developments with less than 500 square feet of landscaped area are exempt from submitting a Landscape Management Plan, and may submit a Landscape Plan prepared by a non-professional. Capital street improvement projects involving fewer than 10 street trees are exempt from submitting a Landscape Management Plan.

b. The Urban Forest Manual (UFM) provides best management practices for plant selection, design, installation, care, and other specifications. Required landscaping shall be selected, installed and maintained consistent with the technical guidance of the UFM.

c. The Director will consider adopted neighborhood, area-specific or streetscape design specifications and/or plans for landscaping selection and location, and may modify the standard requirements of this section if such plans meet the intent of this section.

d. Modifications to landscaping installed under this section shall be in conformance with the intent of these requirements and the technical guidance of the UFM. Regular maintenance and pruning; replacement of plant material in kind; and revisions to planting plans that are consistent with all requirements and any conditions of approved permits, are authorized without further review. Significant changes to the configuration or location of required landscaped areas require the approval of the Director.

e. Landscaping quantity calculations. When an amount or number of trees or plants is specified, that shall be the minimum number required. Any requirement resulting in a fraction of 0.3 or greater, when applied, shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number. Any requirement resulting in a fraction of less than 0.3 shall be rounded down to the nearest whole number. In cases where the minimum is expressed as a ratio of a number of trees or shrubs per a specified amount of area or length of site frontage or buffer, the number of required trees or shrubs shall be calculated by applying the ratio to the square footage of the area or length. For example, street tree requirements of 4 Small, 3 Medium or 2 Large trees per 100 feet of street frontage can be viewed as 1 Small per 25 feet, 1 Medium per 33.33 feet, or 1 Large tree per 50 feet. Small, Medium and Large Trees may be used in combination, according to the applicable ratios.

EXAMPLE: A site with 50 feet of street frontage would require 2 Small (50 x 4/100 = 2), 2 Medium (50 x 3/100 = 1.5, which rounds up to 2), or 1 Large (50 x 2/100 = 1).

EXAMPLE: A site with 60 feet of street frontage would require 3 Small (60 x 4/100 = 2.4 which rounds up to 2), 2 Medium (60 x 3/100 = 1.8, which rounds up to 2), or 1 Large (60 x 2/100 = 1.2, which rounds down to 1).
f. Landscaping provided to meet one requirement may in some cases count toward another applicable requirement if the intent of both requirements are being fully met. When two or more landscaping requirements apply to the same portion of a site, the most stringent of the requirements shall apply.

g. All landscaping required by this section must be planted prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. If the applicant files financial security with the City, which ensures that the vegetation will be installed, the vegetation may be deferred during the summer months to the next planting season, but for no more than 6 months, unless otherwise approved by the Director.

2. Plant Material Selection.

a. Existing trees, shrubs, and groundcover which comply with the requirements of this Section may count towards the required landscape plantings.

b. Native and climate-adapted landscaping. All required landscaping shall be climate-adapted. The retention and use of natives is encouraged and permitted for any and all landscaping. Invasive species, as identified in the UFM, shall not count toward meeting required plantings. Noxious weeds are prohibited from being planted in required landscaped areas.

(1.) Habitat Corridors. A minimum of 50 percent of required landscaping located within Comprehensive Plan designated Habitat Corridors, and a minimum of 25 percent in adjacent areas within 20 feet of Habitat Corridors, must be native plant species. Reductions are permitted when necessary to follow coordinated plans to address slope stability, habitat health, streetscape or area-wide plans.

c. Required landscaping areas are encouraged to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) bioretention and infiltration stormwater facilities, as defined in the City of Tacoma Stormwater Management Manual. Limited flexibility shall be granted to specific standards as applicable to accommodate LID features.

d. Visibility and safety. Except in cases where required landscaping is intended to provide dense visual buffers or to enhance natural conditions, trees and shrubs shall be selected and maintained to maximize visibility at eye level for safety. To meet this requirement, shrubs shall be chosen that will readily remain under 3 feet in height. Trees shall be selected and pruned (once tall enough) to maximize views below 7 feet in height.

e. Trees.

(1) Tree Species Selection – Small, Medium and Large species. Trees are categorized as small, medium or large based on their height and crown spread at maturity and on their growth rate. Trees size categories are determined according to the Canopy Factor, which is calculated using the following formula: (mature height in feet) x (mature crown spread in feet) x (growth rate number) x 0.01 = Canopy Factor. The growth rate number is 1 for slow growing trees, 2 for moderately growing trees, and 3 for fast growing trees. Large Trees have a Canopy Factor greater than 90; Medium Trees have a Canopy Factor from 40 to 90; Small Trees have a Canopy Factor less than 40.

(a.) Small, Medium and Large Tree lists are included in the UFM. To determine the size category of a tree not listed in the UFM, the applicant must provide an authoritative source of information about the tree’s mature height, crown spread and growth rate. Objective information must come from published sources or from the nursery providing the tree growth information, often called “cut sheets”.

(2) Species shall be selected to avoid or minimize potential conflicts with infrastructure and utilities. Trees under power lines shall have a maximum mature height (at 25 years of age) not greater than 25 feet. New tree plantings shall be a minimum of 2 feet from pavement (curb, sidewalk, alley, street), 5 feet from a structure, 5 feet from underground utilities, and 10 feet from light standards. Distances may be reduced, with staff approval, upon a demonstration that the species selected will not cause infrastructure conflicts. The UFM contains additional guidelines on this subject.

(3) Tree variety. For projects that involve the planting of between four and ten trees, at least two different kinds (Genera) of trees shall be included. For projects involving the planting of more than ten trees, at least three different kinds (Genera) of trees, and a mixture of tree types (evergreen and deciduous) shall be included. For projects that involve planting more than twenty-five trees, no more than 25 percent shall be from one Genera and a minimum of 20 percent must be evergreen.

(4) Tree size at planting. Trees provided to meet the landscaping requirements shall be consistent with the following size requirements at the time of planting: For deciduous trees, at least 50 percent of the trees provided shall be a
minimum 2-inch caliper at the time of planting, with the remaining deciduous trees a minimum 1½-inch caliper. For evergreen trees, at least 50 percent of the trees provided shall be a minimum of 6 feet tall, with the remaining evergreen trees a minimum of 5 feet tall at the time of planting. Evergreen trees provided to meet these requirements shall also be species with the ability to develop a minimum branching width of 8 feet within 5 years.

f. Shrubs and Groundcover.

(1) Turf lawn and mulch are not considered groundcover for the purposes of complying with this section.

(2) Low Impact Development bioretention and infiltration stormwater facilities, as defined in the City of Tacoma Stormwater Management Manual, that incorporate trees, shrubs and/or groundcover may count as meeting tree, shrub and groundcover requirements.

(3) Shrub variety. If there are more than 25 required shrubs, no more than 20 percent of them can be of one species.

(4) Groundcover and shrub plants must be planted at a density that will cover the entire area within three years.

(5) Unless specified otherwise, shrubs provided to meet these requirements shall be from a minimum 2-gallon container.

3. Installation and Maintenance.

a. Landscaping shall be installed and maintained in a healthy, thriving, and safe condition, and replaced as necessary, during the plant establishment period and for the life of the project, consistent with the requirements, standards and specifications of this Section and the UFM.

b. Conditions shall be provided to promote tree longevity, thus reducing the need for replacement. Considerations shall include planting species in locations and with conditions favorable to their health, and providing appropriate protection from potential damage from adjacent uses, development or activities.

c. Minimum tree trunk setbacks, unpaved planting area per tree, soil volumes and spacing requirements shall be provided for healthy tree growth, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Trees</th>
<th>Medium Trees</th>
<th>Large Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum unpaved planting area (sq. ft.):</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum tree pit width (ft.):</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum tree pit length (ft.):</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum soil volume (cu. ft.):</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum spacing (ft.) between trees:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceptions to these minimums may be approved with staff review, upon demonstration that healthy tree growth will be achieved and infrastructure and other conflicts will be avoided.

d. All required landscaping must be planted in the ground, where feasible. In cases where this is not feasible, the use of planters or other approaches may be authorized as long as minimum soil depth and unpaved planting area dimensions are maintained. Soil composition and volume shall be provided as appropriate to promote the health of the plants, per the specifications of the UFM.

e. Irrigation. An irrigation system, which in some cases shall include hand watering, shall be provided for all required landscaping per the guidance of the UFM, to ensure survival through the plant establishment period.

f. Pruning: Pruning of required trees or shrubs shall be for the purpose of maintaining the tree or shrub in a healthy and thriving condition and/or to enhance its natural growing form. Trees and shrubs shall not be excessively pruned such that it adversely affects the healthy living condition of the plant, significantly damages the natural growing form of the plant, or eliminates or significantly reduces the purpose for the planting. Topping, an extreme form of pruning, of trees required by this Section is prohibited. This prohibition does not apply to pruning performed to remove a safety hazard, or to remove dead or diseased material, or to avoid overhead power lines.

g. Violations of the provisions of this section are subject to Code Enforcement, per TMC 13.05.100.
D. Credits and Flexibility

1. Utilizing credits and flexibility. The following credits may be utilized separately or in combination.

2. Tree retention. The following tree planting credits are available for existing trees, provided a Certified Arborist’s Report determines that the tree(s) is healthy and can be saved through construction activities. If retained trees are damaged during or after construction, replacement shall be based upon the same ratios. A Certified Arborist’s Report and Tree Protection Plan consistent with the requirements outlined in the UFM showing existing trees, existing and proposed grading, new development on the site (such as buildings, utilities, etc.), measures taken to protect existing trees and any new trees that will be planted on the site shall be submitted if trees are being retained for credit. To be eligible for this credit, trees must be healthy and have minimal serious defects or defects that cannot be mitigated by proper pruning as indicated on the Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan. Trees shall count according to their species as Small, Medium and Large Trees.

   a. One required tree for every retained tree of at least equal size:

   b. Two required trees for every retained tree that is 8 inches to 20 inches in DBH;

   c. Three required trees, for every retained tree 20 inches to 32 inches in DBH;

   d. Four required trees, for every retained tree over 32 inches in DBH.

   e. In order to facilitate and provide an incentive for the retention of substantial numbers of mature trees, additional flexibility is available on Parking Lot Distribution requirements. See table 13.06.502.E.

3. Evergreen trees. Evergreen trees, above and beyond those otherwise required, shall count as 1.1 trees toward total number required. If greater than two-thirds of required trees are Evergreens, additional flexibility is available on Parking Lot Distribution requirements. See table 13.06.502.E.

4. Low Impact Development features. For sites utilizing Low Impact Development (LID) techniques as defined in the City of Tacoma Stormwater Management Manual as their primary stormwater management approach, additional flexibility is available on Parking Lot Distribution requirements. See table 13.06.502.E.

5. Urban Forestry Fund. In limited instances when specific site characteristics do not support the preservation or planting of trees, funds may instead be paid into the City Urban Forestry Fund. Applicants must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Director that specific site characteristics make the installation of landscaping on the site problematic to its reasonable use. Landscaping buffer requirements may not be modified through this provision. Landscaping must still be installed to the maximum extent practicable. Funds collected will be used by the City Urban Forestry Program to plant trees on other public or private property within the City. The required amount will be equal to 1.5 times the cost to purchase and plant the required landscaping and maintain it through establishment, as specified in the UFM.

6. Self-managed Agencies. An optional process for additional flexibility is available for public agencies with urban forestry programs and plans. This option is intended to encourage public agencies to take a leadership role in implementing urban forestry goals and policies. This flexibility can facilitate more intensive development of a particular development site, while meeting the urban forestry policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the intent of the landscaping code by planting the required landscaping at another site within the City of Tacoma in the agency’s permanent control.

   a. To initiate this optional process, public agencies must submit a request to PDS to be designated as a self-managed agency, including the agency’s urban forestry plan, an overview of its urban forestry program, and an analysis demonstrating general consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and landscaping code. The general landscaping requirements of this section apply. Plantings already required by a separate regulatory authority may not count toward meeting the requirements of this section. Upon review, the Director will issue a Determination regarding the consistency of the request with the Comprehensive Plan and code intent. If approved, the Determination shall grant self-managed agency status for up to ten years, subject to reevaluation. The Director reserves the right to withdraw the self-managed agency status should the intent not be met.

   b. Self-managed agencies may choose to plant landscaping required as part of a particular development proposal in another location per their urban forestry plan. This flexibility can be utilized at the agency’s discretion on subsequent site-specific development proposals. Each request to utilize this process as part of a development
proposal review shall make reference to the approved Determination, be supported by running totals of landscaping planted in this manner, and include status updates on ongoing health of such landscaping.

c. Landscaping Buffers, when required, must be provided on the development site and cannot be shifted to another site. In addition, to the extent feasible, some portion of required street trees and parking lot landscaping shall be planted at the development site, or if shifted from the development site shall be planted in proximity to impervious surfaces, in order to achieve commensurate stormwater benefits.
**TMC 13.06.502.E Landscaping requirements applicable to Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Mixed-Use Districts.**

The standards of this section are intended to implement the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the intent of this section. The landscaping standards of this table apply to new development and substantial alterations, as stipulated above, in Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Mixed-Use Centers (X) Districts.

**Exemptions:**

1. Single, two and three-family developments, unless in association with a full plat or a short plat with 5-9 lots, are exempt from all landscaping requirements.
2. Passive open space areas are exempt from all landscaping requirements (however development activities on such sites may trigger landscaping requirements).
3. Park and recreation uses are exempt from the Overall Site, Site Perimeter and Buffer requirements of this section.

**Using this table:**

- This table contains both numerical and distribution requirements for trees. In each case, whichever requirement would generate the larger number shall control and be the required number of trees.

**Overall Site Landscaping:** Overall Site Landscaping is intended to ensure that a minimum amount of landscaping is provided with development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Site Landscaping Minimums</th>
<th>This requirement may be provided anywhere on the site. The amount is determined as a percentage of the site which is not covered with structures. It may be satisfied by landscaping provided to meet other requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Districts: 5 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Districts: 10 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Districts: 5 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Districts: 15 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planting requirements**

- When Required, Overall Site Landscaping shall consist of a mixture of trees, shrubs and groundcover plants, as follows:
  - At least one Small Tree per 200 square feet; one Medium Tree per 300 sf; or one Large Tree per 400 sf of required overall site landscaped area.
  - Shrubs and groundcover to completely cover the remaining area within 3 years.

**X Districts Exceptions**

- Requirements for developments with structured parking are relaxed based on the percentage of structured parking to the total number of on-site parking spaces. For example, if all parking is structured, there is no overall site landscaping requirement. If 50 percent of the parking is structured, then the amount of required overall site landscaping is reduced by 50 percent.
  - Green roofs and roof gardens may be used to meet up to one-third of the landscaped area requirements.
  - Planting strips within street rights-of-way shall not be counted toward this requirement.
### Site Perimeter Landscaping

Site Perimeter Landscaping is intended to ensure that areas abutting public rights-of-way, and not developed with structures, be attractive, and provide the environmental benefits of vegetation.

**Exceptions:**

1. Site Perimeter Landscaping is not required in Industrial or X Districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- When applicable, a Site Perimeter is required around the entire perimeter of the site. Perimeter strips may be broken for primary structures, vehicle and pedestrian access crossings, and to allow limited access to and use of utility services located in alleys, but not by accessory structures, paved areas, outdoor storage or other development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A minimum 7-foot wide site perimeter strip shall be provided on sides without abutting street trees. The required perimeter strip shall be reduced to 5 feet for parcels of 150 feet or less in depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A minimum 5-foot wide site perimeter strip shall be provided on sides with abutting street trees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The perimeter strip shall be covered with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and groundcover plants, as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At least one Small Tree per 200 sf; one Medium Tree per 300 sf; or one Large Tree per 400 sf of required landscaped area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trees planted shall be generally evenly distributed over the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Place trees to create a canopy in desired locations without obstructing necessary view corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shrubs and groundcover to completely cover the remaining area within 3 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscaping Buffers

Landscaping buffers are intended to function as a substantial vegetative screening providing physical and visual separation between dissimilar districts in order to soften visual and aesthetic impacts. Buffers also provide the aesthetic and environmental benefits of vegetation.

**Exceptions:**

1. When there is a 20 foot vertical grade difference between a development site that is located across the street or alley or is abutting R-District property, no Landscape buffers are required along the affected property line if such grade difference is demonstrated to provide comparable protection.

2. When the development site is across an arterial street or highway from the R-District property being screened, it is not required to provide a Landscape buffer along the affected property line abutting the arterial street or highway.

3. The Director may waive the requirement for a screening if equivalent screening is provided by existing parks, parkways, recreation areas, or by topography or other natural conditions.

4. The Director may waive the requirement for a screening if the R-District property being screened is in long-term use for a purpose other than residential, and which would not be negatively impacted by adjacency to a more intensive use.
### More intensive district abutting an R-District property
- A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 15 feet shall be provided on the property, along the boundary with the R-District.
- Where the property required to provide a buffer is 150 feet or less in depth, measured perpendicularly from the residential parcel, the buffer can be reduced to the minimum 10-foot wide buffer listed below.

### More intensive district across the street or alley from R-District property
- A continuous planting area that has a minimum width of 7 feet shall be provided on the property, across from the R-District.
- In cases where there is a demonstrated site constraint, the minimum buffer width may be reduced to a minimum 4 feet, with the integration of a continuous site-obscuring vegetated fence or wall.

### Planting – when abutting R-District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. For landscaping strips 10 to 15 feet wide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. At least one row of evergreen trees, minimum 8 feet in height at the time of planting and 10 feet maximum separation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Shrubs at a rate of one shrub per 20 square feet of landscaped area. In addition to being from minimum 3-gallon sized containers, shrubs shall be at least 16 inches tall at planting and have a mature height of at least 3 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Groundcover plants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These provisions supersede the standard height, spacing and visibility provisions of the General Section, above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. For landscaping strips wider than 15 feet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. A minimum of one evergreen tree for every 150 square feet arranged in a manner to obstruct views into the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Shrubs and groundcover as required above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| c. This Landscaping Buffer is not subject to landscaping credits or flexibility provisions of TMC 13.06.502.D. |
| d. Alternative species selection and spacing plans demonstrated to substantially meet the Buffer intent may be approved with staff review. |

### Diagrams
- **For landscaping strips 15 feet wide or less:**
  - 8' tall min.
  - Shrubs@ 1/20sf
  - Groundcover

- **For landscaping strips wider than 15 feet:**
  - A minimum of one evergreen tree at least 8' tall for every 150 square feet arranged in a manner to obstruct views into the property.
| Planting – across the street or alley from R-District | • At least one Medium Tree per 300; or one Large Tree per 400 square feet of landscaped area.  
• Trees to be spaced at an average of 20 feet on-center, but may be grouped in asymmetrical arrangements.  
• At least 50 percent of trees must be evergreen conifers. |
| Mobile home/trailer courts abutting Residential districts (where permitted) | • A wall, fence, vegetated wall, evergreen hedge, or other suitable enclosure of minimum height four and one half feet and maximum height of seven feet placed at least five feet from the side and rear lot lines. The area between such enclosures and the property lines shall be landscaped to form a permanent screening area.  
• A landscaped screening area at least five feet in depth must be provided along the street frontage on a non-arterial street forming a boundary between a mobile home park site and an R-1, R-2, or R-3 District.  
• No signs shall be permitted on any part of a screening enclosure or within a screening area. |

**Street trees:** Street trees are intended to provide multiple benefits including aesthetics, traffic calming, environmental, shading, visual buffering and noise separation from streets.

**Exceptions:**

1. Street trees are not required in PMI Districts, with the exception of the following gateway corridors into the City located within or near the Port of Tacoma: Marine View Drive, E. 11th Street west of Portland Avenue, Portland Avenue (south of E. 11th Street), and Port of Tacoma Road (south of E. 11th Street).

**Planting Requirements:**

- Four Small Trees; three Medium Trees; or, Two Large Trees per 100 linear feet of site frontage.
- Street trees should generally be evenly spaced to create or maintain a rhythmic pattern, but can be provided with variations in spacing and/or grouped to accommodate driveways, building entrances, traffic signs, or other streetscape features, or if such variations are demonstrated to better achieve the intent.
- Street trees shall, when possible, be planted within the right-of-way adjacent to the curb and between the pedestrian lane/sidewalk and curb. When this is not possible or a different location would better achieve the intent, street trees may be located elsewhere within the right-of-way, including behind the sidewalk, in street medians, parking strips or bulbouts. If neither of these preferred locations is possible, such as when existing infrastructure prevents trees from being planted within the right-of-way, trees located within 10 feet of the right-of-way may be counted as street trees.
**Parking Lot Landscaping:** Parking lot landscaping is intended to provide visual relief, to enhance the aesthetic appearance, screening from adjacent sites and public areas, to reduce environmental impacts of parking and other paved areas, and to provide shade and shelter for pedestrians.

**Exceptions:**
1. Parking Lot Perimeter Landscaping is not required in M-2 or PMI Districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Area tree minimum - overall</th>
<th>One Small Tree per 700 square feet; one Medium Tree per 1,000 square feet; or, one Large Tree per 1,400 square feet of parking lot area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parking Lot – Interior Planting Requirements | A mixture of trees, shrubs and groundcover meeting the following requirements:  
- At least one Small Tree per 200 sf, one Medium Tree per 300 sf; or one Large Tree per 400 sf of landscaped area.  
- Trees planted shall be generally evenly distributed over the site.  
- Shrubs and groundcover plants as required above.  
- Trees placed to create a canopy in desired locations without obstructing necessary view corridors. |
| Distribution | No stall shall be more than 50 feet from a tree trunk.  
- Long rows of parking shall be broken by islands or peninsulas with trees, such that there are no more than eight parking stalls in a row without a tree.  
- Planting areas with trees are required at all parking aisle ends.  
- Trees shall be provided at an average of 40-foot intervals along walkways within or adjacent to parking lots. In X Districts, trees shall be provided at an average of 30-foot intervals. |
| Distribution Flexibility Bonuses | For each of the following bonuses provided, Parking Lot Distribution requirements may be modified as follows: The maximum distance from each stall may increase by 10 feet; and, maximum parking row length may increase by 1 stall.  
- Tree retention: Retention of trees at least 20 inches in diameter constitutes at least 50 percent of the number of required trees.  
- Evergreen trees: Evergreen trees constitute greater than two-thirds of required trees.  
- Low Impact Development: Sites utilizing Low Impact Development (LID) techniques as defined in the City of Tacoma Stormwater Management Manual as their primary stormwater management approach. |
| Parking lot - Perimeter landscaping Planting Requirements | Parking Lots with more than 20 stalls are required to provide a 10-foot wide planting strip per the planting requirements below.  
- Where the subject property is 150 feet or less in depth, the perimeter strip can be reduced to 5 feet in width.  
- When applicable, a Parking Lot Perimeter is required around the shortest circumferential line defining the exterior boundary of a...
parking, loading or similar paved area, excluding driveways or walkways providing access to the facility.

Parking Lot Perimeters shall be planted with a mixture of trees, shrubs and groundcover meeting the following requirements:
- At least one Small Tree per 200 sf, one Medium Tree per 300 sf; or one Large Tree per 400 sf of landscaped area.
- Trees planted shall be generally evenly distributed over the site.
- Shrubs and groundcover plants as required above.
- Trees placed to create a canopy in desired locations without obstructing necessary view corridors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X District Front Yard and Foundation Landscaping: Trees, shrubs and groundcover plantings intended to soften the visual appearance of exposed foundations and building frontages in highly pedestrian areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong> In areas where buildings are not located adjacent to the sidewalk, the area between the public sidewalk and buildings shall incorporate expanded sidewalk space, outdoor seating, plazas and/or landscaping with a combination of trees, shrubs, and/or ground cover plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong> All street-facing elevations must have landscaping along any exposed foundation. The landscaped area may be along the outer edge of a porch instead of the foundation. This landscaping requirement does not apply to portions of the building facade that provide access for pedestrians or vehicles to the building. The foundation landscaping must meet the following standards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The landscaped area must be at least three feet wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There must be at least one shrub for every three lineal feet of foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Groundcover plants must fully cover the remainder of the landscaped area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.06.700 Definitions and illustrations.

13.06.700.A Arborist: An individual engaged in the profession of arboriculture who, through experience, education and related training, possesses the competence to provide for or supervise the management of trees and other woody plants and is certified and in good standing with the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA), or equivalent agency.

13.06.700 C Caliper: Diameter of a tree’s trunk or stem measured at a point 6 inches above finish grade if the resulting measurement is up to and including 4 inches. If the resulting measurement is more than 4 inches the point of measurement shall be relocated to 12 inches above finish grade.

Climate-adapted Plant Species. Climate adapted plants include both native and non-native plant species which are able to thrive in the local climate and soil conditions of the City of Tacoma. The two most authoritative references on climate adaptation for plants are the USDA Plant Hardiness Zones and the Sunset Climate Zones.

13.06.700.D Deciduous: A plant that loses its leaves and remains leafless for some months of the year, usually in winter (temperate zones) or the dry season (tropical zones).

Diameter at breast height (DBH): A tree’s trunk or stem diameter measured at four and one-half feet above the ground.

13.06.700.E Establishment period. A minimum of a three year time period following the transplanting/installation of vegetation where maintenance is crucial to the survival of the vegetation.

Evergreen: A plant that bears leaves throughout the year. Evergreen. A tree or shrub that retains green leaves throughout the year.
13.06.700.G

Genus (pl. genera): A group of plants within a family that is morphologically similar and contains one of more species.

Groundcover. Low and dense growing plants that cover the ground in place of turf, planted for ornamental purposes or to prevent soil erosion. Turf lawn and mulch do not count as groundcover.

13.06.700.H

Hazard Tree. Hazard Tree as defined by the Pacific Northwest Chapter of the International Society of Arboriculture: A hazard tree, or a hazardous component, exists when the sum of the risk factors assessed equals or exceeds a predetermined threshold of risk. Below that threshold, the tree (or component parts) is not considered to be a hazard.

13.06.700.I

Invasive species. A plant species that has a negative environmental, economical, recreational, and/or public health impacts that overcome native plants or ornamental landscaping for resources. For a current listing of Pierce County Invasive/Noxious weeds consult the Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Board.

13.06.700.L

Low-Impact Development. Low-Impact Development is a stormwater management strategy that emphasizes conservation and the use of natural site features, including transplanted and retained trees, integrated with engineered, small-scale stormwater controls to more closely mimic predevelopment hydrologic conditions.

13.06.700.M

Mature or maturity, tree. A tree that has achieved at least 75 percent of its anticipated crown growth or a tree that is over 15 years of age.
Noxious weed. A plant that, once established, is highly destructive, competitive, and difficult to control using cultural or chemical practices. For a current listing of Pierce County Invasive/Noxious weeds consult the Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Board.

13.06.700.P

Permanent Roadway. Roadway constructed with a designed full depth subgrade and road surface section with an established curb and gutter alignment.

Permeable pavement. Pervious concrete, permeable pavers, or other forms of pervious or porous paving material effectively allowing the passage of water through the pavement section. It often includes an aggregate base that provides structural support and acts as a stormwater reservoir.

Plants; Plant; Plant Material: These terms refer to vegetation in general, including trees, shrubs, vines, groundcovers, ornamental grasses, bulbs, corms, tubers, or herbaceous vegetation.

13.06.700.S

Shrub. Any woody perennial plant that is generally less than fifteen feet in height at maturity.

13.06.700.T

Tree. Any woody perennial that generally matures over fifteen feet in height, generally has a minimum mature canopy width of ten feet and greater, and is capable of being shaped and pruned to develop a branch-free trunk to at least eight feet in height at maturity.

Tree Size: Categorized as Large, Medium or Small as determined by the Canopy Factor, which takes into account the trees mature height, mature crown spread and growth rate. The Canopy Factor is calculated using the following formula: (mature height in feet) x (mature crown spread in feet) x (growth rate number) x 0.01 = Canopy Factor. The growth rate number is 1 for slow growing trees, 2 for moderately growing trees, and 3 for fast growing trees.

(A) Large Trees = Canopy Factor greater than 90
(B) Medium Trees = Canopy Factor from 40 to 90
(C) Small Trees = Canopy Factor less than 40

13.06.700.U

Chapter 13.06A
DOWNTOWN TACOMA

Sections:
13.06A.010 Purpose.
13.06A.020 Applicability.
13.06A.030 Definitions.
13.06A.040 Downtown Districts and uses.
13.06A.050 Additional use regulations.
13.06A.052 Primary Pedestrian Streets.
13.06A.055 Nonconforming Development.
13.06A.060 Development Standards.
13.06A.065 Parking Standards.
13.06A.070 Basic design standards.
13.06A.080 Design standards for increasing allowable FAR.
13.06A.090 Transfer of Development Rights for Increasing Allowable Floor Area Ratio.
13.06A.100 Downtown Master Planned Development (DMPD).
13.06A.110 Variances.
13.06A.111 Downtown District Fencing Standards.
13.06A.112 Known Archaeological, Cultural, and Historic Resources within the South Downtown Subarea.
13.06A.113 Traffic Impacts Assessment.
13.06A.120 Repealed.
13.06A.130 Severability.

***

13.06A.065 Parking Standards

***

D. General Parking Design Standards Applicable to the RPA and All Downtown Zones

***

3. All new surface parking lots, additions to parking lots, parking lots associated with buildings undergoing substantial alteration, parking lots increased in size by 50 percent, and parking lots altered on 50 percent of its surface shall provide a perimeter landscaping strip abutting adjacent sidewalks containing a combination of trees, and shrubs and groundcover per the General Landscaping requirements and the Parking Lot Perimeter requirements of TMC 13.06.502.

a. In no case shall fewer than three trees per 100 linear feet of frontage be provided.

b. Masonry walls no lower than 15” and no higher than 30” may be substituted for shrubs.

c. For lots greater than 20 stalls, at least 15 percent of the interior area shall be planted with trees, and shrubs and groundcover.

d. All trees shall have a minimum caliper of 2 1/2-inch at the time of planting.
13.06A.070  Basic design standards.

3. Four Small Trees, Three Medium Trees, or Two Large Trees  One street tree shall be provided per each 25 linear feet of frontage, with tree grates or alternative pervious surface materials covering the pits, in conformance with the City General Landscaping requirements of TMC 13.06.502. This standard, in its entirety, shall apply to all new construction, additions, substantial alterations, and when 50 percent or more of the existing sidewalk is replaced. One street tree shall be provided, consistent with the requirements of this standard, proportionate with the linear length of for each 25 linear feet of existing sidewalk that is replaced. Existing street trees shall be counted toward meeting this standard. Trees and grates should generally conform to the Tacoma Downtown Streetscape Study and Design Concepts.

a. The required street trees should generally be evenly spaced to create or maintain a rhythmic pattern, but can be provided with variations in spacing and/or grouped to accommodate driveways, building entrances, etc. To achieve consistency with the existing pattern of tree spacing, the quantity of required street trees may be modified.

b. Tree pits shall be covered by tree grates, or alternative pervious surface materials, to accommodate pedestrians in the planting area. The use of tree grates or alternative pervious surface materials will be determined by the presence of existing grates or surface materials in the district, and the width and function of the sidewalk.

c. Residential development may substitute plantings for grates or alternative tree pit pervious surface materials.

d. Where existing areaways, vaults or insufficient sidewalk widths prevent this form of planting, trees may be planted in planters that are generally in conformance with the Tacoma Downtown Streetscape Study and Design Concepts and the technical guidance of the Urban Forest Manual.

e. All trees shall have a minimum caliper of 2 1/2-inch at the time of planting.

6. Development shall also comply with the General Landscaping requirements of Section 13.06.502, the requirements as established in Section 13.06.511, Transit Support Facilities and Section 13.06.512, Pedestrian and Bicycle Support Standards.
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<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>City-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>City-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Amendment:</td>
<td>Various amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code to address inconsistencies, correct minor errors, and provide additional clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission Recommendations:
The proposed amendments involve changes to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan and changes to various sections in the Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC), Chapters 13.04, 13.05, 13.06, 13.11, and 13.12. These minor amendments are intended to address inconsistencies, correct minor errors, and improve provisions that, through administration and application of the Zoning Code, are found to be unclear or not fully meeting their intent.

The following is a summary list of the proposed changes, details of which are shown in Exhibits A and B.

Changes to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan:
- Updating the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) section to reflect the latest regulatory requirements and program opportunities approved by the Washington State Department of Transportation.
- Updating project cost information in the Mobility Master Plan section by:
  - Removing the cost information from the following tables:
    - Table 2 Short Term Bicycle Project Priority List
    - Table 9 Short Term Project Costs and Maintenance Estimates
    - Table 10 Medium Term Project Costs and Maintenance Estimates
    - Table 11 Long Term Project Costs and Maintenance Estimates
  - Deleting the following tables:
    - Table 7 Summary of Construction Costs for Recommended Projects
    - Table 8 Summary of Maintenance Costs for Recommended Projects
  - Adding a new table:
    - Table 7 Estimated Cost Range for Bicycle Facilities.
• Adjusting the boundary of the Downtown Regional Growth Center to reflect the removal of the northern half of the land area on the west side of the Thea Foss waterway. This change will bring about consistency with the adopted Shoreline Master Program.

Changes to the Container Port Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Application #2014-07):
• Adjusting the boundary of the Downtown Regional Growth Center to reflect the removal of the northern half of the land area on the west side of the Thea Foss waterway.

Changes to the Growth Strategy and Development Concept of the Comprehensive Plan:
• Adjusting the boundary of the Downtown Regional Growth Center to reflect the removal of the northern half of the land area on the west side of the Thea Foss waterway.

Changes to the Generalized Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan:
• Adjusting the boundary of the Downtown Regional Growth Center to reflect the removal of the northern half of the land area on the west side of the Thea Foss waterway.

Changes to the South Downtown Subarea Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plan:
• Adjusting the boundary of the Downtown Regional Growth Center to reflect the removal of the northern half of the land area on the west side of the Thea Foss waterway.

Changes to Chapter 13.04 Platting and Subdivisions, including:
• Clarification of the submittal requirements for short plats. The requirement to provide legal descriptions for all proposed lots will not be required at submittal but prior to recording for verification by the City Surveyor.
• The requirement that a vicinity sketch is included on the notice has been removed, consistent with the State’s requirement. The requirement that a legal description and a non-legal description are included in the notice remain.
• Standards for pipestem lots have been added. The intent of the standards is to ensure better integration of the new parcel and dwelling within the existing neighborhood. The standards include setback requirements and building height limitation.
• The correction of minor scrivener’s errors.

Changes to 13.05 Land Use Permit Procedures, including:
• Updating the Expiration of Permits chart to ensure accuracy and consistency within other code sections.
• Clarification the Hearing Examiner’s authority to hear appeals of Short Plat decisions.
• The addition of code language which changes the permitting process for Major Modifications to Conditional Use Permits.
• The correction of minor scrivener’s errors.

Changes to 13.06 Zoning, including:
• Section 13.06.100 – Residential Zoning and Development Standards
  • The addition of provisions requiring single-family dwellings to be oriented to the adjacent street or right-of-way.
A clarification to the Home Occupation Standards that on-premises sales of products associated with a Home Occupation are accessory to a service offered. For example, a home occupation engaged in hair salon services would be allowed to sell hair products and accessories.

Section 13.06.200 – Commercial Districts
- The addition of work-live units to the use Chart. Work-live units are allowed in most commercially zoned districts.

Section 13.06.300 – Mixed-Use Center Districts
- Changes include the removal of references and regulations pertaining to the Urban Center Mixed-Use - Tacoma Dome (UCX-TD) zoning designation as it was eliminated through the South Downtown Subarea Plan process. The UCX-TD zoning district was rezoned to Downtown Mixed-Use (DMU).

Section 13.06.400 – Industrial Districts
- The addition of Work-live units to the use charts.

Section 13.06.501 – Building Design Standards
- The revision of fencing standards language to ensure consistency with the Downtown (13.06A) code.

Section 13.06.502 Landscaping and/or Buffering Standards
- Removal of references to the zoning designation Urban Center Mixed-Use - Tacoma Dome (UCX-TD) as it has been replaced with Downtown Mixed-Use (DMU).

Section 13.06.510 Off-Street Parking and Storage Areas
- Removal of references to the zoning designation Urban Center Mixed-Use - Tacoma Dome (UCX-TD) as it has been replaced with Downtown Mixed-Use (DMU).

Section 13.06.513 Drive-throughs
- Removal of references to the zoning designation Urban Center Mixed-Use - Tacoma Dome (UCX-TD) as it has been replaced with Downtown Mixed-Use (DMU).

Section 13.06.522
- The addition of a definition for ‘work-live unit’ which is a combined living and work unit that includes a kitchen and a bathroom.

Changes to 13.06A
- Clarification of the regulations for work-live units in the Downtown by removing references to the Mixed-Use Centers.
- The designation of four new Pedestrian Streets within the South Downtown Subarea Plan area.
- Re-designating existing pedestrian streets in the Downtown Mixed-Use zoning district that were associated with the former zoning designation of Urban Commercial Mixed-Use zoning district. When the rezone to a downtown district occurred, it became necessary to re-designate the pedestrian streets.
Changes to 13.11 CAPO, including:

- Changes making the CAPO compliant with the new Shoreline Master Program and code.
- The removal of and all invalid references to critical areas that are now regulated under the shoreline code (Refer to 13.11.190.D).
- The CAPO changes will include minor corrections due to scrivener’s errors, duplication of code citation, and clarification of intent and regulatory application for certain code citations that in practice have revealed unintended interpretation errors.

Changes to 13.12 SEPA, including:

- The clarification of the appeals process for Shoreline Substantial Development Permits. Appeals of Shoreline Substantial Development Permits are appealable to the Shoreline Hearings Board.

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014, and kept the record open through March 21, 2014, to receive additional written comments. The Master Builders Association expressed concerns over the proposed setback requirements and building height limitations pertaining to pipestem lots (see “Changes to Chapter 13.04 Platting and Subdivisions” above). Upon review of analysis and clarifications provided by staff, the Commission made no modification to the proposed amendments.

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Tacoma Municipal Code as set forth in Exhibits A and B, respectively.

Exhibits:

A. Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (including the Transportation, Growth Strategy and Development Concept, Generalized Land Use, South Downtown Subarea Plan, and the proposed Container Port Elements)

Note:
The proposed amendments pertain to the following five elements of the Comprehensive Plan: (1) Transportation, (2) Growth Strategy and Development Concept, (3) Generalized Land Use, (4) South Downtown Subarea Plan, and (5) the proposed new Container Port Element.

The sections shown below are only those portions of the Comprehensive Plan associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that is deleted is shown in strikethrough.

****

Transportation Element

****

Section II – Mobility Master Plan

Policy Intent

Prioritizing Transportation Investment

Guiding Principles

Vision and Goals

Policies

T-MMP-1 Implementation
T-MMP-2 Livability
T-MMP-3 Environmental Sustainability
T-MMP-4 Transit Integration
T-MMP-5 Connectivity and Access
T-MMP-6 Maintenance
T-MMP-7 Education and Encouragement
T-MMP-8 Health and Safety
T-MMP-9 Engineering
T-MMP-10 Enforcement
T-MMP-11 Evaluation
T-MMP-12 Funding

Definitions

Implementation

Table 1 – Infrastructure Project Evaluation Criteria
Table 2 – Short Term Bicycle Project Priority List

Demonstration Projects

Bikeway Recommendations

Map 1 – Existing Bicycle Network Recommendations
Map 2 – Short Term Bicycle Network Recommendations
Map 3 – Medium Term Bicycle Network Recommendations
Map 4 – Long Term Bicycle Network Recommendations

Sidewalk Recommendations

Table 3 – Proposed Sidewalk Improvements
Map 5 – Pedestrian Network Improvements
Intersection Improvement Recommendations

Table 4 – Proposed Intersection Improvements

Sub-Area Plan Recommendations

Low-Impact Pedestrian Trails
Table 5 – Low-Impact Pedestrian Trails and Shared-Use Paths

Implementation Costs
Table 6 – Tiered Facility Lengths
Table 7 – Summary of Construction Costs for Recommended Projects
Table 8 – Summary of Maintenance Costs for Recommended Projects
Table 9 – Short Term Project Costs
Table 10 – Medium Term Project Costs
Table 11 – Long Term Project Costs

Implementation Strategies

1. Implementation
Action 1.1 Connected Network
Action 1.2 Monitor Progress
Action 1.3 Meet or Exceed Standards
Action 1.4 Partner with Transit
Action 1.5 All Ages and Abilities
Action 1.6 Wayfinding Signage
Action 1.7 Land Use Considerations
Action 1.8 End of Trip Facilities
Action 1.9 Implementation Committee
Action 1.10 Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
Action 1.11 Network Prioritization Timeline
Action 1.12 Network Prioritization Criteria
Action 1.13 Develop Partnerships

2. Livability
Action 2.1 Local Retail and Services
Action 2.2 20-Minute Neighborhoods
Action 2.3 Commercial Nodes
Action 2.4 Residential Connections
Action 2.5 Development Incentives for Promoting Walkability
Action 2.6 ADA Accessibility

3. Environmental Sustainability
Action 3.1 Climate Action Plan
Action 3.2 Parking Strategies to Reduce Driving
Action 3.3 End of Trip Facilities for Active Commuting
Action 3.4 Establish Vehicle Miles Traveled Goals

4. Transit and Streetcar Integration
Action 4.1 Connections and Transfers
Action 4.2 Incorporating Bikeways into Transit Projects
Action 4.3 Support Bus, Rail, and Streetcar Network
Action 4.4 Routes to Transit
Action 4.5 Bicycle Facilities at Transit Hubs

5. Connectivity and Access
Action 5.1 Cul-de-Sac Connectivity
Action 5.2 Regional Connectivity

6. Maintenance
Action 6.1 Prioritize Safety
Action 6.2 Inspection and Maintenance
Action 6.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes through Construction Zones
Action 6.4 Establish Routine Maintenance Program
Action 6.5 Ongoing Maintenance Strategy

7. Education and Encouragement
Action 7.1 Safety Education
Action 7.2 Linking Trips Education
Action 7.3 Promotion through City Sponsored Events
Action 7.4 Safety Education for Children
Action 7.5 Education on Laws and Regulations
Action 7.6 Education for Drivers
Action 7.7 Safe Routes to Schools
Action 7.8 Proper and Safe Behavior
Action 7.9 Awareness of Pedestrians with Disabilities

8. Health and Safety
Action 8.1 Partner with TPCHD
Action 8.2 Reduce Crashes
Action 8.3 Address Conflicts
Action 8.4 Barriers and Hazards

9. Engineering
Action 9.1 Signal Prioritization
Action 9.2 Bicycle Detection at Intersections
Action 9.3 Traffic Calming
Action 9.4 Separated Bicycle Facilities
Action 9.5 Design Guidelines

****

Annual Amendment Application #2014-11
Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (May 7, 2014)
Commute Trip Reduction

Policy Intent
As required by the Commute Trip Reduction Efficiency Act of 2006 (RCW 70.94.521-551) and the associated Washington Administrative Code WAC 468-63, the Tacoma City Council adopted the Commute Trip Reduction Plan on July 10, 2007 (Resolution No. 37220) and adopted the Commute Trip Reduction Ordinance into the Tacoma Municipal Code Chapter 13.15 on December 9, 2008 (Ordinance No. 27771).

The City’s CTR Plan is an evolving document that is frequently updated and provides guidelines for the City and major employers affected by the State law to implement effective strategies to achieve the trip reduction goals of 10% reduction in drive-alone trips and 13% reduction in vehicle miles traveled by 2014. The CTR Ordinance establishes requirements for affected employers, including an appeals process, and procedures for the City for program administration, monitoring, enforcement and intergovernmental coordination.

The CTR Plan and Ordinance are designed to achieve the following objectives: improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion, and reduce the consumption of petroleum fuels. With the focus on employer-based programs that encourage the use of alternatives to driving alone for the commute trip, CTR represents a centerpiece of the overall strategy of Transportation Demand Management (TDM).

In addition to the mandated program activity, the City of Tacoma is also participating in a voluntary, pilot program encouraged and funded by the State, whereby Downtown Tacoma is designated as a Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center (GTEC). More aggressive CTR strategies will be implemented within the GTEC, involving selected target audiences besides the CTR-affected employers. Expected outcomes of the pilot program are the reduction of auto-dependent trips and the alleviation of the burdens on State highway facilities within and between GTECs. The GTEC program was effective from July 2008 through June 2012. The City used State GTEC funds and partnered with Pierce Transit and the Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber of Commerce to create the City’s first transportation demand management association, Downtown on the Go (DTOG).

In addition to the mandated CTR activities, the City of Tacoma is also committed to participating in voluntary, innovative trip reduction pilot programs as approved by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). These pilots allow for designing customized strategies for a given boundary or target audience. The City of Tacoma will embark on its first residential outreach efforts as part of WSDOT’s CTR Pilot Alternative Plan from July 2013 – June of 2015. Commute Trip Reduction is now also referred to as Community Trip Reduction to more broadly refer to a variety of travel destinations beyond employment.

And between July 2008 to June 2012, Tacoma participated in the Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center pilot that enabled the development of Tacoma’s first Transportation Management Association called Downtown On the Go (DOTG). This innovative effort to target downtown trip reduction was created in partnership with Pierce Transit and the Tacoma Pierce County Chamber of Commerce. DOTG focuses trip reduction efforts in downtown Tacoma which has the highest employment and residential densities in the city.

DOTG has a Board made up of downtown businesses and local transportation agencies. Its purpose is to be the transportation advocate for anyone whose daily life is downtown by:

- Advocating for transportation choices and land use policies that promote a vibrant and integrated downtown; and
- Educating and encouraging downtown employers, employees and residents about transportation choices other than driving alone such as transit, ridesharing, biking, walking, and flexible work arrangements.

There are a number of Comprehensive Plan policies and strategies that are supportive of CTR and TDM, including policies contained in the Transportation Element, transportation-efficient land use policies contained in the Generalized Land Use Element, and traffic management strategies contained in the Neighborhood Element. The following policies are intended to provide additional tools to ensure the successful implementation of the CTR Plan and Ordinance, and contribute to accomplishing the City’s strategic goals of healthy environment, sustainable economy and livable community.

Policies
T-CTR-1 Comprehensive Planning and CTR
Incorporate Commute Trip Reduction in the planning for land use, transportation, housing, capital facilities, environmental protection, open space and recreation facilities, neighborhoods and communities, and other applicable disciplines of comprehensive planning. This will be accomplished by promoting CTR related and supportive policy aspects, such as those listed below:

- Promote transit-oriented development;
- Encourage maximum parking requirements for new development;
- Require active transportation connections between retail, living and work places;
- Evaluate land use changes to the Comprehensive Plan and determine how the development furthers the goals of CTR;
- Realize the Complete Street concept;
- Strive for job-housing balance;
- Support an integrated, regional high capacity transit system;
- Enhance walking and bicycling environment;
- Require parking for bicycles where applicable; and
- Ensure that connectivity, accessibility and transferability among multiple modes of transportation are adequate, efficient, safe and friendly for pedestrians and bicyclists.

T-CTR-2 Funding for CTR
Assign higher funding priority to and actively pursue funding opportunities for improvement projects and programs that are related to, supportive of, or integrated with Commute Trip Reduction.

T-CTR-3 Collaboration on CTR
Join force with appropriate jurisdictions and organizations to coordinate the Commute Trip Reduction program efforts; to best utilize and multiply each others' resources, success stories and innovative practices; and to ensure that fair and consistent services are provided to employers across jurisdictions and employers with worksites located in more than one jurisdiction.

T-CTR-4 Climate Change and CTR
Integrate the Commute Trip Reduction program efforts into the work program of the Office of Environmental Policy and Sustainability and the Sustainable Tacoma Commission on Climate Change (established pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 37631, adopted on October 21, 2008) to effectively reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality.

T-CTR-5 Innovation and Expansion of CTR
Pursue innovative measures of Commute Trip Reduction beyond the statutory suggestions and endeavor in expanding the scope of CTR beyond the statutory requirements, in order to maximize the effects of CTR. Focus efforts on personal trips as well as commute trips with an emphasis on active transportation for short travel distances.

T-CTR-6 Monitoring and Evaluation of CTR
Continually monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of employers' Commute Trip Reduction programs and the City’s CTR policies, and implement changes needed to achieve and exceed the statutory goals.

T-CTR-7 Leadership in CTR
The City of Tacoma as an employer should take the leadership role and set a positive example by maintaining a strong Commute Trip Reduction program for its employees.

Environmental Stewardship

Policy Intent
The City of Tacoma recognizes that environmental stewardship must be a central focus in establishing a transportation system that serves today's users and future generations. This is consistent with the City of Tacoma's compliance with the Washington Clean Air Act, the Commute Trip Reduction Law, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the State Environmental Policy Act. It also supports the City's interest in reducing stormwater and air pollution by lessening the use of petroleum fuel vehicles.
Section II – Mobility Master Plan

Policy Intent

The Mobility Master Plan Section of the Transportation Element provides a vision, policies and an implementation plan for how the City of Tacoma can improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists citywide over the next fifteen years. This section was distilled from Tacoma’s 2010 Mobility Master Plan Study. It moves the City towards social, economic and environmental sustainability and serves as a cornerstone for Tacoma’s climate action diminution strategies. A sustainable non-motorized transportation network is vital for Tacoma to achieve a substantial reduction in carbon emissions, as well as to provide a healthier environment for its residents.

The Mobility Master Plan Section envisions an interconnected bicycle and pedestrian network that provides safe routes to neighborhoods, schools, transit, business districts recreational facilities, and other destinations.

The implementation of a new set of mobility policies will improve Tacoma residents’ health, enhance their quality of life, help protect the City’s natural resources and be a source of pride to the community. It will also lead toward the goal of achieving “Bicycle Friendly Community” status by the League of American Bicyclists.

The Mobility Master Plan Section is consistent with the City’s Complete Streets policy and its associated design guidelines. The Mobility Master Plan Design Guidelines (Appendix E of the 2010 Mobility Master Plan Study) provide a comprehensive set of tools for designing and implementing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Tacoma’s streets vary significantly in width, speed and usage and the Design Guidelines provide a wide array of options to make them more user-friendly.

Prioritizing Transportation Investment

The ‘Green Transportation Hierarchy’ is a recent movement that recognizes transportation modes that have the least environmental impact and greatest contribution to livability. Intended as a prioritization strategy, the Green Transportation Hierarchy promotes funding and development of facilities for modes that affordably enhance access for the majority of Tacoma residents, rather than using level of service standards focused on vehicle movement. The hierarchy gives precedence to pedestrians, then to bicyclists and public transit. Commercial vehicles and trucks are also recognized as having priority over passenger vehicles.
Implementation

The recommended pedestrian and bicycle network improvements were developed with a thorough analysis of existing conditions utilizing a variety of methodologies, including the Pedestrian Zone Analysis, Pedestrian Crash Analysis, Bikeway Quality Index and Cycle Zone Analysis. Detailed descriptions of existing conditions analyses can be found in Appendix D of the 2010 Mobility Master Study. The recommended pedestrian network improvements should be consistent with the City of Tacoma’s 2008 ADA Transition Plan. This Plan outlines the City’s strategic priorities for curb ramp and sidewalk improvements.

The following table lists the criteria used to evaluate potential projects for the pedestrian and bicycle networks. These criteria, listed in the order of importance, were developed with input from public workshops and the Steering Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhances system connectivity/Closure of critical gap</td>
<td>To what degree does the project fill a missing gap in the bicycle and/or pedestrian system? How well does the project overcome a barrier in the current bicycle and pedestrian network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface with other transportation modes (e.g., transit)</td>
<td>To what degree does the project connect to transit facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic distribution of City coverage</td>
<td>To what degree does the project offer potential benefits to the wider, regional community by offering opportunities for increased connectivity to surrounding communities, other regional walkways/bikeways etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>How difficult will it be to implement the project? This criterion takes into account constraints like topography, existing development, presence or lack of available right-of-way, and environmental and political issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability for bicycling and/or walking with improvements</td>
<td>Does the route have potential to be safe and/or comfortable for bicycling after improvements have been made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations served</td>
<td>Does the project provide connectivity to key destinations, including schools, parks, employment, commercial centers, and civic centers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement that serves an immediate safety need</td>
<td>Can the project potentially improve bicycling and walking at locations with perceived or documented safety issues? This criterion takes into account available crash data as well as feedback from the Steering Committee and Tacoma residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration into the existing local and regional bikeway/walkway system</td>
<td>How many user generators does the project connect to within reasonable walking or bicycling distance, such as schools, parks, Downtown, colleges and universities, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected reduction in vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>To what degree will the project likely generate transportation or recreational usage based on population, corridor aesthetics, etc.? Does the project serve transportation needs, reducing the need for drive-alone trips, and promoting bicycling as a viable alternative to driving?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****
### Table 2. Short Term Bicycle Project Priority List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From-To</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Tyler St</td>
<td>S 60th St – S Manitou Wy</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>S Park Ave</td>
<td>S 40th St – E 96th St</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>$177,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>S 40th St</td>
<td>S Park Ave – S G St</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>Delin St/S G St/S 36th St/Tacoma/S 38th St</td>
<td>S 25th St – S 48th St</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>$342,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>Fawcett Ave/S 25th St</td>
<td>6th Ave – Tacoma</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>6th Ave</td>
<td>S G St – Fawcett Ave</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Sharrow&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>S G St</td>
<td>Division Ave – 6th St</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>Division Ave/Wright Park</td>
<td>Yakima Ave – N G St</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Shared-Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>N 23th/N 24th/Yakima Ave</td>
<td>Highland – Division Ave</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>N Highland St</td>
<td>N 23rd St – N 21st St</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>N 26th St</td>
<td>N Stevens St – Pearl St</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N 26th St</td>
<td>N Proctor – Alder</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>Sharrow/Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>S 37th St</td>
<td>A St – S Hosmer St</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>S Alaska St</td>
<td>S 38th St – S 37th St</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St</td>
<td>Alder St – McCarver St</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane/Sharrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>Historic Water Ditch Trail – Phase 2</td>
<td>S 80&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; / S Tacoma Way – S 72&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; and S 60&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; – S 56&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Streets</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>$488,000</td>
<td>Shared-Use Path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Completed and Underway**: 17.83 $1,996,000

### Short Term

1. N Stevens St: N 46th St – N 37th 0.62 $118,000 Bike Lane
2. Stevens/Tyler St: 6th Ave – S Wright Ave 1.76 $332,000 Bike Lane
3. S 47th St/S 48th St/E C St/E 46th St/E E St: S Tacoma Wy – McKinley Ave 3.20 $603,000 Bike Lane
4. Orchard: S 19th – N 26<sup>th</sup> 1.70 $307,000 Bike Lane
5. N 1st St/Broadway: N Tacoma Ave – Prairie Line Trail 1.43 $69,000 Bicycle Boulevard
6. NE Nassau Ave: Browns Pt Blvd – NE Northshore Pkwy 1.06 $200,000 Bike Lane
7. N 11th St: ferry St – Pacific Ave 1.25 $236,000 Bike Lane
8. S 12th St: S Jackson Ave – S Union Ave 2.51 $473,000 Bike Lane

---

<sup>1</sup> All improvements to a WSDOT facility must be coordinated with and approved by WSDOT Olympic Region Development Services

<sup>2</sup> Cost estimates in 2010 dollars

<sup>3</sup> Sharrow = Shared Lane Marking used in situations where bicyclists share the travel lane with motor vehicles

<sup>4</sup> Projects have the same priority number when they are part of a continuous corridor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From-To</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6th Ave</td>
<td>Ainsworth Ave – E Broadway</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ainsworth Ave</td>
<td>N Steele St – 6th Ave</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>N 11th St</td>
<td>N Pearl St – N Steele St</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S Washington</td>
<td>S 60th – S 43rd (S Tacoma Way)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S 66th St</td>
<td>Orchard St – Tacoma Mall Blvd</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>$347,000</td>
<td>Lanes/Sharrows/Bike Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>N Alder/N Cedar St</td>
<td>N 22nd St – SR 16</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>$527,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S Oakes St/S Pine St</td>
<td>SR16 – S 74th St</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>$587,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Historic Water Ditch Trail</td>
<td>Pine – C St</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>$745,000</td>
<td>Shared-Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Schuster Parkway Trail</td>
<td>S 7th – Ruston Way</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pipeline Road Trail</td>
<td>E 40th St – Waller Rd and 72nd</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>$618,000</td>
<td>Shared-Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E I St/E K St/E Wright Ave/Pipeline Rd</td>
<td>D St at Tacoma Dome/McKinley Park/Pipeline Road Trail</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sheridan Ave</td>
<td>6th St – S 25th St</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S 25th St</td>
<td>S State St/Scott Pierson Trail – Sheridan Ave</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Prairie Line Trail (Hood Street)</td>
<td>Foss Waterway to S 17th to S 25th St</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Shared-Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S 64th St</td>
<td>S Alaska Way – Waller Rd</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>S 43rd St/E E St/E 40th St</td>
<td>A St – Portland Ave</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S 37th St/Sprague Ave</td>
<td>Water Ditch Trail – S Steele St</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NE 51st St/NE Northshore Pkwy</td>
<td>NE Harbor View Dr – Hoyt Rd</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>$391,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NE Slayden Rd</td>
<td>NE Marine View Dr – NE Harbor View Dr</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Sharrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>N Baltimore St</td>
<td>N 46th – N 26th St</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>N Pearl St/Ferry Landing</td>
<td>N 51st St – Ferry Station</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>Sharrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S 80th/82nd St</td>
<td>S Hosmer – McKinley Ave</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>S Alaska St</td>
<td>S 56th – 96th St S</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>$473,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>S Mildred St</td>
<td>S 12th St – S 19th St</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$94,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dock St</td>
<td>S Schuster Pkwy – E D St</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td>Sharrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>N 51st St/Gallagher Dr</td>
<td>N Vassault St – Ruston Way</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ruston Way</td>
<td>N 49th St – Schuster Parkway</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>Sharrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>S Oxford St/S 8th St/S Meyers St/S 15th St</td>
<td>N Skyline Dr – S 19th St</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>N 37th St</td>
<td>N Shirley St – N Orchard St</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>Shared-Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>E Side Foss (D Street)</td>
<td>Murray Morgan Bridge to E 3rd St</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>Shared-Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S A St</td>
<td>E 96th St – E 37th St</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pearl St</td>
<td>N 11th – N 9th (Scott Pierson)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>Shared-Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jackson St</td>
<td>N 10th St – Scott Pierson Trail</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dome District to Puyallup Connection</td>
<td>Analysis for best route to River Road/Pioneer from Dome District and reverse direction</td>
<td>.25/TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Short Term</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implementation Costs

Tacoma has the potential to build on the existing walkway and bikeway networks and transform itself into a community where walking and bicycling for transportation and recreation are popular activities. This section lays out the approximate cost for completing the system. This network builds upon previous and ongoing local and regional planning efforts and reflects the extensive input offered by City staff, the Mobility Master Plan Steering Committee, bicycle and pedestrian stakeholder groups and Tacoma residents.

The charts below show the total projected mile of new facilities as well as the approximate cost. All cost estimates include only the pedestrian and bicycle facility treatment and not any additional costs of roadway expansion or improvement. Please note: these cost figures and those provided in the charts below are in 2010 dollars.

The time frames are as follows: short term is 1-5 years, medium term 6-10 and long term, 11-15 years. The total implementation cost of the Tacoma Mobility Master Plan is estimated at approximately $42.2 million, as shown in Table 7. Approximately 11% ($4.6 million) of the total build out is in planning/construction phase or has been completed. Short-term recommendations account for approximately $15.3 million.

The following tables show the breakdown of costs by facility type and time frame:

### Table 6. Tiered Facility Lengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Completed/Underway</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Boulevards</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>51.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>76.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Tracks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared-Use Paths</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>40.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>193.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Summary of Construction Costs for Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Completed/Underway</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Boulevards</td>
<td>$524,000</td>
<td>$1,101,000</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$2,485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td>$5,499,000</td>
<td>$5,840,000</td>
<td>$1,835,000</td>
<td>$14,134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>$4000</td>
<td>$179,000</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Tracks</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,029,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,029,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>$2,384,000</td>
<td>$6,454,000</td>
<td>$3,381,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$12,219,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$714,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$1,218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Use Paths*</td>
<td>$508,000</td>
<td>$1,816,000</td>
<td>$1,517,000</td>
<td>$7,055,000</td>
<td>$10,896,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,590,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,259,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,122,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,244,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,215,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Costs do not include projects programmed in the FY 2010-2015 Capital Facilities Program, including the Historic Water Ditch Trail and Pipeline Road Trail. Projected costs are approximate and based on a simple 10' asphalt path with two feet of crushed gravel on either side. This may not be an adequate width to accommodate the growing number of users in many instances.

---

2009 City Council and Planning Commission
Bike Ride on the Scott Pierson Trail

---
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Table 7. Estimated Cost Range for Bicycle Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Approximate Cost per Mile (low end)</th>
<th>Approximate Cost per Mile (high end)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Street</td>
<td>$1,456,000</td>
<td>$1,573,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Track</td>
<td>$1,546,000</td>
<td>$1,894,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Boulevard</td>
<td>$659,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Street, Minor Separation (bike lanes or buffered bike lanes)</td>
<td>$321,000</td>
<td>$574,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Street</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cost estimates for bike facilities derived from the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan. Costs estimates include the facility treatment and not any additional costs of roadway expansion or improvement. Costs are in 2013 dollars.

All cost estimates include only the pedestrian and bicycle facility treatment and not any additional costs of roadway expansion or improvement. Intersection cost estimates are based on the average cost of installing eight new ADA ramps and four crosswalks per intersection. Additional work may be required at some intersections to make them ADA accessible to make them per federal regulations safe for cyclists and pedestrians. Table 8 provides an estimate of maintenance costs for the recommended projects. Maintenance costs do not include sweeping and other repair that is part of regular street maintenance activities. Maintenance costs are estimated annually, with the overall cost amortized by the frequency of maintenance tasks.

Table 8. Summary of Maintenance Costs for Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Completed/Underway</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Boulevards</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$128,700</td>
<td>$718,200</td>
<td>$754,200</td>
<td>$250,700</td>
<td>$1,854,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrows (or Shared Lane Markings)</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Tracks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Use Paths</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$229,400</td>
<td>$191,600</td>
<td>$901,900</td>
<td>$1,376,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$197,500</td>
<td>$961,900</td>
<td>$1,082,400</td>
<td>$1,144,500</td>
<td>$3,386,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Short Term Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Boulevards</td>
<td>N Steele St – 6th Ave</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1 St/E Wright Ave/E K St/Pipeline Rd</td>
<td>McKinley Park – Pipeline Road Trail</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 11th St</td>
<td>N Pearl St – N Steele St</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 1st St/Broadway</td>
<td>N Tacoma Ave – Prairie Line Trail</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Baltimore</td>
<td>N 46th – N 26th St</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 43rd St/E E St/E 40th St</td>
<td>S A St – Portland Ave</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 64th St</td>
<td>S Alaska Way – Waller Rd</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 66th St</td>
<td>Orchard St – Tacoma Mall Blvd</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 80th/82nd St</td>
<td>S Hosmer – McKinley Ave</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S A St</td>
<td>E 96th St – E 37th St</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Oxford St/S 8th St/S Meyers St/S 15th St</td>
<td>N Skyline Dr – S 19th St</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan Ave</td>
<td>6th St – S 25th St</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Maintenance costs include re-striping, signage replacement, and roadway patching depending on facility type. Estimates do not include sweeping and other repair that is part of regular street maintenance activities. Estimated maintenance costs are presented on an annual basis, however the overall cost has been amortized by the frequency of maintenance tasks. For example, the need for re-striping is estimated to occur every other year, so the total cost ($4.50 per LF) is divided in half for the annual estimate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th Ave</td>
<td>Ainsworth Ave – E Broadway</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 51st St/Gallagher Dr</td>
<td>N Vassault St – Ruston Way</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
<td>$28,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Alder/N Cedar St</td>
<td>N 30th St – SR 16</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>$527,000</td>
<td>$68,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Stevens St</td>
<td>N 46th St – N 37th</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
<td>$15,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Nassau Ave</td>
<td>Browns Pt Blvd – NE Northshore Pkwy</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 51st St/NE Northshore Pkwy</td>
<td>NE Harbor View Dr – Hoyt Rd</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>$391,000</td>
<td>$50,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>S 19th – N 26th</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>$41,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puylallup Ave</td>
<td>Pacific Ave – City Line (bike lane only)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>$322,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 11th St</td>
<td>Ferry St – Pacific Ave</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>$236,000</td>
<td>$30,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 12th St</td>
<td>S Jackson Ave – S Union Ave</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>$473,000</td>
<td>$61,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 25th St</td>
<td>S State St/Scott Pierson Trail – Sheridan Ave</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 37th St/Sprague Ave</td>
<td>Water Ditch Trail – S Steele</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 47th St/S 48th St/E C St/E 46th St/E St</td>
<td>S Tacoma Wy – McKinley Ave</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>$603,000</td>
<td>$78,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Alaska</td>
<td>S 56th – 96th St S</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>$473,000</td>
<td>$61,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Mildred St</td>
<td>S 12th St – S 19th St</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$94,000</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Washington St</td>
<td>S 60th – S 43rd (S Tacoma Way)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Oakes St/SPine St</td>
<td>SR 16 – S 74th St</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>$587,000</td>
<td>$76,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens/ Tyler St</td>
<td>6th Ave – S Wright Ave</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
<td>$43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson St</td>
<td>N 10th – Scott Pierson Trail</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sharrows**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dock St</td>
<td>S Schuster Pkwy – E D St</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td>$1,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Pearl St/Ferry Landing</td>
<td>N 51st St – Ferry Station</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Slayden Rd</td>
<td>NE Marine View Dr – NE Harbor View Dr</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruston Way</td>
<td>N 49th St – Schuster Parkway</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sidewalks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 76th St</td>
<td>Alaska Ave – Pacific Ave</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 51st St</td>
<td>Slayden Rd – Browns Point Blvd</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 66th St</td>
<td>S Verde St Aly – South Tacoma Wy</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>$433,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 64th St</td>
<td>E J St – E N St</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 66th St</td>
<td>S Junett St – Wapato</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 84th St</td>
<td>Tacoma Mall Blvd – S Alaska St</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>$321,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Vassault, E</td>
<td>N 26th St – N 24th St</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 92nd Ave</td>
<td>S Hosmer – S D St</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>$743,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S L St</td>
<td>South End Neigh. Center – S 80th St</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>$141,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 24th St</td>
<td>N Narrows Dr – Lenore Dr</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>$172,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Harbor View Dr/NE 49th St</td>
<td>NE 51st St – Browns Point Blvd</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>$705,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Wapato</td>
<td>S 64th St – S 68th St</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 64th St</td>
<td>S Orchard St – Tyler St</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>$909,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 80th St</td>
<td>S Sheridan Ave – S Tacoma Ave</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>$894,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Ave</td>
<td>E D St – Wright St</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>$217,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Project Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 1 St &amp; Division Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Ave S &amp; S 9th St</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division St &amp; Sprague &amp; 6th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Mall Blvd &amp; S 48th St</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S J St &amp; S 19th St</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shared-Use Paths**

2 Sharrows, or Shared Lane Markings, are roadways marked with a bicycle symbol and chevrons where cars and bicycles share the same space. The Sharrow delineates the area where the cyclist is safest riding.

3 Costs for the N 37th St Trail and Pipeline Road Trail have been allocated into the FY 2010-2015 CIP and are not included in cost estimate totals. Projected costs for trails are approximate and based on a simple 10’ asphalt path with two feet of crushed gravel on either side. This may not be an adequate width to accommodate the growing number of users.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Side Foss (D Street)</td>
<td>Murray Morgan Bridge – E 3rd St</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Street</td>
<td>N 11th – N 9th (Scott Pierson)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 37th St</td>
<td>N Shirley St – N Orchard St</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Road Trail</td>
<td>E 40th St – Waller Rd</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>$618,000</td>
<td>$78,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Line Trail</td>
<td>Pacific Ave to Water Ditch Trail</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Short Term Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>71.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,259,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$962,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Medium Term Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Boulevards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court D/St Helens Ave</td>
<td>S G St – S 9th St</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J St</td>
<td>N 3rd St – S 27th St</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>$91,000</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J St</td>
<td>S 37th St – S 84th St</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 37th St</td>
<td>N Orchard St – N Proctor St</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 45th St/N Verde St/N 45th St</td>
<td>N Baltimore St – N Stevens St</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 7th St</td>
<td>N Orchard St – N Pine St</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Highland St</td>
<td>N 23rd St – N 21st St</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 56th St</td>
<td>S Washington St – S State St</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline Dr</td>
<td>N 17th/Westgate Blvd – N 11th St</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State St</td>
<td>S 25th St – N Grant Ave</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Park St/E 29th St/E L St</td>
<td>E 26th St to McKinley Park</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Lanes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center St</td>
<td>S Orchard St – S 25th St</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>$649,000</td>
<td>$84,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 11th St/Taylor Way</td>
<td>SR 509 – Marine View Dr</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>$521,000</td>
<td>$67,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 38th St</td>
<td>A St – Portland Ave</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$27,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E McKinley Ave</td>
<td>S 72nd St – E D St</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Ave</td>
<td>SR 16 – S 12th St</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine View Rd</td>
<td>SR 509 – NE Slayden Rd</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>$97,000</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarver St/Tacoma St</td>
<td>N Schuster Pkwy – S Tacoma Ave</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
<td>$36,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 17th St/Westgate Blvd/N 21st St</td>
<td>N Narrows Dr – N Proctor St</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$54,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 21st St/N I St/S I St</td>
<td>N Alder St – Division Ave</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>$313,000</td>
<td>$40,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 46th St</td>
<td>N Vassault St – N Baltimore St</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 49th Ave</td>
<td>NE 45th Ave – NE 33rd St</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Ferdinand St</td>
<td>Ruston Way – N 46th St</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Highland</td>
<td>N 21st – N 11th</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Norpoint Way</td>
<td>Marine View Dr – NE 29th St</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$75,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puyallup Ave</td>
<td>Holgate – Pacific Ave</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 19th St</td>
<td>Mildred – Yakima Ave</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
<td>$93,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 35th St</td>
<td>S Pine St – S Sprague St</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 56th St</td>
<td>S State St – Pipeline Trail</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>$547,000</td>
<td>$71,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 56th St</td>
<td>S Orchard St – S Washington St</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Maintenance costs include re-striping, signage replacement, and roadway patching depending on facility type. Estimates do not include sweeping and other repair that is part of regular street maintenance activities. Estimated maintenance costs are presented on an annual basis, however the overall cost has been amortized by the frequency of maintenance tasks. For example, the need for re-striping is estimated to occur every other year, so the total cost ($4.50 per LF) is divided in half for the annual estimate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Yakima Ave /Thompson Ave</td>
<td>S 27th St – S 56th St</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$56,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Ave</td>
<td>N 3rd St – S 2nd St</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima Ave</td>
<td>Wright Park – S 27th St</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>$282,000</td>
<td>$36,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sharrow**2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five Mile Dr/N 51st St</td>
<td>N Vassault St – N 54th St</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruston connection</td>
<td>N 51st St – Ferry Landing Road</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 96th St</td>
<td>Park – Pacific</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cycle Tracks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 509</td>
<td>Pacific Ave – Marine View Dr</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>$1,029,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sidewalks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 58th St</td>
<td>S Durango St – S Tacoma Way Aly</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>$337,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Adams St</td>
<td>S 56th St – S 66th St</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$627,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 21st St</td>
<td>W of N Pearl St – Highland St</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Ave</td>
<td>Center – S 19th St</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Pine St/S Cedar St</td>
<td>S 19th – Hood St</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$627,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 11th St</td>
<td>N Highland St – N Orchard St</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$251,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 62nd St</td>
<td>S Clement Ave – S Wapato St</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>$473,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 11th St</td>
<td>N Adams St – N Union Ave</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S M St</td>
<td>S 84th St – S 88th St</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$266,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 56th St</td>
<td>Tacoma Mall Blvd – S Alaska St</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>$384,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A St &amp; S 38th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 56th &amp; E McKinley Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Portland Ave &amp; E 29th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 74th St &amp; Tacoma Mall Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 72nd St &amp; Hosmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 NB off-ramp terminus at Portland Ave/E 28th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 38th St &amp; Pacific Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 38th &amp; McKinley Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Portland Ave &amp; E 32nd St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 11th &amp; N Pearl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 84th &amp; Pacific Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 96th St &amp; Pacific Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Hosmer St &amp; S 84th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Puget Sound Ave &amp; S 56th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Steele St &amp; S 96th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Ave &amp; N 1st St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 54th &amp; Tacoma Mall Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shared-Use Paths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Trail Connection</td>
<td>Collaborate with neighboring jurisdictions for connectivity</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$32,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuster Parkway Trail</td>
<td>Cost is for 10’ asphalt trail alone and does not include slope stabilization or other infrastructure</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>$349,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Total Medium-Term Projects: 56.75 | $12,432,000 | $1,010,200 **

---

2 Sharrows, or Shared Lane Markings, are roadways marked with a bicycle symbol and chevrons where cars and bicycles share the same space. The Sharrow delineates the area where the cyclist is safest riding.
**Table 11. Long Term Project Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Boulevards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne St</td>
<td>N 46th – 6th</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 15th St/N Pine</td>
<td>N Yakima Ave – S 12th St</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 18th St</td>
<td>S Puget Sound Ave – S Pine St</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 43rd St</td>
<td>Park Ave – A St</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Puget Sound Ave</td>
<td>N 7th St – S 18th St</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Lanes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 49th St – N 46th St</td>
<td>Puyallup Ave – S 72nd St</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>$665,000</td>
<td>$66,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Ave</td>
<td>Puyallup Ave – S 19th St</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>$504,000</td>
<td>$51,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor St</td>
<td>Princeton – Tyler St</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 11th St</td>
<td>Dock St – E Portland Ave</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>$161,000</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 25th St</td>
<td>S Sheridan Ave – MLK Jr Way</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 66th St/S 64th St Bridge</td>
<td>Tacoma Mall Blvd – S Alaska St</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uphill Bike Lanes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Ave</td>
<td>S Walters Rd – S Jackson Ave</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 26th &amp; N Pearl St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 56th St &amp; Pacific Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared-Use Paths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Side Foss</td>
<td>S 11th – Waterway Park</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>$443,000</td>
<td>$44,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield/Ruston Way</td>
<td>Garfield Gulch – Ruston</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>$204,000</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puyallup River Levee Trail</td>
<td>City Limits – 11th St</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Defiance Trail (Metro)</td>
<td>Point Ruston – Vashon Ferry</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>$605,000</td>
<td>$60,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dome to Pt. Defiance</td>
<td>Foss Esplanade to Pt. Ruston</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Ridge Trail</td>
<td>SR 7 – Jennie Reed – S. 34” St</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>$790,000</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Slope Trail</td>
<td>Pt. Defiance /Titlow/S. 19” St</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>$1,616,000</td>
<td>$161,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trails with undetermined alignment. Coordination with neighboring jurisdictions critical for connectivity.**

| Trail to Mountain Corridor            | Tacoma Dome to Mt. Rainier    | TBD           | Unknown           | TBD                  |
| Trail to Sumner                      | Tacoma Dome to Sumner         | TBD           | Unknown           | TBD                  |

**Total Long Term Projects**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>$6,627,000</td>
<td>$801,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Maintenance costs include re-striping, signage replacement, and roadway patching depending on facility type. Estimates do not include sweeping and other repair that is part of regular street maintenance activities. Estimated maintenance costs are presented on an annual basis, however the overall cost has been amortized by the frequency of maintenance tasks. For example, the need for re-striping is estimated to occur every other year, so the total cost ($4.50 per LF) is divided in half for the annual estimate.
Map Change

The boundary of the Downtown Regional Growth Center has been adjusted to reflect the removal of the northern half of the land area on the west side of the Thea Foss waterway. Subsequently, all Downtown Regional Growth Center maps within the Comprehensive Plan will be redrawn accordingly. This will affect maps listed within the following Comprehensive Plan Elements:

- Proposed Container Port Element (Annual Amendment Application #2014-07)
- Growth Strategy and Development Concept
- Generalized Land Use
- Transportation
- South Downtown Subarea Plan
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE REGULATORY CODE
May 7, 2014

Note: These amendments show proposed changes to existing Land Use Regulatory Code. The sections included are only those portions of the Code that are associated with these amendments. New text is underlined and text that has been deleted is shown as strikethrough.

TITLE 13
LAND USE REGULATORY CODE

Chapter 13.04
PLATTING AND SUBDIVISIONS

6. A City-approved preliminary short plat layout drawing containing the following information:
   a. The name and address of the owner or owners of said tract;
   b. The legal description of the existing lot, tract or parcel, and the legal descriptions for all proposed lots, tracts, or parcels;

Mailed notices required by these regulations shall provide a legal description of the property to be subdivided, a vicinity sketch, and a location description in non-legal vernacular.

G. Final Short Plat. The final short plat shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Services Department and shall be an accurate short plat for official record, surveyed and prepared by, or under the supervision of, a registered land surveyor who shall certify on the plat that it is a true and correct representation of the lands actually surveyed. The final short plat shall be prepared in accordance with the regulations set forth in subsequent sections of this chapter and the City's Comprehensive Plan and applicable ordinances, plans and guidelines in Section 13.04.120. When the final short plat is submitted to the Planning and Development Services Department for processing, it shall be accompanied by two copies of a title title report confirming that the title of lands, as described and shown on the short plat, is in the name of the owner(s) signing the certificate of the short plat. The final short plat will be reviewed by the City Engineer and representatives of the Water and Light Divisions of the Department of Public Utilities, and the Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department.

13.04.095 Appeals.
The Director's decision on a boundary line adjustment, binding site plan approval, or short subdivision shall be final unless a request for reconsideration or appeal is filed in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 13.051.23 of the Tacoma Municipal Code.

Mailed notices required by these regulations shall give the time, date, and place of the hearing; a legal description of the property to be platted, a vicinity sketch, and a location description in non-legal language.
D. Pipestem Lots. The creation of pipestem lots shall be allowed in certain circumstances. The intent of these limitations is to minimize negative impacts of inconsistent development patterns while allowing land to be divided when more traditional layouts are not achievable. The creation of pipestem lots is not allowed when a lot configuration can be provided that is consistent with the established pattern on the block without significantly reducing the number of allowed lots (see examples provided below). Pipestem lots shall provide a lot extension or primary accessway which connects to a public or private street. The creation of a pipestem lot is allowed under the following circumstances:

1. No more than one out of every three proposed lots is a pipestem lot; and
2. One of the following are met:
   a. An existing dwelling which has been on the site for at least five years precludes a land division that is consistent with Section 13.04.230.A and would otherwise not meet the lot width, frontage, or setback requirements without a pipestem configuration (see examples for R-2 District below); or
   b. The site has dimensions which preclude a land division that is consistent with Section 13.04.230.A and would otherwise not meet the lot width, frontage, or setback requirements without a pipestem configuration.

3. The following standards apply to pipestem lots:
   a. Pipestem lots shall have the same setback along all lot lines. In the R-1 District the setback shall be 15 feet. For all other districts the setback shall be 10 feet.
   b. The height of the main building on a pipestem lot shall be no taller than 25 feet or no more than the average of the height of the dwellings on each abutting property line and shall not exceed the height of the zoning district.

Examples of allowed pipestem layouts

*In the first example, even though there is an established pattern on the block, the existing home prevents a property division consistent with that pattern. In the second example, the width and size of the property lends itself to a pipestem lot being created.*

Example of a prohibited pipestem layout

*In this example there is an established pattern on the block and a division consistent with that layout can be provided without significantly reducing the number of possible lots. Instead of creating a pipestem lot, the property should be divided consistent with the existing pattern.*
Project Permit or Project Permit Application: Any land use or environmental permit or license required for a project action, including, but not limited to, subdivisions, binding site plans, planned developments, conditional uses, shoreline substantial development permits, site plan review, permits or approvals required by the critical area preservation ordinance, site-specific rezones authorized by a Comprehensive Plan or sub area plan, but excluding the adoption or amendment of a Comprehensive Plan, sub area plan, or development regulations, except as otherwise specifically included in this subsection. This chapter does not apply to Exempted Activities under Section 13.11.140, to activities allowed under 13.11.200 or 13.11.210.

H. Notice and Comment Period for Specified Permit Applications. Table H specifies how to notify, the distance required, the comment period allowed, expiration of permits, and who has authority for the decision to be made on the application.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Preapplication Meeting</th>
<th>Notice: Distance</th>
<th>Notice: Newspaper</th>
<th>Notice: Post Site</th>
<th>Comment Period</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Hearing Required</th>
<th>City Council</th>
<th>Expiration of Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of code</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses not specifically classified</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary line adjustment</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding site plan</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental SEPA DNS/EIS</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Same as case type</td>
<td>Yes if no hearing</td>
<td>Yes for EIS</td>
<td>Same as case type</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance, height of main structure</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space classification</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plats 10+ lots</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Final Plat 5 years^6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezones</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline/CUP/ variance</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 days^5</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 years/maximum 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short plat (2-4 lots)</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short plat (5-9 lots)</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site approval</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 days^5</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional use</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 days^3</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional use, large-scale retail</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>1,000 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 days^3</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Minor Modification</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Major Modification</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 Days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 Days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Condition of permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland/Stream/FWHCA development permits</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years* with 5 year renewal option to a maximum of 20 years total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland/Stream/FWHCA Minor Development Permits</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years* with 5 year renewal option to a maximum of 20 years total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland/Stream/FWHCA verification</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No^1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFORMATION IN THIS TABLE IS FOR REFERENCE PURPOSE ONLY.

*Programmatic Restoration Projects can request 5 year renewals to a maximum of 20 years total.

When an open record hearing is required, all other land use permit applications for a specific site or project shall be considered concurrently by the Hearing Examiner (refer to Section 13.05.040.E).
2 Comment on land use permit proposal allowed from date of notice to hearing.
3 Must be recorded with the Pierce County Auditor within five years.
4 Special use permits for wireless communication facilities, including towers, are limited to two years from the effective date of the Director’s decision.
5 If a public meeting is held, the public comment period shall be extended 7 days beyond and including the date of the public meeting.
6 Refer to Section 13.05.070 for preliminary plat expiration dates.
7 Public Notification of Minor Variances may be sent at the discretion of the Director. There is no notice of application for Minor Variances.

BD. Interpretation and Application of Land Use Regulatory Code. In interpreting and applying the provisions of the Land Use Regulatory Code, the provisions shall be held to be the minimum requirements for the promotion of the public safety, health, morals or general welfare. It is not intended by this code to interfere with or abrogate or annul any easements, covenants or agreements between parties. Where this code imposes a greater restriction upon the use of buildings or premises or upon the heights of buildings or requires larger yards or setbacks and open spaces than are required in other ordinances, codes, regulations, easements, covenants or agreements, the provisions of this code shall govern. An interpretation shall be utilized where the factual basis to make a determination is unusually complex or there is some problem with the veracity of the facts; where the applicable code provision(s) is ambiguous or its application to the facts unclear; or in those instances where a person applying for a license or permit disagrees with a staff determination made on the application. Requests for interpretation of the provisions of the Land Use Regulatory Code shall be processed in accordance with the requirements of Section 13.05.040.

CE. Permitted Uses – Uses Not Specifically Classified. In addition to the authorized permitted uses for the districts as set forth in this title, any other use not elsewhere specifically classified may be permitted upon a finding by the Director that such use will be in conformity with the authorized permitted uses of the district in which the use is requested. Notification of the decision shall be made by publication in a newspaper of general circulation.

DF. Reasonable Accommodation. Any person claiming to have a handicap, or someone acting on his or her behalf, who wishes to be excused from an otherwise applicable requirement of this Land Use Code under the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, 42 USC § 3604(f)(3)(b), or the Washington Law Against Discrimination, Chapter 49.60 RCW, must provide the Director with verifiable documentation of handicap eligibility and need for accommodation. The Director shall act promptly on the request for accommodation. If handicap eligibility and need for accommodation are demonstrated, the Director shall approve an accommodation, which may include granting an exception to the provisions of this Code.

13.05.070 Expiration of permits.
(Refer to Table H in Section 13.05.020).
A. Expiration Schedule. The following schedule indicates the expiration provisions for land use permits within the City of Tacoma.

1 Conditional use permits for wireless communication facilities, including towers, shall expire two years from the effective date of the Director’s decision and are not eligible for a one-year extension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Permit</th>
<th>Maximum Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conditional Use Permit</td>
<td>5 years, possible 1-year extension¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Variance</td>
<td>5 years, possible 1-year extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Site Approval</td>
<td>5 years, possible 1-year extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Waiver</td>
<td>5 years, possible 1-year extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wetland/Stream/FWHCA Development Permits and Wetland/Stream/FWHCA Minor Development Permits</td>
<td>5 years, with 5-year renewal option to a maximum of 20 years. Programmatic restoration projects can apply for possible 5 year renewals, not to exceed 20 years total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wetland Delineation Verifications</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Preliminary Plat</td>
<td>5 years, 7 years, or 9-10 years to submit a final plat permit application, dependent on preliminary plat approval date per RCW 58²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Binding Site Plans, Short Plats, Boundary Line Adjustments</td>
<td>5 years to record with Pierce County Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Shoreline Permits</td>
<td>2 years to commence construction; 5 years maximum, possible one-year extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. When Permit Expired. A permit under this chapter shall expire if, on the date the permit expires, the project sponsor has not submitted a complete application for building permit or the building permit has expired, with the exception of projects that qualify for a programmatic restoration project extension. Programmatic restoration projects shall be allowed to apply for a be renewed every five (5) years for a maximum total of 20 years to allow implementation of long-term habitat recovery that may be utilized as advanced mitigation for future impacts associated with public access and enjoyment.

In order to apply for a renewal after every 5 years, the applicant is required to submit a status report explaining the progress of a minor development permit or development permit and shall identify the remaining items requiring additional permitting, including building permits. The applicant shall provide copies of any monitoring reports that were required as part of the permit conditions. The renewal application shall be submitted prior to the termination of the five year limit with the appropriate renewal fees.

(See 13.11.220.A – Programmatic Restoration Projects processed under either the Minor Development Permit or the Development Permit may qualify for additional time extensions according to TMC 13.05.070.)

D. Extension of Permits (excluding those permits subject to RCW 58 Boundaries and Plats and those permits subject to WAC 173-27-090). The Director may authorize a permit extension for up to one (1) year if a written request for an extension has been filed prior to the permit expiration date and has been determined to comply with the following criteria:

***

13.05.080 Modification/revision to permits.

A. Purpose. The purpose of this section is to define types of modifications to permits and to identify procedures for those actions.

B. Minor Modifications. No additional review for minor modifications to previously approved land use permits is required, provided the modification proposed is consistent with the standards set forth below:

1. The proposal results in a change of use that is permitted outright in the current zoning classification.
2. The proposal does not add to the site or approved structures more than a 10 percent increase in square footage.
3. If a modification in a special condition of approval imposed upon the original permit is requested, the proposed change does not modify the intent of the original condition.
4. The proposal does not increase the overall impervious surface on the site by more than 25 percent.

² If the preliminary plat was approved on or before December 31, 2007, the final plat must be submitted within nine years of the preliminary plat approval. If the preliminary plat was approved after December 31, 2007, but on or before December 31, 2014, the final plat must be submitted within seven years of the preliminary plat approval. A preliminary plat approved after January 1, 2015, must be submitted for final plat within five years of the preliminary plat approval.
5. The proposal is unlikely to result in a notable increase in or any new significant adverse effects on adjacent properties or the environment.

6. Any additions or expansions approved through a series of minor modifications that cumulatively exceed the requirements of this section shall be reviewed as a major modification.

C. Major Modifications. Any modification exceeding any of the standards for minor modifications outlined above shall be subject to the following standards.

1. Major modifications shall be processed in the same manner and be subject to the same decision criteria that are currently required for the type of permit being modified. Major modifications to Conditional Use permits shall be processed as a Process I permit, consistent with the regulations found in Section 13.05.020.C.

2. In addition to the standard decision criteria, the Director or Hearing Examiner shall, in his/her review and decision, address the applicability of any specific conditions of approval for the original permit.

***

Chapter 13.06
ZONING

Sections:

13.06.300.B.3 UCX and UCX-TD Urban Center Mixed-Use District.

***
D. Lot size and building envelope standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max. Height Limits (in feet)</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-2SRD</th>
<th>HMR-SRD</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4-L</th>
<th>R-4</th>
<th>R-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Buildings</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse Dwelling Setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipestem Lot Setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Main Buildings on Pipestem Lots**: The height of the main building on a pipestem lot shall be no higher than 25 feet or no higher than the average of the height of the dwellings on each abutting property line, not to exceed the height of the zoning district.

- **Accessory Buildings**: 15-feet

- **Exceptions**: Buildings within a View Sensitive Overlay district are subject to the additional height restrictions contained in 13.06.555. Certain specified uses and structures are allowed to extend above height limits, per Section 13.06.602.

- **Townhouse Dwelling Setback**: For townhouse dwellings, the minimum rear yard setback shall apply only along the rear property line of the development, and not to property lines internal to the development. For additional townhouse development requirements, see Section 13.06.100.G.

- **Pipestem Lot Setback**: Pipestem lots shall have the same setback along all lot lines. In the R-1 District the setback shall be 15 feet. For all other districts the setback shall be 10 feet. For additional pipestem requirements, see Section 13.04.230.D.

### Additional Residential Development Standards

#### Minimum Usable Yard Space
All lots shall provide a contiguous rear or side usable yard space equivalent to at least 10% of the lot size. This usable yard space shall meet all of the following standards:

- Have no dimension less than 15-feet, except for lots that are less than 3500 SF, where the minimum dimension shall be no less than 12 feet
- Not include structures, parking, alley or driveway spaces or required critical area buffers
- Not be located in the front yard

For townhouse and multi-family developments, this usable yard space requirement can be calculated based on the overall project site and the yard space(s) provided to meet the requirement can be any combination of individual and shared yard spaces, as long as each meets the above standards and as long as all dwellings have access to at least one qualifying yard space.

For through lots, the required yard space may be located within the “functional rear yard” (see Subsection 13.06.100.F.5.a for additional information about “functional rear yards”).

#### Vehicular Access and Parking
All on-site parking for dwellings and buildings other than dwellings shall be located in the rear portion of the lot and shall not be accessed from the front if suitable access to the rear is available, such as an abutting right-of-way that is or can practicably be developed. If access is not practicably available to the rear yard or not practicably limited only to the rear and sides (such as for institutional and other large uses), subject to determination by the City Engineer, then vehicular access to the front may be developed. However, in all cases such access and parking shall be limited to the minimum necessary and in no case shall driveway and/or parking areas exceed a total of 50 percent of the front yard or 50 percent of a corner street side yard.

#### Building Orientation
All dwellings shall maintain primary orientation to the adjacent street or right-of-way and not toward the alley or rear of the site, unless otherwise determined by the Director. The building elevation facing the street or right-of-way shall not contain elements commonly associated with a rear elevation appearance.
5. Limited on-premises sales of products or stock-in-trade may be permitted in conjunction with a home occupation; provided, that the product is accessory to a service offered through the home occupation and that the applicant can clearly demonstrate that such on-premises sales will not be inconsistent with the criteria set forth above. For example, a home occupation engaged in hair salon services may sell hair care products or accessories.

13.06.200 Commercial Districts.

4. District use table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C-1</th>
<th>C-2</th>
<th>HM</th>
<th>PDB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live-Work unit</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.06.300 Mixed-Use Center Districts.

3. UCX and UCX-TD Urban Center Mixed-Use District. To provide for dense concentration of residential, commercial, and institutional development, including regional shopping centers, supporting business and service uses, and other regional attractions. These centers are to hold the highest densities outside the Central Business District. An urban center is a focus for both regional and local transit systems. A TD designation is used for the Urban Center Mixed-Use District in the Tacoma Dome area to provide specific transit oriented development, consistent with the Tacoma Dome Area Plan. Walking and transit use is facilitated through designs which decrease walking distances and increase pedestrian safety. Residential uses are encouraged in UCX Districts as integrated development components.
### 3. District use table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>NCX</th>
<th>CCX</th>
<th>UCX</th>
<th>UCX-TD</th>
<th>RCX¹</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>HMX</th>
<th>URX</th>
<th>NRX</th>
<th>Additional Regulations³,⁴,⁵ (also see footnotes at bottom of table)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult family home</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Subject to additional requirements contained in Section 13.06.535. See definition for bed limit. Prohibited at street level along designated pedestrian streets in NCX.² Not subject to minimum densities found in Section 13.06.300.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult retail and entertainment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prohibited, except as provided for in Section 13.06.525.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural uses</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance services</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Except in the CIX District, must be conducted entirely within an enclosed structure. Must be set back 20 feet from any adjacent residential district or use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal sales and service</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prohibited at street level along designated pedestrian streets in NCX.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prohibited at street level along designated pedestrian streets in NCX.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewpub</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Brewpubs located in NCX, CCX, UCX, and RCX shall be limited to producing, on-premises, a maximum of 2,400 barrels per year of beer, ale, or other malt beverages, as determined by the annual filings of barrelage tax reports to the Washington State Liquor Control Board. UCX-TD is limited to 5,000 barrels in the same manner. Equivalent volume winery limits apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building materials and services</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>In NCX, all activities must occur within buildings; outdoor storage/repair is prohibited. Customer service offices must be located at building fronts on designated pedestrian streets in NCX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnival</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Subject to Section 13.06.635.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery/internment services</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>New facilities are not permitted. Enlargement of facilities in existence prior to the effective date of this provision (May 27, 1975) may be approved in any zoning district subject to a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial parking facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>In UCX-TD, only permitted if provided in a structure or below ground facility. Prohibited at street level along frontage of designated pedestrian streets in NCX and CCX Districts.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial recreation and entertainment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>NCX</td>
<td>CCX</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>UCX-TD</td>
<td>RCX</td>
<td>CIX</td>
<td>HMX</td>
<td>URX</td>
<td>NRX</td>
<td>Additional Regulations¹,²,³,⁴,⁵ (also see footnotes at bottom of table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication facility</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prohibited at street level along frontage of designated pedestrian streets in NCX and CCX Districts.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential shelter</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.535. Prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets in NCX.² Not subject to minimum densities founding Section 13.06.300.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing care retirement community</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.535. Prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets in NCX.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional facility</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Production</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Must include a retail/eating/drinking/tasting component that occupies a minimum of 10 percent of usable space, fronts the street at sidewalk level or has a well-marked and visible entrance at sidewalk level, and is open to the public. Outside storage is allowed provided screening and/or buffer planting areas are provided in accordance with Section 13.06.502.D. All production, processing and distribution activities are to be conducted within an enclosed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural institution</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care, family</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care center</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Not subject to RCX residential requirement.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoxification center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-through with any use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>--Within the “UCX – TD” District, drive-throughs are required to be located entirely within a building. * In the HMX District, drive-throughs are only allowed for hospitals and associated medical uses. All drive-throughs are subject to the requirements of TMC 13.06.513.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, single-family detached</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.² See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, two-family</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.² See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, three-family</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.² See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Refer to Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities.
² See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities.
³ See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities.
⁴ See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities.
⁵ See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities.

---

Annual Amendment Application #2014-11

Exhibit B – Proposed Amendments to the Land Use Regulatory Code (May 7, 2014)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>NCX</th>
<th>CCX</th>
<th>UCX</th>
<th>UCX-TD</th>
<th>RCX</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>HMX</th>
<th>URX</th>
<th>NRX</th>
<th>Additional Regulations (also see footnotes at bottom of table)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dwelling, multiple-family   | P   | P   | P   | P      | P   | P   | P   | P   | N   | In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.  
|                            |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     | See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities. In the NRX District, multiple-family dwellings lawfully in existence on August 31, 2009, the time of reclassification to this district, shall be considered permitted uses; said multiple-family dwellings may continue and may be changed, repaired, replaced or otherwise modified, provided, however that the use may not be expanded beyond property boundaries owned, leased, or operated as a multiple-family dwelling at the time of reclassification to this district. |
| Dwelling, townhouse        | P   | P   | P   | P      | P   | P   | P   | P   | CU  | In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.  
|                            |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     | See Section 13.06.300.E for minimum densities. |
| Eating and drinking        | P   | P   | P   | P      | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.  
|                            |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     | See Section 13.06.150 for specific Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Standards. |
| Emergency and transitional housing | CU | P   | P   | P      | P   | P   | N   | CU  | CU  | See Section 13.06.535. In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.  
|                            |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     | |
| Foster home                | P   | P   | P   | P      | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.  
|                            |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     | See Section 13.06.535. In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.  
| Fueling station            | N   | P   | P   | P      | N   | P   | N   | N   | N   | Prohibited along frontage of designated pedestrian streets within the UCX and CCX Districts.  
|                            |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     | Fueling station pump islands, stacking lanes and parking areas shall be located at the side or rear of the building. |
| Group housing              | P   | P   | P   | P      | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.  
|                            |     |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>NCX</th>
<th>CCX</th>
<th>UCX</th>
<th>UCX-TD</th>
<th>RCX¹</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>HMX</th>
<th>URX</th>
<th>NRX</th>
<th>Additional Regulations³,⁴,⁵ (also see footnotes at bottom of table)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heliport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Home occupations shall be allowed in all X-Districts pursuant to the standards found in Sections 13.06.100.E and 13.06A.050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/motel</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry, heavy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry, light</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>In UCX-TD, only permitted if 50 percent of site contains an enclosed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate care facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.535. In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile community facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P/CU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P/CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.² See Section 13.06.530 for additional information about size limitations and permitting requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging house</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets in NCX and CCX Districts.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master plan for any conditional use</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>The purpose of this process is to allow an applicant to seek approval for a development program which occupies a large site with multiple-buildings, a complex program, and a detailed plan developed by the applicant which would be implemented in phases and which would extend beyond the normal expiration date, to be reviewed after a ten-year period for those portions of the plan which have not yet been developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbrewery/ winery</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Microbreweries shall be limited to 15,000 barrels per year of beer, ale, or other malt beverages, as determined by the filings of barrelage tax reports to the Washington State Liquor Control Board. Equivalent volume winery limits apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home/trailer court</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Not subject to RCX residential requirement for properties fronting the west side of South Pine Street between South 40th Street and South 47th Street.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, recreation and open space</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Not subject to RCX residential requirement.¹ Subject to the requirements of Section 13.06.560.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger terminal</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*Limited to 7,000 square feet of floor area, per business, in the HMX District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Subject to the requirements of Section 13.06.560.D.
² Subject to the requirements of Section 13.06.535.
³ In UCX-TD, only permitted if 50 percent of site contains an enclosed building.
⁴ Subject to the requirements of Section 13.06.530 for additional information about size limitations and permitting requirements.
⁵ Not subject to RCX residential requirement for properties fronting the west side of South Pine Street between South 40th Street and South 47th Street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>NCX</th>
<th>CCX</th>
<th>UCX</th>
<th>UCX-10</th>
<th>RCX</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>HMX</th>
<th>URX</th>
<th>NRX</th>
<th>Additional Regulations3,4,5 (also see footnotes at bottom of table)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port, terminal, and industrial; water-dependent or water-related (as defined in Chapter 13.10)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>In the NRX District, unless the specific use is otherwise allowed outright, public service facilities are permitted only upon issuance of a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640. Not subject to RCX residential requirement.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety and public service facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Not subject to RCX residential requirement.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>In NCX, all activities must occur within buildings; outdoor storage/repair is prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and development industry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential care facility for youth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.535. In CCX and NCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.2 Not subject to minimum densities found in Section 13.06.300.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential chemical dependency treatment facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.535. In CCX and NCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P/CU~</td>
<td>P/CU~</td>
<td>P/CU~</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-- A conditional use permit is required for retail uses exceeding 45,000 square feet. See Section 13.06.640.J. *Limited to 7,000 square feet of floor area, per business, in the HMX District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, public or private</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.535. In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.2 Not subject to RCX residential requirement.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal sales</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Subject to Section 13.06.635.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-storage</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>See specific requirements in Section 13.06.503.B. In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>NCX</td>
<td>CCX</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>UCX-TD</td>
<td>RCX</td>
<td>CIX</td>
<td>HMX</td>
<td>URX</td>
<td>NRX</td>
<td>Additional Regulations&lt;sup&gt;3,4,5&lt;/sup&gt; (also see footnotes at bottom of table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffed residential home</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.535. See definition for bed limit. Prohibited at street level along designated core pedestrian streets in NCX and CCX Districts.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; Not subject to minimum densities found in Section 13.06.300.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets in NCX and CCX Districts.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface mining</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary uses</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.635. Theaters only permitted up to 4 screens in NCX and CCX. Theaters only permitted up to 6 screens in CIX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freight terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>In NCX and CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; Not subject to RCX residential requirement.&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle rental and sales</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>In UCX-TD, only permitted if 50 percent of site contains an enclosed building. In CCX Districts, prohibited at street level along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; *Use permitted in the 56th Street and South Tacoma Way Mixed-Use Center NCX only, if all activities occur within buildings; outdoor storage repair, and sales are prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle service and repair</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>All activities must occur within buildings; outdoor storage and/or repair is prohibited. Subject to development standards contained in Section 13.06.510.E. In UCX-TD, only permitted if 50 percent of site contains an enclosed building. In CCX Districts, prohibited along frontage of designated core pedestrian streets.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; *Use permitted in the 56th Street and South Tacoma Way Mixed-Use Center NCX only, provided all activities occur entirely within buildings; outdoor storage and/or repair is prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle service and repair, industrial</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Subject to additional development standards contained in Section 13.06.510.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle storage</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Subject to development standards contained in Section 13.06.510.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse, storage</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale or distribution</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Building envelope standards.

1. The following table contains the primary building envelope requirements. See Section 13.06.501 for additional requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>NCX</th>
<th>CCX</th>
<th>UCX</th>
<th>UCX-TD</th>
<th>RCX</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>HMX</th>
<th>URX</th>
<th>NRX</th>
<th>Additional Regulations³,⁴,⁵ (also see footnotes at bottom of table)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wireless communication facility</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>P*/CU**</td>
<td>*Wireless communication facilities are also subject to Section 13.06.545.D.1. **Wireless communication facilities are also subject to Section 13.06.545.D.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work release center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Permitted with no more than 15 residents in the UCX and no more than 25 residents in the CIX, subject to a Conditional Use Permit and the development regulations found in Section 13.06.550.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses not prohibited by City Charter and not prohibited herein</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum lot area</th>
<th>NCX</th>
<th>CCX</th>
<th>UCX</th>
<th>UCX-TD</th>
<th>RCX</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>HMX</th>
<th>URX</th>
<th>NRX</th>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>3,750 square feet for single-family dwellings; 2,500 square feet per unit for duplexes; 6,000 square feet for triplexes and multi-family dwellings; 5,000 square feet total per townhouse development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Minimum lot width | 0 feet | 0 feet | 0 feet | 0 square feet | 0 feet | 0 feet | 0 feet | 0 feet | 25 feet for single-family dwellings, duplexes and triplexes; 14 feet for townhouses |
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For townhouse developments, a setback of at least 5 feet shall be provided along the perimeter of the development on all sides that do not abut public street or alley right-of-way.

For X District property across a non-designated Pedestrian Street from R-1, R-2 or R-2SRD District property, the following front yard setback shall be provided:

- Minimum 10-foot front yard setbacks are required along non-designated Pedestrian Streets.
- Limited exception: For corner lots that also front on a designated Pedestrian Street, this setback shall not apply for the first 130 feet from the corner, as measured along the edge of the right-of-way.
- Covered porches and entry features may project up to 6 feet into the setback.
- The setback area may include landscaping, walkways, pedestrian plazas, private patios, porches, or vehicular access crossings (where allowed), but not include parking.

For single, two- and three-family dwellings and townhouses:
- 10-foot front, 5-foot sides, 15-foot rear

For other uses:
- 10-foot front, 7.5-foot sides, 20-foot rear

Maximum setbacks may apply (see Section 13.06.300.F).

If a buffer is required, a minimum setback is created (see Section 13.06.503).

Townhouse setback standards apply to the perimeter property lines of the development and not to individual internal property lines between townhouses in the same development.

See 13.06.501.N for additional requirements applicable to duplex, triplex and townhouse developments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NCX</th>
<th>CCX</th>
<th>UCX</th>
<th>UCX-TD</th>
<th>RCX</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>HMX</th>
<th>URX</th>
<th>NRX</th>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height of</td>
<td>45 feet¹; 65 feet in the Stadium</td>
<td>60 feet; 75 feet, if at least 25 percent</td>
<td>75 feet; 120 feet, if at least 25 percent</td>
<td>60 feet¹; 120 feet, if for a cultural</td>
<td>75 feet³; 120 feet, if at least 25 percent</td>
<td>75 feet³; 120 feet, if for a cultural</td>
<td>150 feet</td>
<td>45 feet³;</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>Height will be measured consistent with Building Code, Height of Building. Maximum heights, shall be superseded by the provisions of Section 13.06.503.A. Certain specified uses and structures are allowed to extend above height limits, per Section 13.06.602.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures (feet)</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Center¹</td>
<td>of floor area is residential or through use of TDRs from an identified TDR sending area¹.</td>
<td>of floor area is residential or through use of TDRs from an identified TDR sending area¹.</td>
<td>of floor area is residential or through use of TDRs from an identified TDR sending area¹.</td>
<td>of floor area is residential or through use of TDRs from an identified TDR sending area¹.</td>
<td>of floor area is residential or through use of TDRs from an identified TDR sending area¹.</td>
<td>of floor area is residential or through use of TDRs from an identified TDR sending area¹.</td>
<td>of floor area is residential or through use of TDRs from an identified TDR sending area¹.</td>
<td>of floor area is residential or through use of TDRs from an identified TDR sending area¹.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¹ In NCX, RCX, and CIX Districts, additional height above these standard height limits may be allowed is certain areas through the X-District Height Bonus Program – see Section 13.06.300.E.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>² In UCX-TD Districts, for all properties lying south of a line running parallel to the center line of the alley between East 26th Street and East 27th Street starting at the western boundary of the UCX-TD District and running east to the center line of East E Street, then north to the center line of East 26th Street, then east to the eastern boundary of the UCX-TD District, height is 120 feet, if at least 4 of the design elements found in Section 13.06A.080 (excluding Section 13.06A.080(8)) are incorporated into the project. Height can be increased to 225 feet, if at least 4 of the design elements are incorporated and 2 of the special features found in Section 13.06A.090 (excluding Section 13.06A.090(7)) are included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>³ In the McKinley Mixed-Use Center, the portion of the URX District that is north of the alley between East Wright Avenue and East 34th Street has a height limit of 35 feet instead of 45 feet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>NCX</td>
<td>CCX</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>UCX-TD</td>
<td>RCX</td>
<td>CIX</td>
<td>HMX</td>
<td>URX</td>
<td>NRX</td>
<td>Additional Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper story setback</td>
<td>See Section 501.C.2 for stepback standards along pedestrian streets.</td>
<td>See Section 501.C.2 for stepback standards along pedestrian streets.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.503; residential transition standards may also apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum floor area</td>
<td>30,000 square feet per business; 45,000 square feet for full service grocery stores only; offices shall be exempt from these limits.</td>
<td>45,000 square feet per business for retail uses, unless approved with a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640.J</td>
<td>45,000 square feet per business for retail uses, unless approved with a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640.J</td>
<td>45,000 square feet per business for retail uses, unless approved with a conditional use permit. See Section 13.06.640.J</td>
<td>30,000 square feet per business; 45,000 square feet for full service grocery stores only.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>See Section 13.06.300.D for limitations on the amount of non-residential space allowed in developments in RCX Districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCX</td>
<td>CCX</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>UCX-TD</td>
<td>RCX</td>
<td>CIX</td>
<td>HMX</td>
<td>URX</td>
<td>NRX</td>
<td>Additional Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30; 40 on designated pedestrian streets (see Section 13.06.300.C)</td>
<td>30; 40 on designated pedestrian streets (see Section 13.06.300.C)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30; 40 on designated pedestrian streets (see Section 13.06.300.C)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Projects that do not include residential uses, and mixed-use projects (such as residential &amp; commercial, residential &amp; industrial, or residential &amp; institutional) are exempt from minimum-density requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For purposes of this provision, density shall be calculated by dividing the total number of dwelling units in a development by the area, in acres, of the development site, excluding any accessory dwelling units or areas dedicated or reserved for public rights-of-way or full private streets. In the same manner, to determine the minimum number of units required to meet this standard, multiply the size of the property, in acres, by the required minimum density, then round up to the nearest whole number. For example, the minimum number of units required on a 67,5000 square foot (.156-acre) property located in the UCX-TD District would be 65 units (.156 x 340 = 4.476.4, which rounds up to 65 units).
F. Maximum setback standards. To achieve a pedestrian serviceable environment, where buildings are located in close proximity to the street and designed with areas free of pedestrian and vehicle movement conflicts, maximum building setbacks are required as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-residential buildings and/or shopping centers of 30,000 square feet or less floor area</th>
<th>Non-residential buildings greater than 30,000 square feet floor area</th>
<th>Shopping centers greater than 30,000 square feet floor area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCX and RCX, and UCX-TD Districts</strong></td>
<td>• 5 feet maximum front and corner side setback from the property lines at the public right-of-way for 75 percent of front and corner side facade.</td>
<td>• 5 feet maximum setback from property lines at the public right-of-way for 75 percent of front and corner side facade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCX Districts</strong></td>
<td>• 10 feet maximum front and corner side setback from the property lines at the public right-of-way for 50 percent of front and corner side facade.</td>
<td>• 10 feet maximum setback from the property line at the public right-of-way for 50 percent of the front or side of the facade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCX, HMX and CIX Districts</strong></td>
<td>• 20 feet maximum front and corner side setback from the property lines at the public right-of-way for 50 percent of front and corner side facade.</td>
<td>• 20 feet maximum setback from the property line at the public right-of-way on either 50 percent of the front or side of the facade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedestrian Streets**
- When the site is adjacent to a designated pedestrian street(s), that street(s) frontage shall be utilized to meet the maximum setback requirement with the front, side, and/or corner side of the facade, as indicated above.
- When the site has more than two pedestrian street frontages, the primary pedestrian street frontage shall be utilized to meet the maximum setback requirement.

**Motor Vehicles**
- Maximum setback areas shall be designed to be sidewalk, pedestrian plaza, public open space, landscaping, and/or courtyard, and to be free of motor vehicles at all times.

**Exceptions in all Mixed-Use Center Districts**
- **In UCX-TD**, setback distance beyond the maximum may be used if the additional area is devoted to pedestrian plazas, public open spaces, and/or courtyards, with no motor vehicle use and at least 25 percent of the building frontage meets the maximum setback.
- In all X-Districts, when there is a steep slope (at least 25% slope with a vertical relief of 10 or more feet) located adjacent to the sidewalk, the maximum setback requirement shall be measured from the top or toe of the slope, as appropriate.
- When a residential buffer is required, the buffer requirement shall supersede the maximum setback requirement (see Section 13.06.502.D).

- Additions to legal, nonconforming buildings are exempt from maximum setbacks, provided, the addition reduces the level of nonconformity as to maximum setback.
- When a public easement precludes compliance with this standard, the setback requirement shall be measured from the back edge of the easement.
- Buildings that are 100 percent residential do not have a maximum setback.
- The primary building of a fueling station, where fueling stations are allowed, is subject to the maximum setback on only one side of the building on corner parcels. Kiosks without retail, and intended for fuel payment only, are exempt.
- Public facilities on sites greater than 5 acres in neighborhood, community and urban mixed-use centers shall be exempt from maximum setback requirements. This exemption shall expire upon the establishment of a new Institutional Zoning designation, an Institutional Master Plan process, or similar zoning process for reviewing, evaluating and approving large, public, campus-like facilities.
- Within parks, recreation and open space uses, accessory or ancillary structures, such as restroom buildings, playground equipment and picnic shelters, are exempt from the maximum setback standards.
13.06.400 Industrial Districts.

***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>M-1</th>
<th>M-2</th>
<th>PMI</th>
<th>Additional Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live-Work unit</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***

13.06.501 Building design standards.

A. General applicability. The design standards of this section are required to implement the urban design goals of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Tacoma. The building design standards apply to all new development in C-1, C-2, HM, T, PDB, and Mixed-Use Center Districts and alterations, as outlined below, as well as to townhouses in R-districts, except as follows:

1. Standards. Each item of this section shall be addressed individually. Exceptions and exemptions noted for specific development situations apply only to the item noted.

2. Alterations. Three thresholds are used to gauge the extent of design standard compliance on alterations to existing development:

a. Level I alterations include all remodels and/or additions within a two year period whose cumulative value is less than 50% of the value of existing development or structures, as determined by the applicable Building Code. The requirement for such alterations is only that the proposed improvements meet the standards and do not lead to further nonconformance with the standards. For example, if a property owner decides to replace a building façade’s siding, then the siding shall meet the applicable exterior building material standards, but elements such as building modulation would not be required.

b. Level II alterations include all remodels and/or additions within a two year period whose cumulative value ranges from 50% to 200% of the value of the existing development or structure, as determined by the applicable Building Code. All standards that do not involve repositioning the building or reconfiguring site development shall apply to Level II alterations.

c. Level III alterations include all remodels and/or additions within a two year period whose cumulative value exceeds 200% of the value of the existing development or structure, as determined by the applicable Building Code. Such alterations shall conform to ALL standards.

d. The standards do not apply to remodels that do not change the exterior form of the building. However, if a project involves both exterior and interior improvements, then the project valuation shall include both exterior and interior improvements.

e. No addition or remodel shall increase the level of nonconformity or create new nonconformities to the development or design standards.

***
M. X-District Fencing, Retaining Wall and Utility Standards. The following requirements apply to all development in any X-District, unless specifically exempted. They are intended to provide for thoughtful placement and design of utilities, mechanical equipment, service areas and fences to mitigate visual impact on public views, general community aesthetics and residential privacy.

2. Fencing type limitation
   a. Chain link fencing, with or without slats, is prohibited for required screening.
   b. Barbed or razor wire. The use of barbed or razor wire is limited to those areas not visible to a public street or to an adjacent residential use.
   c. Chain link. Chain link or similar wire fencing is prohibited between the front of a building and a public street, except for wetland preservation and recreation uses.
   d. Electrified. The use of electrified fencing is prohibited in all zoning districts.
   e. The maximum height of free-standing walls, fences, or hedges between any public street and building shall be 3 feet. Exception: Decorative fences up to 8 feet in height may be allowed between a public street and any residential use provided the portion of the fence between 3 and 7 feet above grade is at least 50 percent transparent and features a planting strip at least 5 feet wide with Type C or D landscaping to soften the view of the fence and contribute to the pedestrian environment. Fences required by the Washington State Liquor Control Board shall also be exempt from the maximum height limitation, provided any portion of the fence between 3 and 7 feet above grade is at least 50 percent transparent.
   f. The maximum height of free-standing fences along an alley shall be 3 feet, except that fences greater than 3 feet in height are allowed if the portion of the fence between 3 and 7 feet above grade is at least 20% transparent. Fences along alleys are allowed provided fences greater than 3 feet in height above grade are at least 20% transparent between 3 and 7 feet. If no transparency is provided, the maximum height of such fence shall be 3 feet.

### Section 13.06.502.D
**X-District Landscaping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCX, NCX, CCX, UCX, UCX-TD, CIX, URX, HMX, NRX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Exemptions
- Single-family detached dwellings are exempt from all landscaping requirements contained in this table.
- Parking lots of 15 stalls or less, loading areas, and fueling stations are exempt from the Interior Landscaping Distribution requirements contained in the Planting Requirements section of this table, to allow flexibility in placement of required landscaping.
- Parking lots of 15 stalls or less, located behind buildings and accessed by alleys, are exempt from the Perimeter Strip, Buffer and Interior Landscaping Distribution requirements below.
- Property across an arterial street or highway from R-District property is not required to provide a Buffer Planting Area along the affected property line abutting the arterial street or highway.
- Park and recreation uses are only required to meet the Front Yard and Planting Requirements of this table. Passive open space areas of such uses are exempt from all landscaping requirements of this table.
**TABLE 2 – Parking in Mixed-Use Center Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses</td>
<td>Minimum 1.0 stall per unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or Office Uses</td>
<td>Minimum 2.5 stalls per 1000 square feet of floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCX-TD Commercial or Office Uses (including retail, service and eating and drinking establishments)</td>
<td>Minimum 0 stalls per 1000 square feet of floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses</td>
<td>For uses not specifically listed above, the parking requirement in the Mixed-Use Center Districts shall be 70% of the parking requirement for that use identified in Table 1. See Section 13.06.510.B.2.f for use of compact stalls. For purposes of calculating parking quantity requirements, “floor area,” when used, shall not include space devoted to parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development Standards – Location.**

| NCX, RCX, NRX, and URX and UCX-TD Districts | Parking shall be located to the rear, side, within, or under a structure, or on a separate lot. Surface parking located to the side of a structure shall not exceed a maximum of 60 feet in width for paved vehicular area along designated pedestrian street frontages. |

---

2. The following additional standard applies in Downtown Districts and within the UCX-TD District:
   a. Drive-throughs and associated stacking lanes shall be located entirely within buildings.
### District sign regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 13.06.522.J</th>
<th>DCC, DMU</th>
<th>WR</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting</strong></td>
<td>Indirect, internal illumination, neon, and bare bulb allowed.</td>
<td>Same as DCC.</td>
<td>Bare bulb illumination prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotating, mechanized</strong></td>
<td>Allowed.</td>
<td>Same as DCC.</td>
<td>Prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flashing, animated</strong></td>
<td>Prohibited.</td>
<td>Prohibited.</td>
<td>Prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic changing message center</strong></td>
<td>Allowed. <a href="#">Refer to 13.06.521.H for additional regulations.</a></td>
<td>Same as DCC.</td>
<td>Same as DCC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Temporary Signs

| Temporary off-premises advertising signs | Section 13.06.521.C shall apply, except public facility sites in DCC and DMU shall be allowed temporary advertising signs of 32 square feet, including banners not to exceed 160 square feet, attached to temporary fencing during the time of construction. | Prohibited. | Prohibited. |

---

*Exhibit B – Proposed Amendments to the Land Use Regulatory Code (May 7, 2014)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 13.06.522.K</th>
<th>C-2, CIX, CCX, UCX, UCX–TD, M-1, M-2, PMI</th>
<th>C-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signage Allocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum total sign area</td>
<td>Wall signage, 1 square foot per 1 linear foot of the building frontage with the public entrance. Freestanding signage, 1 square foot per 1 linear foot of street frontage(s).</td>
<td>Same as C-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback</td>
<td>Provisions of Section 13.06.521.G shall apply, minimum 200 feet separation from other freestanding signs, sites with freeway frontage shall locate signs on the abutting parallel frontage, no signs shall be allowed adjacent to the freeway.</td>
<td>Same as C-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboards</td>
<td>Allowed only in C-2, M-1, M-2, and PMI. Provisions of Section 13.06.521.M shall apply.</td>
<td>Prohibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating, mechanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashing, animated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Electronic changing message center | Allowed, but prohibited on Pedestrian Streets and Core Pedestrian Streets, as defined in 13.06.300.C and 13.06.200.D, and 13.06.521.H | Same as C-2. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary Signs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary off-premises advertising signs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 13.06.522.M</th>
<th>PDB</th>
<th>RCX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signage Allocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating, mechanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic changing message center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***
13.06.535 Special needs housing.

***

Special Needs Housing – Use Table
(P = Permitted Outright, CU = Conditional Use Permit Required, N = Not Permitted)

*Note: See Subsection C, below, for additional siting restrictions

**Note: The residency limitations indicated in this use table apply to the number of residents housed at a facility, exclusive of any support or care staff. Where specific residency limitations are provided in the definition of the use, the size information herein is provided for reference only.

| Size (number of residents) | R-1, R-2, R-2SRD, HMR-SRD, NRX | R-3 | R-4L, R-4, R-5, PRD, URX, RCX, NCX, T, C-1, HM, HMX, PDB | UCX, UCX-TD, CCX, CIX, C-2, M-1, DCC, DMU, DR, WR | M-2, PMI |

***

13.06.630 Nonconforming parcels/uses/structures.

***

F. Nonconforming structure and conforming commercial, industrial, and institutional uses.

A legal conforming use located in a structure that is nonconforming as to setback, location, maximum height, lot coverage, or other development regulations may be replaced, enlarged, moved, or modified in volume, area, or space; provided, such replacement, enlargement, movement, or modification does not increase the degree of nonconformity. Any structure’s replacement, enlargement, movement or modification of volume, area, or space must comply with all other current applicable development regulations as provided by this chapter, and with the requirements of TMC Chapter 13.11.
13.06.700 Definitions and illustrations.

Work-live unit. A combined living and work unit that includes a kitchen and a bathroom. The residential portion of the unit, including the sleeping area, kitchen, bathroom, and closet areas, occupies no more than 33 percent of the total floor area of the legal non-residential use, and the living space is not separated from the work space. It must be located within buildings lawfully in existence on September 25, 2012, in Downtown districts or mixed-use centers.

Chapter 13.06A

13.06A.050 Additional use regulations

E. Work-Live.

1. Purpose and Intent: The purpose of this Section is to assist with the revitalization of Downtown Tacoma and the City’s other Mixed-Use Centers and with the implementation of the City’s Comprehensive Plan by facilitating the conversion of older, economically distressed, or historically significant buildings to work-live units. This will help to reduce vacant space as well as preserve Downtown’s architectural and cultural past and encourage the development of a work-live and residential community Downtown, thus creating a more balanced ratio between housing and jobs in the region’s primary employment center. This revitalization will also facilitate the development of a “24-hour city” and encourage mixed commercial and residential uses in order to improve air quality and reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled by locating residents, jobs, hotels and transit services near each other. Adding a minor residential component to an existing or historic building does not trigger change of use requirements under the City’s Land-use codes.

a. A work-live unit is a combined living and work unit that includes a kitchen and a bathroom. The residential portion of the unit, including the sleeping area, kitchen, bathroom, and closet areas, occupies no more than 33 percent of the total floor area of the legal non-residential use, and the living space is not separated from the work space. It must be located within buildings lawfully in existence on September 25, 2012 in Downtown or the other mixed-use centers.

13.06A.052 Primary Pedestrian Streets.

A. Within the Downtown, the “primary pedestrian streets” are considered key streets in the intended development and utilization of the area due to pedestrian use, traffic volumes, transit connections, and/or visibility. The streetscape and adjacent development on these streets should be designed to support pedestrian activity throughout the day. They are designated for use with certain provisions in the Downtown zoning regulations, including setbacks and design requirements. Within the Downtown zoning districts, the primary pedestrian streets are:

1. Pacific Avenue between S. 7th and S. 25th Streets.
2. Broadway between S. 7th and S. 15th Streets.
3. Commerce Street between S. 7th and S. 15th Streets.
4. “A” Street between S. 7th and S. 12th Streets.
5. Tacoma Avenue between S. 7th and S. 15th Streets.
6. South Jefferson Avenue between South 21st Street and South 25th Street
7. South 25th Street between I-705 and South Fawcett Avenue
8. East ‘C’ Street
9. South ‘C’ Street
10. Puyallup Avenue
Chapter 13.11
CRITICAL AREAS PRESERVATION

Sections:

13.11.530 FWHCA’s Shoreline – Marine Buffers.
13.11.540 FWHCA’s Marine Buffer Modifications.

13.11.145 Pre-existing Uses/Structures.
A. An established use or existing structure that was lawfully permitted prior to adoption of this chapter, but which is not in compliance with this chapter, may continue subject to the provisions of Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) Chapter 13.11 Critical Areas Preservation, Chapter 13.10 Shoreline Management and Section 13.06.630.

B. Site Review. In order to assist customers with potential proposals, City staff will provide an initial site review based on existing information, maps and a potential site visit to identify potential wetlands, streams, and their associated buffers within 300 feet. FWHCAs and their marine habitat buffer management areas will also be identified. Site reviews are completed on a case by case basis and may require the applicant to submit a wetland delineation, wetland categorization, stream type and Ordinary High Water Mark location, hydrology reports, and priority fish and wildlife species and habitat presence information from WDFW or the City.

Following the site visit and Review Process, a project may proceed without further critical area permitting if the applicant can demonstrate the following:
1. There are no adverse impacts to the critical area or buffer, and
2. Structures and improvements are all located beyond the required buffers, and
3. Existing hydrology will be maintained to support critical areas, and
4. The proposed use or activity is consistent with WDFW species management recommendations.

C. In conjunction with the site review process, the Director of Planning and Development Services (the “Director”; see 13.11.900 D., below) may require additional information on the physical, biological, and anthropogenic features that contribute to the existing ecological conditions and functions to determine whether a formal wetland/stream/WHCA exemption, assessment or development permit is required.

D. Review, Assessment and Permit Requirements.

1. Review of development activities within the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Management Act, including Puget Sound, Wapato Lake, or any stream where the mean annual flow is 20 cubic feet per second or greater are regulated under provisions of both this Chapter and TMC 13.10, Shoreline Management. If there are any conflicts between TMC 13.10, Shoreline Management, and Chapter 13.11, Critical Areas Preservation, the most restrictive requirements shall apply. Upon adoption of the new Shoreline Master Program and code, all critical area code excerpts referring to the regulation of critical areas within the shoreline will no longer be valid and those critical areas shall be regulated under the new shoreline code.

a. Development activities that require a Shoreline Substantial Development permit do not require a separate Wetland/Stream/WHCA permit or exemption, provided the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit review includes review for consistency with this Chapter.

b. Development activities that require a Shoreline Exemption and a Wetland/Stream/WHCA permit will be processed separately.
13. Within Shorelines of the State, as defined by RCW 90.58.030, activities exempt under WAC 173-27-040, with the exception of WAC 173-27-040 (2) (c), (g) and (h). This exemption shall not include activities within wetlands, streams, or their associated buffers, and shall not include activities within associated wetlands or streams as established in RCW 90.58.030(2)(d).**

1413. Watershed restoration projects that conform to the provisions of RCW 89.08.460 shall be reviewed without fee and approved within 45 days per RCW 89.08.490.

145. Fish habitat enhancement projects that conform to the provision of RCW 77.55.181 shall be reviewed without fee and comments provided as specified in RCW 77.55.181.

15. Maintenance and repair of existing bulkheads, stream bank armoring and bioengineered stabilization measures designed to protect property from erosion or slope failure.

155. Demolition of structures.


13.11.500 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas (FWHCAs).
The 500 section contains the regulations for fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas (FWHCAs), including the following:

13.11.510 Classification.
13.11.520 Standards.
13.11.530 FWHCA’s Shoreline – Marine Buffers.
13.11.540 FWHCA’s Marine Buffer Modifications.
13.11.550 FWHCA’s Mitigation Requirements.
13.11.560 FWHCA’s Management Areas.
13.11.580 Repealed.


13.11.510 Classification.
A. Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas are areas identified by the Washington Department of Wildlife as being of critical importance to the maintenance of fish and wildlife species. These areas may include other critical areas such as geologically hazardous areas, stream corridors, wetlands, and these critical areas’ associative buffers.

1. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas (FWHCAs). Fish and Wildlife habitat areas include:

a. Lands and waters containing priority habitats and species including Commencement Bay and all waterways.

b. All public and private tidelands or bedlands suitable for shellfish harvest, including any shellfish protection districts established pursuant to Chapter 90.72 RCW. The Washington Department of Health’s classification system shall be used to classify commercial shellfish areas.

c. Kelp and eelgrass beds and herring, sand lance, and smelt spawning areas. Kelp and eelgrass beds may be classified and identified by the Washington Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Lands Program and the Washington Department of Ecology. Locations are compiled in the WDNR Aquatic Lands Shore Zone Inventory, and the Puget Sound Environmental...

ad. Natural ponds under 20 acres and their submerged aquatic beds that provide critical fish or wildlife habitat.

be. Waters of the State, which are defined in WAC Title 222, Forest Practices Rules and Regulations. Waters of the State must be classified using the system in WAC 222-16-030. In classifying waters of the state as FWHCAs the following may be considered:

***

\[\text{fc. Lakes, ponds, streams and rivers planted with game fish, including those planted under the auspices of a federal, state, local, or tribal program and waters which support priority fish species as identified by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.}\]

***

13.11.530 FWHCA’s Shoreline—Marine Buffers.
A. FWHCA’s Marine Buffers

1. General. A marine buffer area shall be provided within the shoreline for all uses adjacent to a FWHCA to protect the integrity and function of the FWHCA. The buffer shall be measured horizontally from the edge of the ordinary high water mark landward.

2. Marine Buffer. Beneficial nearshore habitat functions that can be provided by landward buffers include feeder bluff input, water quality, sediment control, wildlife habitat, microclimate, nutrient input, fish prey production, shade, and habitat structure such as large woody debris. Buffer widths shall be established according to Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marine Habitat Area</th>
<th>Buffer Width (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Narrows South (from south city limits to waterward extension of 6th Avenue)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Narrows Central (from public ownership starting at waterward extension of 6th Avenue to centerline of SR 16)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Narrows North and Point Defiance (from centerline of SR 16 to the existing northwesterly portion of the existing bulkheaded promenade at Owen Beach)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Bay West (the northwesterly portion of the existing bulkheaded promenade at Owen Beach to Thea Foss Waterway, except for Slag Island beginning at the boundary between parcels 8950100017 and 8940100016 that runs perpendicular from Eaton Street and continuing to Point Ruston, the site of the former ASARCO Tacoma Smelter, at the waterward extension of North 49th Street)</td>
<td>115 (50 feet for Slag Island and former ASARCO Tacoma Smelter site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Bay Waterways (industrial waterways and Thea Foss)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Bay East (East 11th Street to city limits)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Buffers may not apply if use is exempt according to Section 13.11.140.B.8.

(Ord. 27728 Ex. A; passed Jul. 1, 2008; Ord. 27431 § 45; passed Nov. 15, 2005)

13.11.540 FWHCA’s Marine Buffer Modifications.
A. Where a designated FWHCA marine buffer geographically coincides with a stream or wetland, provisions for increasing buffers, buffer averaging, and buffer reductions for the wetland and stream component shall apply as described within this chapter only when there is no impact to the FWHCA.

B. Modification of a FWHCA marine buffer is subject to the site review requirements, according to Section 13.11.250 and are not subject to the permitting requirements of Section 13.11.230, when modification is necessary to accommodate an essential public facility or public utility where no feasible alternative location will accommodate the facility; for water dependent uses and their accessory structures; water-related uses; or the minimum public access as required in the S-6, S-7, and S-8 shoreline districts as required by TMC Section 13.10.175, where:

1. No new surface that is permeable by water at the time of the application will be covered with an impervious surface; and
2. No vegetation important to the function of the critical area will be removed; and

3. Any additional stormwater impacts will be managed according to the City’s Surface Water Management Manual or an equivalent, in accordance with the Department of Ecology’s Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington; and

4. The facility is located, designed, and constructed to minimize and, where possible, avoid FWHCA marine buffer disturbance to the maximum extent feasible; and

5. In-water uses are subject to review and approval through the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Hydraulic Project Approval and/or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide or Individual Permit; and

6. The use must also comply with all applicable local, state, and federal laws; or

C. Modification of a FWHCA marine buffer is also allowed for applicable uses and activities per 13.11.140 and for those uses and activities subject to the permitting requirements contained within Section 13.11.230, including Innovative Mitigation, and 13.11.550.

(Ord. 27728 Ex. A; passed Jul. 1, 2008)

13.11.550 FWHCA’s Mitigation Requirements.

A. All proposed modification in a FWHCA or its marine buffer shall be in accordance with the standards of this section, except where the modification has met the standards contained in 13.11.540.B or is Exempt per 13.11.140 allowed through 13.11.200 or 13.11.210.

B. All FWHCA and their marine buffer mitigation will comply with applicable mitigation requirements specified in 13.11.260 and 13.11.270, including, but not limited to, mitigation plan requirements, monitoring and bonding.

C. Where a designated FWHCA geographically coincides with a stream or wetland, mitigation will comply with applicable mitigation requirements described within this chapter.

D. Mitigation for habitat impacts in the marine buffer shall occur in the following order of preference:

1. On the parcel within the buffer as close to the ordinary high water mark as possible;

2. Within the buffer as close to the ordinary high water mark as possible on a parcel that abuts the ordinary high water mark within one quarter (1/4) mile along the shoreline from where the vegetation removal, placement of impervious surface or other loss of habitat occurred;

3. Farther along the shoreline within the buffer as close to the ordinary high water mark as possible.

E. The following mitigation ratios are required for habitat impacts in the marine buffer. The first number specifies the area of replacement habitat, and second specifies the area of altered habitat:

1. 1:1 for areas on the parcel or on a parcel that abuts the ordinary high water mark within one quarter (1/4) mile along the shoreline from where the vegetation removal, placement of impervious surface or other loss of habitat occurred.

2. 3:1 farther along the shoreline, provided that if a five (5) year bonded monitoring program is provided that monitors the effectiveness of mitigation measures and provides a means for ensuring the attainment of the goals of the program, the Director may approve a 2:1 ratio.

Df. Habitat Management Plan. If the critical area review process as described in this chapter (13.11.250) determines that a Habitat Management Plan shall be prepared as part of a development proposal to avoid or minimize impacts to FWHCAs or marine buffers, the following standards shall apply.

1. A habitat management plan shall be prepared in coordination with the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife by a qualified professional.

2. A habitat management plan shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

a. Analysis and discussion on the project’s effects on critical fish and wildlife habitat;

b. An assessment and discussion on special management recommendations which have been developed for species or habitat located on the site by any federal or state agency;

c. Proposed mitigation measures which could minimize or avoid impacts;

d. Assessment and evaluation of the effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed; and
e. Assessment and evaluation of ongoing management practices which will protect critical fish and wildlife habitat after development of the project site, including proposed monitoring and maintenance programs.

GE. If mitigation is performed off-site, a conservation easement or other legal document must be provided to the City to ensure that the party responsible for the maintenance and monitoring of the mitigation has access and the right to perform these activities.

(Ord. 28109 Ex. O; passed Dec. 4, 2012; Ord. 27728 Ex. A; passed Jul. 1, 2008)

13.11.900.S Shoreline modifications. Those actions that modify the physical configuration or qualities of the shoreline area, usually through the construction of a physical element such as a dike, breakwater, pier, weir, dredged basin, fill, bulkhead, or other shoreline structure.

Shoreline structure. A permanent or temporary edifice or building, or any piece of work artificially built or composed of parts joined together in some definite manner, whether installed on, above, or below the surface of the ground or water, except for vessels.

13.11.900.W Water-dependent activity. Activity or use which requires direct contact with the water and cannot exist at a non-water location due to the intrinsic nature of its operation.

Water-related activity. Activity or use which is not intrinsically dependent on a waterfront location, but whose operation cannot occur economically without a waterfront location.

Chapter 13.12
ENVIRONMENTAL CODE

13.12.820 Appeals of SEPA threshold determination and adequacy of final environmental impact statement.

a. Threshold determination or adequacy of a final environmental impact statement for a proposed land use action shall be appealable to the Hearing Examiner. All other appeals under this chapter, other than appeals of environmental reviews associated with Shoreline Substantial Development Permits, shall be made as set forth in 13.12.820.B, below.

3. Appeals of SEPA associated with Shoreline Substantial Development Permits shall be made to the Shoreline Hearings Board in accordance with the Tacoma Shoreline Master Program Section 2.7.

4. Appeals of other actions shall be processed in accordance with the appeal provisions of the underlying action.
Proposed Amendments
Recommended by the Planning Commission

Application #2013-05:

Shoreline Related Element

(Carried over from 2013 Annual Amendment)
Staff Note (May 7, 2014):

Application #2013-05 is being carried over from the 2013 Annual Amendment. The proposed documents contained therein were intended to be implementation strategies of the revised Shoreline Master Program (SMP) and were recommended by the Planning Commission on May 1, 2013 for the City Council’s adoption concurrently with the adoption of the SMP. Due to delays in the State approval process for the SMP, Application #2013-05 was held over until 2014. Now that the SMP has been approved (in October 2013), the Planning Commission recommends that Application #2013-05 be adopted by the City Council along with the 2014 Annual Amendment. Included below is the summary of the Planning Commission’s recommendations formulated in 2013, which remains valid.

* * * *

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
May 1, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #:</th>
<th>2013-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Planning and Development Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Stephen Atkinson, Planning Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Amendment:</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Text Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use &amp; Zoning:</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location &amp; Size of Area:</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Council area:</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Commission Recommendations:

The proposed amendments to the Ruston Way Plan, Shoreline Trails Plan, and Foss Waterway Design and Development Plan are intended to (1) carry forward and integrate the design elements of these Comprehensive Plan elements into one streamlined Waterfront Design Guidelines document; (2) integrate the relevant public access vision and project descriptions into the Public Access Alternatives Plan; (3) improve the consistency of the Comprehensive Plan and Shoreline Master Program and associated documents; and (4) to rescind and replace the Comprehensive Plan elements with a Waterfront Design Guidelines document and updated Public Access Alternatives Plan.
The following is a summary of the proposed amendments, while details are shown in the exhibits:


3. Update of the Public Access Alternatives Plan that: 1) describes an overall vision for the waterfront public access system, 2) incorporates the vision, plan area, and implementation strategies of past waterfront public access plans, 3) updates the projects list, and 4) improves the usability of the document through reorganization, map updates, and formatting.

4. Create a unified Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines that: 1) updates and replaces the design elements of past waterfront plans, 2) applies to new waterfront public access projects city-wide, and 3) identifies specific design guidelines for the Dome to Defiance shoreline.

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 20, 2013 and kept the record open through March 29, 2013 to receive additional written comments. Public testimony on the proposed amendments focused primarily on two issues: 1) the timing of the adoption and delay in Department of Ecology approval of the Shoreline Master Program, and 2) improving the treatment and description of the S-6/7 Shoreline District to better reflect City Council intent as adopted in the Shoreline Master Program. Based on the public testimony the following amendments have been made and are recommended.

1. A separate map and description were created for the S-6/7 District in the Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines to better distinguish the area from the S-7 Shoreline District.

2. Guidelines were added to recognize concerns regarding public safety and the security of single family residences in close proximity to gulch and forested trail systems.

3. Map and text edits were made in the Schuster Corridor section of the Public Access Alternatives Plan to better distinguish between the S-6/7 and S-7 Shoreline Districts and to incorporate the findings from the Schuster Parkway Multi-Use Trail study.

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plan, rescind the Ruston Way Plan and Design Booklet, Shoreline Trails Plan, and Foss Waterway Design Guidelines and Foss Waterway Design and Development Plan, and replace these past planning documents with the Public Access Alternative Plan and Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines as detailed in Exhibits A, B and C. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council’s adoption of these proposed amendments coincide with the final adoption of the Shoreline Master Program.

Exhibits:

A. Proposed Amendments to the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan

B. Proposed update of the Tacoma Waterfront Public Access Alternatives Plan

C. Proposed Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines
**Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element**

**Waterfront Open Spaces and Shoreline Access**

**Intent**

Tacoma’s shorelines and waterfront areas are a source of economic activity, entertainment and recreation, as well as providing invaluable ecological and cultural functions. As such, the promotion of shoreline access and recreation is a major priority for Tacomans. Recognizing the multiple benefits and values of its shorelines, the City and others have made substantial investments to clean up environmental pollution and improve shoreline access, recreation and cultural opportunities. Major parks and open space improvements have been and continue to be made, including the Thea Foss esplanade and parks, Chinese Reconciliation Park, Ruston Way promenade, Point Defiance Park, Titlow Beach boardwalk, and other sites. Given the strong connection many people feel to shorelines, investments like these will provide benefits that will be enjoyed and appreciated by a great number of people, improving Tacoma’s livability and long-term prosperity.

Waterfront areas attract a variety of people and uses, from community events attracting thousands of people from Tacoma and the region, including the 4th of July and the Tall Ships Festival, to regular visitors seeking recreational and cultural opportunities. For others, shorelines are the site of daily life and a place to meet daily needs—a place where they live, work and travel. Recreation activities on and in the water, including fishing, SCUBA
Shoreline open spaces and parks will only increase in importance as Tacoma grows. Tacoma has a legacy of industrial and railroad development along the shorelines that has reduced public access and environmental functions. At the same time, the Port of Tacoma and other industrial areas are major economic assets to the City. Continued partnerships with a range of stakeholders to reclaim shoreline areas for public access, recreation, educational and interpretive displays, public art, community events, habitat restoration and other open space purposes are important. Further discussion and policies and regulations for shorelines are contained within the City’s Shoreline Master Program (SMP).

To more effectively plan for and implement a unified network of waterfront open spaces, trail systems and recreation facilities, the City has developed a waterfront Public Access Alternatives Plan (PAAL). The PAAL should be utilized for coordinating public and private efforts, prioritizing waterfront public access projects, and guiding permit applications in accordance with the goals and policies of the Shoreline Master Program.

In addition, the Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines ensure that new waterfront access sites are designed with consideration given to the view, aesthetic, and design objectives of the Shoreline Master Program.

The Public Access Alternatives Plan and Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines are herein incorporated by reference as implementation strategies of the Comprehensive Plan.

OS-SH-1 Prioritize Tacoma’s Shorelines and Waters
Recognize the strong community connection to Tacoma’s shorelines and waters as cultural, historic, recreational, educational, economic, natural and aesthetic assets of tremendous value. Work with partners to undertake a broad range of activities that enhance Tacoma’s identity as a waterfront community, including designating and enhancing shoreline areas for public access, recreation, educational and interpretive displays, public art, community events, habitat restoration and other activities.

OS-SH-2 Shoreline and Water Access
Develop opportunities for public access to the Puget Sound for water-oriented recreation and enjoyment of shorelines, including public access to both natural and man-made waterfront features such as beaches, tidelands, wharfs, piers, esplanades, parks, heritage sites, and waterfront trails and paths.

OS-SH-3 Shoreline and Water Activities
Develop and enhance opportunities for swimming, boating including use of Tacoma’s water trails, fishing, SCUBA diving, educational activities, wildlife observation and other shoreline and water-dependent activities.

OS-SH-4 Reconnect Shorelines and Uplands Habitat
Recognize the critical habitat functions and the loss of historic habitat connectivity between shorelines and upland areas and water courses, and seek to re-create these connections through habitat conservation and restoration efforts.

OS-SH-5 Shoreline Trail Connections
Recognizing that many of Tacoma’s existing and planned trails follow the shoreline or connect shoreline and upland areas, partner to develop and maintain trails oriented to the shorelines, slopes and gulches. Development of trails should be coordinated with habitat restoration efforts.

OS-SH-6 Shoreline Public Access Alternatives
Implement the priority actions identified in the Shoreline Master Program Public Access Alternatives.
TACOMA WATERFRONT
Public Access Alternatives Plan

Exhibit B -- Carried over from 2013
The City of Tacoma's Public Access Alternatives Plan (PAAL) is an implementation strategy associated with the Shoreline Master Program and Open Space Habitat and Recreation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The PAAL describes an overall vision and implementation strategy for the City's 46 miles of waterfront that will connect linear waterfront trail systems to City-wide and regional systems and enhance recreation opportunities for a multitude of uses and abilities. Past waterfront public access plans have been reviewed and incorporated herein to maintain continuity with the past while looking ahead to the future of Tacoma's waterfront and the needs of our community.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

VISION

The City of Tacoma boasts a magnificent shoreline, offering a variety of waterfront experiences for people of all ages and abilities. With over 46 miles of shoreline, water and waterfront is one of the dominant characteristics of the City of Tacoma and its urban form, as well as a locus of economic activity and a driver of our City’s quality of life.

While continuing to respect the past and the history of Tacoma’s waterfront, the City looks towards the future and the tremendous potential and opportunity that lay ahead and the central role that the City’s waterfront will play in the sustainability and quality of life of our community and the prospect of a thriving, resilient economy.

This plan articulates a strategy for developing an integrated, cohesive waterfront public access system that builds on past planning efforts and community aspirations. Despite the significant efforts and resources that have been devoted to the creation of this system by the City of Tacoma, the Foss Waterway Development Authority, Metro Parks and the Port of Tacoma, much of the public shoreline remains inaccessible to our citizens – cutoff by roadways, railroad, steep slopes, or industrial operations – and as a result, priority shoreline trail systems remain incomplete.

This plan memorializes the vision of past planning documents while integrating them into a single, unified approach to public waterfront access. This is a long-term comprehensive strategy to establish a citywide network of trails, parks, and attractions that link different shoreline areas, from Tacoma Narrows to Commencement Bay, with connections inward to city neighborhoods and outward to regional trails.

Translating vision into reality will not be easy, but the benefits to the City will be great. Imagine a city in which youth can bicycle safely from his or her home across town to visit a friend; a city with an active mix of commercial, industrial and recreational uses as well as new neighborhoods along the shoreline; a city with a wide variety of parks and open spaces, connected so that they are, in sum, one big park; a city where citizens gain a first-hand appreciation for active marine industries and international trade; a city known for the environmental health of its shorelines. Imagine a city that is an attractive destination for cyclists and hikers from all over the region.
Recognizing the importance of past waterfront planning efforts, the sections below memorialize and incorporate herein the vision articulated in these community documents, including the Shoreline Trails Plan, Dome to Defiance Study, Ruston Way Plan and Thea Foss Waterway Design and Development Plan.

**Shoreline Trails Plan - 1989**

The Shoreline Trails Plan envisions an urban pedestrian trail system lying within the shoreline districts, steep slopes and gulches, from the Thea Foss Waterway north to Ruston Way, through Point Defiance Park and south along the western shores of Tacoma.

The plan proposes a coordinated trail system that will tie individual trail segments together into a unified, urban pedestrian network. The trail system will provide an alternative means of travel to and from shoreline areas and neighborhoods. The trail segments will be linked together by connecting trails and, where this is not possible, by using nearby streets and sidewalks. The trail system is composed of a corridor trail, access trails, trailheads, trail access points, viewpoints, shoreline access points and destination locations.

**Ruston Way Plan - 1981**

The waterfront areas of cities across the nation are again being recognized as valued resources. But this time not for their potential for industrial development but rather as places for people to go and enjoy the water. Decaying urban waterfronts are being revitalized to provide recreational opportunities for city dwellers. They are being transformed into active, vital areas with new commercial and recreational developments that open up the waterfront to people.

The Ruston Way shoreline is easily reached making it a prime area for revitalization. Once a thriving industrial district, changing technological and economic considerations left the area virtually abandoned. Slowly, it is being rebuilt as private developers and public officials alike take advantage of its magnificent setting, panoramic views, wooded slopes and close proximity to neighborhoods. The Ruston Way shoreline has the potential to become a unique urban waterfront attraction and people-oriented area.

The need for close-in urban recreation areas is increasingly important as energy supplies diminish and the cost of traveling to more distant parks soars. Many people drive several hours to enjoy water-oriented recreation because no or limited opportunities are available close to home even though the city is located near the waterfront.

The Ruston Way waterfront of Tacoma is a public resource that can satisfy the water-oriented recreational needs of citizens and improve the livability of the city. The public developments proposed in this plan for the Ruston Way shoreline area will enhance the
natural areas, strengthen the historical significance, provide optimum public access to the water, maintain views and create opportunities for outdoor recreation and social interaction.

Dome to Defiance Study - 1988

We would have a shoreside people-place 5 ½ miles long. No other waterfront in the Northwest would be as spectacular. This would not be all parks or all commercial development. The shoreside people-place would be a unique blend of mixed uses including industrial, commercial, residential and recreational. It would include both public and private areas. The identifying characteristic of this waterfront would be its urban quality close to the population centers. It would have public access and view access to the water the whole length of the shore. It would be easy to get to, it would link downtown, neighborhood areas, and our major in-town park. It would have a water transportation link to the rest of Puget Sound. It would be diverse and interesting, primarily an area for Tacoma and Pierce County residents, but it could also be a major magnet for tourists and other visitors.

Thea Foss Waterway Plan - 1994

The Thea Foss Waterway represents a unique opportunity for the City of Tacoma to create an attractive focal place for the enjoyment of the inland waters of Puget Sound within an urban context. Developing a mix of uses along the Waterway will bring the economic vitality needed to turn Thea Foss Waterway into a showcase for Tacoma.

The Waterway visually and physically connects surrounding districts. The Waterway’s historic past and working waterfront, combined with new cultural, recreational, residential, office and retail uses, will create a lively, urban environment. A linear waterfront park will link together a variety of attractive, ground level public activities and uses accessible to all of Tacoma’s citizens and to the region. Environmental cleanup and protection measures are being integrated into redevelopment, creating a safe, healthy, and sustainable environment.

The City envisions a mixed use community attuned to the intrinsic qualities of its water setting and inseparable from the city around it. It strives to attain the “ABC’s” of development: Access, Boating and Character.

The Shoreline Master Program focuses on individual policies and development regulations to realize the Waterway’s potential as an attractive setting for maritime industry, civic redevelopment, and water-oriented recreation. The Public Access Alternatives Plan identifies the specific public access projects and capital investments needed to activate the Foss Waterway as a recreational destination. Taken together, the total impact of these efforts will be much more than the sum of the individual actions themselves. They will create a Waterway that:
• Is an active, diversified destination attraction and focus for the City.

• Features a variety of integrated recreational, commercial, marine, industrial, and residential activities.

• Is well connected with neighboring districts, especially the downtown, Ruston Way, and Tacoma Dome areas.

• Is easily accessible for pedestrians, transit users, boaters, and visitors from throughout the region.

• Offers a wide variety of physical settings, landscaped parks, and pedestrian attractions that are unified by a consistent esplanade treatment along the shoreline edge.

• Is based on environmentally sound shoreline management with improved water quality and more ecologically productive shoreline habitats.

PLAN AREA

Under Washington Administrative Code 173-26-221(4) public access is defined as “the ability of the general public to reach, touch, and enjoy the water’s edge, to travel on the waters of the state, and to view the water and the shoreline from adjacent locations.” Therefore, this Plan takes a broad view of the projects that constitute public access and includes trail systems that, while not within shoreline jurisdiction, provide views of the shoreline or connections to trail systems that facilitate direct access. The applicability of this plan, then, is not limited to those areas within 200’ of ordinary high water mark, nor a specific geographic boundary, but rather is based upon a system of access that may expand or contract over time as public process continues to refine the community vision for waterfront access.

The following subsections identify past waterfront public access planning documents and the plan area to which they applied. The public access projects identified in these plans have been integrated herein.

Shoreline Trails Plan

The plan area boundary encompasses the shoreline areas of the Tacoma peninsula which includes the Foss Waterway and extends north along Commencement Bay to Point Defiance Park. From Point Defiance Park, the plan area boundary extends south along the Narrows to Titlow Park at Sixth Avenue and beyond to the City’s southern boundaries. The plan area boundary extends inland from the water’s edge to the top of the steep slope areas and includes all of Point Defiance Park and the gulches (Gold Creek, Mason, Puget, Buckley, and Garfield).

Ruston Way Plan

The plan area is an approximately two-mile stretch of shoreline bordering on Commencement Bay and located between
the Old Town community and the Town of Ruston Way. With exception of the Waterview Street area, the area considered in this plan lies between railroad tracks and the outer harbor line. However, consideration of the nearby slopes and gulches and access to nearby residential areas is also a part of this document.

**Thea Foss Waterway Plan**

Thea Foss Waterway is approximately three and one half miles of continuous shoreline off Commencement Bay adjacent to the City of Tacoma’s downtown. For the purposes of this plan, the boundaries to the northwest begin just to the north of the 4th Street ramp off Schuster Parkway, wrapping around the Waterway bounded by Dock Street and “D” Street, and ending at the northeast point of land near “D” Street and East 3rd Street. Proximity to the central business district, the Union Station, the Tacoma Dome, and the Port Industrial area is indicative of the Waterway’s overall contextual importance. This plan primarily addresses the west side of the Waterway with the intention that more immediate significant changes are oriented to the west side. The east side is addressed in one section but is also referenced in the design and marine guidelines section.

## USE OF THE PLAN

### General

The City recognizes that the finite waterfront land supply and multiple demands for shoreline space and resources - as a place for wildlife, for recreation, and for employment - has the potential to bring the three primary goals of the Shoreline Management Act into conflict. The City views the PAAL as a means for minimizing future conflict between uses and user groups by identifying the scope of public access improvements desired by the citizens of the City of Tacoma, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and to identify the location and type of access envisioned in order to provide predictability for water-oriented uses and as a means to provide permitting predictability for private uses. The Tacoma Waterfront Land Use Analysis developed an inventory and economic demand forecast for water-dependent uses in the shoreline in order to evaluate what economic uses are likely to locate and expand in Tacoma’s shoreline jurisdiction.

### Permit process

The PAAL will be utilized to inform decisions about public access requirements in private developments when required under the City’s shoreline regulations. When public access is required as a condition of a permit application, the PAAL will be used to
determine the type and extent of public access improvements required under the permit, commensurate with the scope and scale of the proposed development.

In addition, the Public Access Alternatives Plan is intended to address concerns regarding potential public safety, security, or operational conflicts between uses and public access. The City of Tacoma Shoreline Master Program recognizes that in some circumstances, the provision of public access on development sites may result in unnecessary safety risks for the public, may violate or jeopardize the security of an existing or proposed use, and may result in harm to the environment that cannot be mitigated. In these circumstances, the PAAL will provide alternative locations for public access to the shoreline where these conditions will be alleviated. The alternative site will be identified and improved as a condition of the permit.

Voluntary efforts

The PAAL will also be used to pursue grant funds and to guide voluntary private and public improvements to public access and recreation within the shoreline. Section XX establishes criteria for prioritizing public or voluntary efforts to implement the public access projects listed herein.

Capital Facilities and Transportation Improvement Programs

The PAAL will be used to identify projects to be added to the Capital Facilities Program and Transportation Improvement Program. While the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan articulates the vision for how Tacoma will develop, the Capital Facilities Program describes the implementation of that vision. It is the critical link between comprehensive planning and capital improvements. The Capital Facilities Program is both a planning and financial document. It is a prioritization of the capital improvements the city intends to build in the next six years and a plan for how to pay for these improvements. The 2011-2016 Capital Facilities Program does not appropriate funds, but rather it functions as a budgeting tool, supporting the actual appropriations that are made through adoption of the budget. It is an important “filter” that demonstrates that the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan is financially realistic.

The Six-Year Comprehensive Transportation Program lists planned transportation projects. The program includes roadways, bridges, non-motorized facilities, sidewalks and other capital related transportation projects. The program is based upon anticipated revenues versus desirable projects. There are always more projects than available revenues.
2.0 EXISTING PUBLIC ACCESS
3.0 Planned Public Access
Tacoma Shorelines
Potential Public Access Improvements Map

PUBLIC ACCESS LEGEND

- Boat Launch
  - Motorized
  - Non-Motorized
- Dock/Pier
- Non-Motorized Moorage
- Float Non-Motorized
- Temporary Natural Areas/Wildlife Park
- Picnic Area
- Saltwater Trail Access Point
- Seaplane
- Shoreline Promenade Trail
- View Point
- Water Taxi
- Existing Pedestrian Trail
- Proposed Pedestrian Trail
- Existing Bike Lane
- Proposed Bike Lane
- Public Access Alternative Plan Trails
- Section Area Boundaries

Potential Public Shoreline Access Points and Features

1. **Tacoma Narrows**
   1.1 West Slope Trail - Crystal Springs Creek Segment
   1.2 Blue Access Trail Point
   1.3 West Slope Trail - Titlow Park
   1.4 Public Boat Launch
   1.5 West Slope Trail - War Memorial Park Segment
   1.6 West Slope Trail - Gold Creek Gulch Segment

2. **Point Defiance Park**
   2.1 Point Defiance Trail System
   2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Service/Water Taxi
   2.3 Guest Moorage
   2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’

3. **Ruston Way**
   3.1 Peninsula Waterfront
   3.2 Point Ruston Waterwalk
   3.3 Mason Gulch Trail
   3.4 Transient Moorage
   3.5 Puget Gulch Trail
   3.6 Buckley Gulch Trail

4. **Schuster Corridor**
   4.1 Garfield Gulch Viewpoint
   4.2 Flyover
   4.3 Bayside Trail
   4.4 Schuster Parkway Trail
   4.5 Flyover to Beach and Pier
   4.6 Esplanade/Overwater Boardwalk

5. **Thea Foss Waterway**
   5.1 Complete Esplanade Segments
   5.2 Fireman’s Park Hillclimb
   5.3 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi
   5.4 11th Street Gateway - Murray Morgan Bridge
   5.5 Repair Esplanade Segments
   5.6 West Foss Central Park
   5.7 15th Street Gateway - Prairie Line Trail
   5.8 Waterway Park

6. **Pot Tidelands**
   6.1 Foss Peninsula Viewpoint
   6.2 Middle Waterway Habitat Observation
   6.3 Puyallup River Levee Trail
   6.4 Hylebos Creek Trail

7. **Northeast Tacoma and Marine View Drive**
   7.1 11th Street Blue Trail Access Point and Beach
   7.2 Scenic Drive
   7.3 View Platforms and Interpretive Elements
   7.4 NE Tacoma Trail Network

8. **Wapato Lake and Park**

---
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SECTION 1

TACOMA NARROWS

Introduction

The Tacoma Narrows is comprised of four shoreline districts, stretching from 19th Street at Narrows Marina to the community of Salmon Beach, adjacent to Pt. Defiance Park. Access to the water is limited along the Western Slope due to railroad right-of-way, which abuts the shoreline from Titlow Park north to Salmon Beach. There is also considerable overwater and upland residential development that impedes direct access to the shoreline.

Water-oriented recreation is provided at Narrows Marina, which has a public boat launch, and at Titlow Park, which provides public beach access for sunbathing, picnicking, launching kayaks and canoes, scuba diving and other water-oriented recreation. Tacoma Outboard Association leases an additional boat launch at Titlow Park for private use.

The planned public access along the Western Slope seeks to off-set the relative lack of direct shoreline access by establishing a connected shoreline trail from University Place in the south and connecting to the Pt. Defiance trail system. In most areas the trail will need to be developed along the bluffs overlooking the Tacoma Narrows. Trail amenities could include view platforms or view points, interpretive signage, and sheltered seating areas.

Gulches and slopes are prime areas for passive recreation such as hiking and nature studies. Their undeveloped status makes these areas desirable for acquisition as open space to provide greenbelts, protect the natural environment and act as buffers to urban development. While these areas are suitable for development of walking and hiking trails, care must be taken in the siting and design of trails to prevent potential hazardous conditions from occurring and to protect the natural environment.

Property within the west slope is both publicly and privately owned. The City, as part of its policy to preserve open space, has been acquiring property as funds are available and as willing property owners agree to sell. However, while much of the bluffs are in public ownership, further land acquisition or easements would be required to develop the West Slope trail system in its entirety.
1.1 West Slope Trail - Crystal Springs Creek Segment
1.2 Blue Access Trail Point
1.3 West Slope Trail - Titlow Park
1.4 Public Boat Launch
1.5 West Slope Trail - War Memorial Park Segment
1.6 West Slope Trail - Gold Creek Gulch Segment

SECTION 1: TACOMA NARROWS

Existing Pedestrian Trail (MoMaP)
Existing Bike Lane (MoMaP)
Proposed Pedestrian Trail (MoMaP)
Proposed Bike Lane (MoMaP)
Public Access Alternative Plan Trails
Section Area Boundaries
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1.1 West Slope Trail – Crystal Springs Creek Segment

From City’s southern boundary at Lemons Beach Road and West 27th Street north to Titlow Park at Sixth Avenue. Trail will use City of Tacoma property along Seashore Drive and will require use of Burlington Northern Railroad ROW.

1.2 Blue Trail Access Point

Develop a blue trail access point where beach grade is conducive for kayak and hand launch craft or incorporate a handcraft accessible float into marina design.
1.3 West Slope Trail - Titlow Park Segment

The trail will use the Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way and the Titlow Park trail system to the War Memorial trail near Hwy 16.

1.4 Public Boat Launch

If the Tacoma Outboard Association site transitions to other uses, seek opportunities to improve existing launch ramp for public use.

1.5 West Slope Trail - War Memorial Park Segment

The trail will require use of the Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way and traverse the steep slopes above. In addition, the trail will extend to a trailhead at War Memorial Park. In conjunction with trail development, provide viewing platforms or lookouts along the West Slope that will facilitate public views of the Tacoma Narrows.

1.6 West Slope Trail - Gold Creek Gulch Segment

This trail segment will extend from the boundaries of Point Defiance Park to the Tacoma-Lake Cushman Transmission Line south of Gold Creek Gulch. The proposed trail will form a loop by using a portion of the Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way and traversing the steep slopes above. In order to accomplish this, a public access easement or dedication for the purpose of trail right-of-way needs to be pursued with Burlington Northern. In addition, the corridor trail will follow Gold Creek through the gulch to a trailhead at Narrows Drive. In conjunction with trail development, provide viewing platforms or lookouts along the West Slope that will facilitate public views of the Tacoma Narrows.
Tacoma Shorelines
Potential Public Access Improvements Map

PUBLIC ACCESS LEGEND
- Picnic Area
- Saltwater Trail Access Point
- Seaplane
- Shoreline Promenade Trail
- Float Non-Motorized Moorage
- Moorage Temporary
- Natural Areas/Wildlife Park
- Water Taxi

Potential Public Shoreline Access Points and Features

1. Tacoma Narrows
   1.1 West Slope Trail - Crystal Springs Creek Segment
   1.2 Blue Access Trail Point
   1.3 West Slope Trail - Titlow Park
   1.4 Public Boat Launch
   1.5 West Slope Trail - War Memorial Park Segment
   1.6 West Slope Trail - Gold Creek Gulch Segment

2. Point Defiance Park
   2.1 Point Defiance Trail System
   2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Service/Water Taxi
   2.3 Guest Moorage
   2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’

3. Ruston Way
   3.1 Peninsula Park
   3.2 Point Ruston Waterwalk
   3.3 Mason Gulch Trail
   3.4 Transient Moorage
   3.5 Puget Gulch Trail
   3.6 Buckley Gulch Trail

4. Schuster Corridor
   4.1 Garfield Gulch Viewpoint
   4.2 Flyover
   4.3 Bayside Trail
   4.4 Schuster Parkway Trail
   4.5 Flyover to Beach and Pier
   4.6 Esplanade/Overwater Boardwalk

5. Thea Foss Waterway
   5.1 Complete Esplanade Segments
   5.2 Fireman’s Park Hillclimb
   5.3 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi
   5.4 11th Street Gateway - Murray Morgan Bridge
   5.5 Repair Esplanade Segments
   5.6 West Foss Central Park
   5.7 15th Street Gateway - Prairie Line Trail
   5.8 Waterway Park

6. Port Tidelands
   6.1 Foss Peninsula Viewpoint
   6.2 Middle Waterway Habitat Observation
   6.3 Puyallup River Levee Trail
   6.4 Hylebos Creek Trail

7. Northeast Tacoma and Marine View Drive
   7.1 11th Street Blue Trail Access Point and Beach
   7.2 Scenic Drive
   7.3 View Platforms and Interpretive Elements
   7.4 NE Tacoma Trail Network

8. Wapato Lake and Park
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SECTION 2

POINT DEFIANCE PARK

Introduction

Point Defiance Park is a 702 acre regional recreation and natural area located on the tip of a steep-cliffed peninsula. The park provides substantial public beach access along the northwest tip of Commencement Bay as well as a world class zoo, aquarium, flower gardens, picnic areas, and historic museums. Much of the park remains a virgin forest with numerous trails winding their way through the woods and along the high banks of the park. An historic waterfront promenade connects the Boathouse to Owen Beach. The promenade, a three-quarter mile, seawalled walk, was once equipped with a railing and benches. Near the center of the promenade lies the “Midway Ravine” area where a small creek exits from a culvert under Five Mile Drive. A switchback walkway leads up from the ravine to Five Mile Drive and the north end of the main picnic area.

The two shoreline districts that comprise Point Defiance Park provide approximately 4.5 miles of shoreline access, though a considerable portion of the shoreline is obstructed. Steep bluffs limit the access points to the public beach, and a combination of shoreline vegetation, marine currents, landslides and high tides makes traversing the Point itself tenuous. As a result, public use tends to be limited to the Owens Beach area and promenade connecting Owens beach to the Pt. Defiance boathouse. A drive and trail system atop the bluff provides some view opportunities which could be enhanced. The beach slope makes the area around Owen Beach suitable for kayak hand launch sites and other existing recreational boating opportunities are available at the Pt. Defiance boathouse and marina.

Residential, some commercial uses, the Town of Ruston and the Point Ruston mixed-use community, abut the park to the south. Portions of Salmon Beach, a historic overwater residential community abuts the park property to the west. Breakwater marina and the Tacoma Yacht Club occupy property leased from the Metro Parks Tacoma. In addition, the Washington State Department of Transportation operates a ferry to Vashon Island from the park.

Metro Parks has developed a master plan to guide the next 100 years of the Park’s life, use and improvement.
SECTION 2: POINT DEFIANCE PARK

2.1 Point Defiance Trail System

2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Service/Water Taxi

2.3 Guest Moorage

2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’
DESCRIPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS AND PROJECT DETAILS

2.1 Point Defiance Trail System

Public access to/within the park—the City will strive to coordinate/leverage resources with Metro Parks Tacoma

2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi

Develop a low impact terminal for water taxi or passenger only ferry access that could connect Point Defiance to other shoreline areas, including the Foss Waterway.

2.3 Guest Moorage

Provide additional capacity for guest moorage to serve the needs of recreational boaters.

2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’

The purpose of the ‘Missing Link’ is to connect the Point Ruston Water Walk to the main Gardens of Point Defiance Park. Phase I consists of physical surveying, conceptual and master planning regarding all aspects of the Missing Link. The Missing Link project area encompasses Peninsula Park (north) to 54th Street (south) and from Trolley Lane (west) into the western edge of Point Ruston.
SECTION 3

RUSTON WAY

Introduction

Tacoma’s earliest industrial district extended along the shoreline from the boundary of Point Defiance Park to today’s Thea Foss Waterway. At the turn of the century this shoreline was an unbroken linear industrial complex of sawmills, granaries, boat building and shipping firms. The deep waters provided a natural harbor that encouraged industrial development. At that time, the water’s edge skirted the base of the steep slopes. As industry developed, the shallower waters were filled in. More fill was added for the construction of the railroad and later for a city street (Ruston Way) until the area developed its present appearance. The process of erosion and irregular filling produced the existing meandering shoreline edge.

Space limitations, changing technology and competition with the newer Port Industrial area eventually forced the demise of most of the industrial and commercial operations along the Ruston Way shoreline.

Today the Ruston Way shoreline is one of Tacoma’s best known and most beloved waterfront recreation areas – boasting panoramic views, beaches, piers, and restaurants.

As the Point Ruston development proceeds, it is expected that trail connections will be established that will create a direct connection between Ruston Way and Point Defiance. Implementing the planned connection across the Point Ruston site is a high priority for developing an integrated system.

It is intended that an organized trail system will be developed in the slopes and gulches. Some paths are already present but are maintained on an irregular basis. Development of trails in Mason, Puget Creek and Garfield Gulches will enhance system capacity and provide further options for the public to get to the shoreline promenade. A developed trail system will also serve the hiking public, seeking a more natural walking experience. It is intended that the trails be developed in a manner that preserves the natural wooded setting of the hillsides as much as possible. Generally, the trails will follow the existing topography. Slope stability and public safety are primary concerns.
3.1 Peninsula Park

Construct a public park on Slag Peninsula that will take advantage of the unique viewing opportunities and provide a large gathering and recreation area for the public. The park could include an amphitheater to promote outdoor events.

3.2 Point Ruston WaterWalk

Construct a public promenade averaging 100’ in width, the length of the Point Ruston development site, connecting the Ruston Way promenade to the Peninsula Park and Point Defiance. The image below illustrates the proposed build-out of the Point Ruston WaterWalk.
3.3 Mason Gulch Trail

Trail or viewpoints providing visual and/or pedestrian access to portions of the gulch and from the gulch to the Ruston Way shoreline.

3.4 Guest Moorage

Provide additional capacity for guest moorage to serve the needs of recreational boaters.

3.5 Puget Gulch Trail

Provide pedestrian access to the gulch and from residential areas and Puget Park to Ruston Way.

3.6 Buckley Gulch Trail

Provide visual and/or pedestrian access to portions of the gulch and from the gulch to the Ruston Way shoreline.

3.9 Garfield Gulch Trail

Provide pedestrian access to the gulch and from residential area at the top of the slope to the Schuster Parkway

3.8 Old Town Dock

This project will include repairs to Old Town Dock and upgrades to the access ramp and transient moorage float. Funding for this project is finalized. Design work has begun and is complete through 90%.
3.7 Chinese Reconciliation Park

The Chinese Reconciliation Park is a planned 3.9 acre park that is located at the southern end of the 1.5-mile Ruston Way waterfront along Commencement Bay, and is in the proximity of the early Chinese settlement that was burned down during the tragic expulsion. The park design is a mixture of traditional Chinese scholar’s style gardens and beautiful natural waterfront setting. Construction of the park will proceed through IV Phases. Two phases are nearing completion.

The Site Plan
Phases / Funding Areas

- Entrance Gate & Sojourners’ Room Area
- Reconciliation Pavilion Area
- Multicultural Pavilion, Pond and Bay-viewing Terrace Area
- Classroom Area

3.9 Chinese Reconciliation Park: Visitors can get their feet wet along a restored gravel beach with gentle grade. Below: The Park Concept shows the planned build-out of the Chinese Reconciliation Park and its enhancement with cultural and educational facilities. Plan implementation will continue through multiple phases.
Potential Public Shoreline Access Points and Features

1  Tacoma Narrows
   1.1 West Slope Trail - Crystal Springs Creek Segment
   1.2 Blue Access Trail Point
   1.3 West Slope Trail - Titlow Park
   1.4 Public Boat Launch
   1.5 West Slope Trail - War Memorial Park Segment
   1.6 West Slope Trail - Gold Creek Gulch Segment

2  Point Defiance Park
   2.1 Point Defiance Trail System
   2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Service/Water Taxi
   2.3 Guest Moorage
   2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’

3  Ruston Way
   3.1 Peninsula Park
   3.2 Point Ruston Waterwalk
   3.3 Mason Gulch Trail
   3.4 Transient Moorage
   3.5 Puget Gulch Trail
   3.6 Buckley Gulch Trail

4  Schuster Corridor
   4.1 Garfield Gulch Viewpoint
   4.2 Flyover
   4.3 Bayside Trail
   4.4 Schuster Parkway Trail
   4.5 Flyover to Beach and Pier
   4.6 Esplanade/Overwater Boardwalk

5  Thea Foss Waterway
   5.1 Complete Esplanade Segments
   5.2 Fireman’s Park Hillclimb
   5.3 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi
   5.4 11th Street Gateway - Murray Morgan Bridge
   5.5 Repair Esplanade Segments
   5.6 West Foss Central Park
   5.7 15th Street Gateway - Prairie Line Trail
   5.8 Waterway Park

6  Port Tidelands
   6.1 Foss Peninsula Viewpoint
   6.2 Middle Waterway Habitat Observation
   6.3 Puyallup River Levee Trail
   6.4 Hylebos Creek Trail

7  Northeast Tacoma and Marine View Drive
   7.1 11th Street Blue Trail Access Point and Beach
   7.2 Scenic Drive
   7.3 View Platforms and Interpretive Elements
   7.4 NE Tacoma Trail Network

8  Wapato Lake and Park

Tacoma Shorelines Potential Public Access Improvements Map

PUBLIC ACCESS LEGEND
- Picnic Area
- Saltwater Trail Access Point
- Seaplane
- Shoreline Promenade Trail
- Float Non-Motorized Moorage Temporary
- Natural Areas/Wildlife Park
- Water Taxi

Existing Pedestrian Trail
Proposed Pedestrian Trail
Existing Bike Lane
Proposed Bike Lane
Public Access
Alternative Plan Trails
Section Area Boundaries
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SECTION 4

SCHUSTER CORRIDOR

Introduction

The Schuster Corridor is comprised of two shoreline districts, the S-7 Schuster Parkway Shoreline District and the S-6/7 Schuster Parkway Transition Shoreline District. This shoreline currently contains active industrial uses, including a lay-berth operation and grain terminal, and is bisected by the mainline BNSF railroad. This shoreline is bounded by dense urban neighborhoods and business districts, and boasts outstanding views, schools, and parks in close proximity to the waterfront. The in-water portion of this shoreline is a migratory route for juvenile salmon, a priority species.

Schuster Corridor sits between two shoreline districts to the north and south, Thea Foss Waterway and Ruston Way, that have undergone a transformation from their past industrial character into attractive urban waterfronts lined with parks, and interspersed with restaurants and other uses. It has been a long-term vision to connect these two urban waterfronts with a pedestrian walkway.

The configuration of Schuster Parkway, a multilane arterial providing primary access from the interstate to north end residential areas has no existing sidewalk on the water’s side. A sidewalk extends the length of the parkway on the landward side, but is not adequate as a multi-use trail facility.

Bayside Trails once offered some excellent views of Commencement Bay, Mount Rainier, and the Cascades. This formal trail system was built in 1975. Construction and design were funded by an Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation Grant (IAC). Bayside Trails are located within the slopes abutting Schuster Parkway and extend from the trailhead at South 5th Street and Stadium Way to Garfield Gulch. The trail system is approximately one and one-half miles long and is currently closed.

Public access design solutions for this corridor should seek to establish a primary waterfront walkway along the existing sidewalk that enhances mobility between the Thea Foss Waterway and Ruston Way. As the route is improved connections could be made to Downtown Tacoma, Stadium Way, Garfield Gulch, Old Town, and the waterfront to facilitate increased bicycle and pedestrian traffic throughout the Dome to Defiance shoreline area. Establishing a public access system through this shoreline area may require easements, property acquisition, and long term capital expenditures to upgrade infrastructure, including slope stability measures and pedestrian fly-overs to traverse the railroad.
DESCRIPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS AND PROJECT DETAILS

4.1 Schuster Parkway Promenade
Reconstruct or realign Schuster Parkway to accommodate a 14’ shared-use promenade, replacing the existing sidewalk. The promenade should be the primary access route through the Schuster Corridor.

4.2 Bayside Trail
Where feasible, improve and reconfigure the Bayside Trails to provide a natural trail that connects upland residential areas to the proposed Schuster Parkway promenade. Priority connections should be made between Stadium Way and Schuster Parkway to facilitate neighborhood access to the waterfront. The Bayside Trail also includes natural trails within Garfield Gulch which should be enhanced as a more park-like setting.

4.3 Water-oriented Boardwalk
When and where feasible, construct a 15’ boardwalk along the water’s edge or overwater where necessary. Implementation of this project will necessitate acquisition of properties or easements and access improvements from existing or other proposed pedestrian walkways.

4.4 Garfield Gulch Viewpoint
Improve and maintain a viewing area at the site of the historic lookout at the top of Garfield Gulch at the intersection of Garfield Gulch and the Schuster Slope.

4.2 Bayside Trail, above: An aerial view of the historic Bayside Trail.

4.4 Garfield Gulch Viewpoint: An example of the types of views available from the top of Garfield Gulch – overlooking Commencement Bay.

PUBLIC ACCESS ALTERNATIVES PLAN
City of Tacoma
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4.5 North Schuster Flyover

A flyover across Schuster Parkway and the railroad could provide a direct access point from the existing sidewalk or an improved trail into the Chinese Reconciliation Park. The project would require close cooperation with BNSF and Sperry Ocean Dock as well as easement agreements or direct property acquisition.

4.6 Beach Access Flyover and Pier

A flyover from Schuster Parkway across to this beach could provide a significant new public destination, especially if coupled with a new public pier aligned with the existing in-water pilings. The project would require easement agreements with BNSF for use of the property as well as significant safety improvements to prevent visitors from walking along or crossing the railroad tracks.

Preferred design concept for integrated access routes, combining elements of Bayside Trail, Schuster Parkway Promenade, and a water-oriented boardwalk. The blue line represents the Schuster Parkway Promenade: Phase 1 of an integrated approach. Other site elements could include “Port Watching” aspects, including educational and interpretive displays.
ANNUAL AMENDMENT APPLICATION #2013-05
Exhibit B -- Carried over from 2013
### Potential Public Shoreline Access Points and Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Tacoma Narrows | 1.1 West Slope Trail - Crystal Springs Creek Segment  
5.12 Old Town Dock  
3.8 Chinese Reconciliation Park |
| 2      | Point Defiance Park | 2.1 Point Defiance Trail System  
2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Service/Water Taxi  
2.3 Guest Moorage  
2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’ |
| 3      | Ruston Way | 3.1 Peninsula Park  
3.2 Point Ruston Waterwalk  
3.3 Mason Gulch Trail  
3.4 Transient Moorage  
3.5 Puget Gulch Trail  
3.6 Buckley Gulch Trail |
| 4      | Schuster Corridor | 4.1 Garfield Gulch Viewpoint  
4.2 Flyover  
4.3 Bayside Trail  
4.4 Schuster Parkway Trail  
4.5 Flyover to Beach and Pier  
4.6 Esplanade/Overwater Boardwalk |
| 5      | Thea Foss Waterway | 5.1 Complete Esplanade Segments  
5.2 Fireman's Park Hillclimb  
5.3 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi  
5.4 11th Street Gateway - Murray Morgan Bridge  
5.5 Repair Esplanade Segments  
5.6 West Foss Central Park  
5.7 15th Street Gateway - Prairie Line Trail  
5.8 Waterway Park  
5.9 East Foss Central Park  
5.10 Wheller-Osgood Pedestrian Bridge  
5.11 East Foss Esplanade  
5.12 11th Street ROW Boat Launch  
5.13 Seaplane Float  
6      | Port Tidelands | 6.1 Foss Peninsula Viewpoint  
6.2 Middle Waterway Habitat Observation  
6.3 Puyallup River Levee Trail  
6.4 Hylebos Creek Trail |
| 7      | Northeast Tacoma and Marine View Drive | 7.1 11th Street Blue Trail Access Point and Beach  
7.2 Scenic Drive  
7.3 View Platforms and Interpretive Elements  
7.4 NE Tacoma Trail Network |
| 8      | Wapato Lake and Park | |
SECTION 5

THEA FOSS WATERWAY

Introduction

In 1974, the City of Tacoma adopted the City Waterway Policy Plan (the City Waterway is now known as the Thea Foss Waterway) that provided the foundation for activities to transform the former shipping terminal and industrial waterfront into an urban waterfront with a mix of public and private uses emphasizing public access and enjoyment. The 1974 Plan was the first of many studies and plans to follow which were developed by both the City and civic organizations interested in the redevelopment of the blighted and abandoned waterfront. These plans envisioned redevelopment with uses that included marinas, restaurants, public spaces, residential hotel/motel and pedestrian uses and event spaces.

The City Waterway Policy Plan was later replaced by the Thea Foss Waterway Design and Development Plan (The Foss Plan,) adopted in 1992, which provided policy and design guidelines for all new public and private development in and surrounding both sides of the Thea Foss Waterway.

The vision for the Thea Foss Waterway is as a mixed use community, attuned to the intrinsic qualities of its water setting and inseparable from the city around it. The Foss Waterway redevelopment strategy strives to attain the “ABC’s” of waterfront development: Access, Boating and Character.

A Downtown Waterfront, unified through common design and character and linked by a continuous waterfront walkway is a central element of the City’s overall public access system. This Section of the PAAL describes the public access vision for the Waterway. The design vision is incorporated into the Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines.

The public access projects identified in the PAAL support the ABC’s of waterfront development. The access priorities for the Foss Waterway will primarily be undertaken on public properties, but may also be implemented on private properties as redevelopment occurs.
Projects on the west side of the Foss Waterway emphasize completion of the public esplanade and boardwalk with improved linkages to and from Downtown. Additional open space is sought along the central waterfront area.

Projects on the east side of the Foss Waterway Park emphasize boating and recreational activity. Park development is planned at the south end of the Waterway and the 11th Street right-of-way could be utilized as a public boat launch. Where feasible, and consistent with public safety and private security requirements, a waterfront walkway should be implemented to link uses and public access together to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle access. Improvements to East D Street should be implemented wherever access cannot be provided along the shoreline. Completion of the public esplanade will create a waterfront loop across the Murray Morgan Bridge and linking the Dome District to Downtown.

The ABC’s of waterfront development: Public esplanade, marinas, and maritime character, linking together restaurants, offices, and retail.

Above: Thea’s Park provides multiple public access amenities: Public artwork; views of TEMCO and the container ships coming into the Port of Tacoma; a public beach where visitors can get their feet wet; and a walking trail connecting to the public esplanade.

Above: The Center for Urban Waters represents the environmental vision of the Foss Waterway, combining state of the art laboratory spaces with public access, habitat, and a LEED Platinum certification.
The Shoreline Master Program policies highlight the industrial and maritime history of the Waterway. This history can be commemorated through site design and through architectural or artistic elements of public access. Specific waterfront locations or walkway segments could be designated as part of a maritime “Heritage Trail” that provides educational, artistic and cultural learning opportunities for the public.

Connectivity between the Thea Foss Waterway esplanade and surrounding districts is key to the success of the system. The Foss Waterway is located within Downtown Tacoma and within walking distance of the University of Washington, Tacoma, the Dome District, the Brewery District and the International Financial Services Area. However, access to the Foss Waterway is impeded by the BNSF line and I-705. The recent completion of the D Street overpass improves the Waterway’s connection to the Dome District and the planned Prairie Line Trail would improve access by developing a direct trail connection from the University of Washington Tacoma campus to the 15th Street entry to the Foss Waterway. Improved linkages to the surrounding districts should be sought when feasible.
SECTION 5: THEA FOSS WATERWAY

5.1 Complete Esplanade Segments
5.2 Fireman's Park Hill Climb
5.3 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi
5.4 11th Street Gateway - Murray Morgan Bridge
5.5 Repair Esplanade Segments
5.6 West Foss Central Park
5.7 15th Street Gateway - Prairie Line Trail
5.8 Waterway Park
5.9 East Foss Central Park
5.10 Wheeler-Osgood Pedestrian Bridge
5.11 East Foss Esplanade
5.12 11th Street ROW Boat Launch
5.13 Seaplane Float

Existing Pedestrian Trail (MoMaP)
Proposed Pedestrian Trail (MoMaP)
Existing Bike Lane (MoMaP)
Proposed Bike Lane (MoMaP)
Public Access Alternative Plan Trails
Section Area Boundaries
DESCRIPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS AND PROJECT DETAILS

WEST FOSS

5.1 Complete Esplanade Segments
Construct public esplanade that will serve pedestrians, roller skaters, bicyclists and provide lighting, street furniture, landscaping and supporting utilities.

5.2 Fireman’s Park Hill Climb
Construct an overpass or funicular railway from Fireman’s Park to Dock Street on the Foss Waterway.

5.3 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi
Improve the Municipal Dock site to accommodate the necessary infrastructure for a passenger-only-ferry that could serve both local water taxi and regional POF service.

5.4 11th Street Gateway – Murray Morgan Bridge
This project will improve way-finding and install design details to create a gateway from 11th street to the Foss Waterway, including improvements to the Murray Morgan Bridge.

5.5 Repair Esplanade Segments
Repair and replace deteriorated public esplanade to serve pedestrians, roller skaters, bicyclists and provide lighting, street furniture, landscaping and supporting utilities.

5.6 West Foss Central Park
Acquire and develop a 1 acre park and recreation area for large events on the central Foss Waterway.

5.7 15th Street Gateway – Prairie Line Trail
This project will design and construct a Class 1 trail along the BNSF railroad track through downtown Tacoma. The new trail segment will connect the Foss Waterway to the Water Ditch Trail project along South Tacoma Way.
EAST FOSS

5.8 Waterway Park

Develop a park and recreation area at the 3.7 acre Berg Scaffolding site.

5.9 East Foss Central Park

Seek acquisition of BNSF property at the mouth of the Wheeler-Osgood for development of a nature park and preserved open space.

5.10 Wheeler-Osgood Pedestrian Bridge

Explore opportunities to develop a pedestrian and bicycle bridge across the Wheeler-Osgood that would connect future walkway improvements and create a more direct route across the waterway and a scenic viewpoint.

5.11 East Foss Esplanade

Establish a 15’ shared use walkway adjacent to the waterway, connecting the north and south ends of the Foss Waterway. The walkway will connect the Wheeler-Osgood Waterway to the Murray Morgan Bridge.

5.12 11th Street ROW Boat Launch

Improve existing public right-of-way on either side of the Murray Morgan Bridge for public recreation and to accommodate a recreational and/or commercial boat launch.

5.13 Seaplane Float

Construct a moorage float designed to accommodate sea planes, to support diverse forms of transportation and recreation.
SECTION 6

PORT TIDEFLATS

Introduction

The Port Industrial shoreline is predominantly developed with heavy industrial and Port/Terminal related facilities. As a result there is very limited opportunity for the public to reach and touch the water in this area. Safety and security concerns require sensitivity in locating access in this shoreline. The Port of Tacoma office on Sitcum Waterway is an example of the type of access that is appropriate - providing a viewing platform from which the public can observe the day to day operations of the Port from a safe distance.

There is also considerable cleanup and restoration activity that has been undertaken in this shoreline area which could accommodate limited access, including natural trails, kayak hand launch sites, or separated habitat viewing platforms. For example, the Port of Tacoma has developed a viewing area at the Rhone Poulenc habitat mitigation site on the Blair Waterway that provides the public with an opportunity to observe one of many habitat restoration projects located in the Port Industrial shoreline area. Access would need to be designed sensitively to prevent damage or harm to natural areas and mitigation sites.

Access is planned in areas that will not interfere with port operations or cause public safety concerns. Where possible, trails are planned that would link recreation and transportation systems, but these are generally located on the periphery of port/industrial operations and along existing publicly owned lands and right-of-ways.
SECTION 6: PORT TIDELANDS

6.1 Foss Peninsula Viewpoint
6.2 Middle Waterway Habitat Observation
6.3 Puyallup River Levee Trail
6.4 Hylebos Creek Trail

Blair Waterway
Hylebos Waterway
Sitcum Waterway
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SECTION 6: PORT TIDEFLATS

DESCRIPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS AND PROJECT DETAILS

6.1 Foss Peninsula View Area and Beach Access

Provide viewpoint on City of Tacoma property at the head of the Foss Peninsula, as well as public amenities, including seating, waste bins, and signage.

6.2 Middle Waterway Habitat Observation Point

Construct a habitat viewing platform with associated educational signage and seating area. Site could be located at head of Middle Waterway on publicly owned properties near the Fire Station or along Middle Waterway Road.

6.3 Puyallup River Levee Trail

Construct 2.5 mile trail along the Puyallup River levee, from the City limits with Fife to 11th Street.

6.4 Hylebos Creek Trail

Construct a low impact natural trail, including educational and way-finding signage, to provide opportunities to learn about habitat and wildlife along the creek and to connect recently completed habitat observation area with the BPA Trail in Fife.
Potential Public Shoreline Access Points and Features

1. **Tacoma Narrows**
   - 1.1 West Slope Trail - Crystal Springs Creek Segment
   - 1.2 Blue Access Trail Point
   - 1.3 West Slope Trail - Titlow Park
   - 1.4 Public Boat Launch
   - 1.5 West Slope Trail - War Memorial Park Segment
   - 1.6 West Slope Trail - Gold Creek Gulch Segment

2. **Point Defiance Park**
   - 2.1 Point Defiance Trail System
   - 2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Service/Water Taxi
   - 2.3 Guest Moorage
   - 2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’

3. **Ruston Way**
   - 3.1 Peninsula Park
   - 3.2 Point Ruston Waterwalk
   - 3.3 Mason Gulch Trail
   - 3.4 Transient Moorage
   - 3.5 Puget Gulch Trail
   - 3.6 Buckley Gulch Trail

4. **Schuster Corridor**
   - 4.1 Garfield Gulch Viewpoint
   - 4.2 Flyover
   - 4.3 Bayside Trail
   - 4.4 Schuster Parkway Trail
   - 4.5 Flyover to Beach and Pier
   - 4.6 Esplanade/Overwater Boardwalk

5. **Thea Foss Waterway**
   - 5.1 Complete Esplanade Segments
   - 5.2 Fireman’s Park Hillclimb
   - 5.3 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi
   - 5.4 11th Street Gateway - Murray Morgan Bridge
   - 5.5 Repair Esplanade Segments
   - 5.6 West Foss Central Park
   - 5.7 15th Street Gateway - Prairie Line Trail
   - 5.8 Waterway Park

6. **Port Tidelands**
   - 6.1 Foss Peninsula Viewpoint
   - 6.2 Middle Waterway Habitat Observation
   - 6.3 Puyallup River Levee Trail
   - 6.4 Hylebos Creek Trail

7. **Northeast Tacoma and Marine View Drive**
   - 7.1 11th Street Blue Trail Access Point and Beach
   - 7.2 Scenic Drive
   - 7.3 View Platforms and Interpretive Elements
   - 7.4 NE Tacoma Trail Network

8. **Wapato Lake and Park**

**PUBLIC ACCESS LEGEND**
- Existing Pedestrian Trail
- Proposed Pedestrian Trail
- Existing Bike Lane
- Proposed Bike Lane
- Public Access
- Alternative Plan Trails
- Section Area Boundaries

**MAP LEGEND**
- Picnic Area
- Saltwater Trail Access Point
- Seaplane
- Shoreline Promenade Trail
- Float Non-Motorized
- Moorage Temporary
- Natural Areas/Wildlife Park
- Water Taxi
SECTION 7

NORTHEAST TACOMA AND MARINE VIEW DRIVE

Introduction

The Marine View Drive shoreline is currently characterized by a combination of water-oriented recreation uses, overwater residences, and relatively unmodified shoreline. There are large areas of public ownership (City of Tacoma and Port of Tacoma) both along the shoreline and the bluffs, but additional acquisition or easements would be necessary to establish a cohesive trail system. The Puyallup Tribe also owns considerable property along the shoreline.

Additional impediments to public access include the relatively constrained land supply along the shoreline as well as the potential for restoration activity. As this shoreline contains large areas of shoreline without structural stabilization (bulkheads), habitat preservation and restoration is a priority.

New shoreline public access should be designed and located with sensitivity for the shoreline environment and the existing and potential mitigation sites. As a result, planned access in this area is generally located away from the shoreline, through a trail system that will traverse the bluffs overlooking Commencement Bay. However, there are several opportunities to provide beach access for the public that would facilitate non-motorized recreational boating or beachcombing. These sites should be designed to facilitate access while protecting the ecological functions of the shoreline. In addition, this shoreline area provides unique viewing opportunities looking back across Commencement Bay on Downtown Tacoma and Port of Tacoma tide flats.
SECTION 7: NORTHEAST TACOMA AND MARINE VIEW DRIVE

Existing Pedestrian Trail (MoMaP)
Proposed Pedestrian Trail (MoMaP)
Existing Bike Lane (MoMaP)
Proposed Bike Lane (MoMaP)
Public Access Alternative Plan Trails
Section Area Boundaries
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DESCRIPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS AND PROJECT DETAILS

7.1 11th Street Blue Trail Access Point and Beach

Provide signage and access for a nonmotorized boat launch and picnic area.

7.2 Scenic Drive

Improve a series of turnouts and scenic viewpoints for automobiles along Marine View Drive. Provide signage and public amenities.

7.3 View Platforms and Interpretive Elements

In conjunction or in advance of trail development, provide view platforms along the top of the bluff and along the shoreline where possible to facilitate public views of the water. Provide way-finding and educational signage where appropriate.

7.4 NE Tacoma Trail Network

Construct 6 mile trail along the slope top of Marine View Dr. from Slayden Rd. to Norpoint Way, with an extension from Browns Pt. Blvd. to Northshore Parkway and a connector between Crescent Heights and Alderwood Parks.

Dick Gilmur Kayak Launch: A recent public recreation facility developed by the Port of Tacoma along Marine View Drive. This site could be expanded to enhance public beach access.
Tacoma Shorelines Potential Public Access Improvements Map

PUBLIC ACCESS LEGEND
- Boat Launch Motorized
- Boat Launch Non-Motorized
- Dock/Pier
- Float Non-Motorized
- Moorage Temporary
- Natural Areas/Wildlife Park
- Picnic Area
- Saltwater Trail Access Point
- Seaplane
- Shoreline Promenade Trail
- View Point
- Water Taxi

Potential Public Shoreline Access Points and Features

1 Tacoma Narrows
   1.1 West Slope Trail - Crystal Springs Creek Segment
   1.2 Blue Access Trail Point
   1.3 West Slope Trail - Titlow Park
   1.4 Public Boat Launch
   1.5 West Slope Trail - War Memorial Park Segment
   1.6 West Slope Trail - Gold Creek Gulch Segment

2 Point Defiance Park
   2.1 Point Defiance Trail System
   2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Service/Water Taxi
   2.3 Guest Moorage
   2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’

3 Ruston Way
   3.1 Peninsula Park
   3.2 Point Ruston Waterwalk
   3.3 Mason Gulch Trail
   3.4 Transient Moorage
   3.5 Puget Gulch Trail
   3.6 Buckley Gulch Trail

4 Schuster Corridor
   4.1 Garfield Gulch Viewpoint
   4.2 Flyover
   4.3 Bayside Trail
   4.4 Schuster Parkway Trail
   4.5 Flyover to Beach and Pier
   4.6 Esplanade/Overwater Boardwalk

5 Thea Foss Waterway
   5.1 Complete Esplanade Segments
   5.2 Fireman's Park Hillclimb
   5.3 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi
   5.4 11th Street Gateway - Murray Morgan Bridge
   5.5 Repair Esplanade Segments
   5.6 West Foss Central Park
   5.7 15th Street Gateway - Prairie Line Trail
   5.8 Waterway Park

6 Port Tidelands
   6.1 Foss Peninsula Viewpoint
   6.2 Middle Waterway Habitat Observation
   6.3 Puyallup River Levee Trail
   6.4 Hylebos Creek Trail

7 Northeast Tacoma and Marine View Drive
   7.1 11th Street Blue Trail Access Point and Beach
   7.2 Scenic Drive
   7.3 View Platforms and Interpretive Elements
   7.4 NE Tacoma Trail Network

8 Wapato Lake and Park
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SECTION 8

WAPATO LAKE AND PARK

Introduction

The Wapato Lake shoreline is situated within a single family residential area and adjacent to a commercial area in south Tacoma. The lake shoreline is approximately 1 mile long but there are additional wetlands associated with the Lake - the Park itself encompasses 88 acres in and around the lake. Wapato Park is a family oriented, resort style park reminiscent of its founding in the late 1800’s. A Parks Improvement Bond Measure was approved in 2005 to fund infrastructure and water quality improvements. The Metro Parks Master Plan is proceeding through several phases:

- Bathhouse Reconstruction (completed)
- Demolition of Existing Residences - (completed)
- Phase 1a: Lake Water Quality Treatment
- Phase 1b: Initial Lakeshore Development
- Phase 2: Park Capital Improvements

Planned public access projects include new and upgraded trails and viewpoints, picnic shelters, and paddle boat dock.

Wapato Park is one of Tacoma’s signature parks and will continue to be a focal point, of not only the South Tacoma Neighborhood but also the surrounding region as a vital urban park and green space. Developed over the years as a family oriented “resort” style park, Wapato Park will continue to be a destination for those seeking a high quality leisure experience in a close to home natural setting.

The Master Plan provides a long-range view for uses and activities that might best occur at Wapato Park. The following proposals take into consideration the historical context of the site, the diversity of uses from the past and present, and the relationship of the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

The Master Plan carefully balances the historic qualities of the park with the current and future needs of the community with a central goal of serving as a guide for future development and improvements to the park.
8.1 Wapato Park Improvements

Coordinate with Metro Parks Tacoma and the City of Tacoma Environmental Services Department to undertake water quality improvement measures such that direct water access, including public swimming, is possible. Continue to support capital improvements that enhance park amenities and recreation.
4.0 PRIORITIES FOR PROVIDING NEW SHORELINE PUBLIC ACCESS

Priorities for providing new shoreline public access in Tacoma are derived from existing goals and policies. Common themes from the Comprehensive Plan and Metro Parks Strategic Plan are emphasized, including:

- Connecting existing public lands and facilities to and along the shoreline;
- Balancing shoreline restoration and public access;
- Improving views;
- Meeting demonstrated demand for new shoreline access and providing a variety of water-oriented types of access; and
- Maximizing public access funds.

Public access prioritization criteria below are organized according to the five themes; they are not listed in order of importance. Implementation criteria from the 2006 Metro Parks Strategic Plan were used as the basis for this guidance.

5.1 Connecting existing public lands and facilities to and along the shoreline

- Does the project facilitate additional access to existing parks?
- Is the project appropriately located and accessible to residents?
- Does the project promote an interconnected system of parks, greenspaces, trails, and community facilities?
- Does the project improve access to Tacoma’s valued water resources?
- Is public transportation available?
- Is the project connected to pedestrian and non-motorized transportation?
- Does the project help facilitate the completion of the ‘Dome to Defiance’ trail system?

5.2 Balancing shoreline restoration and public access

- Would the project inhibit a moderate or high priority restoration action?
- Would the project incorporate shoreline protection or restoration elements?
- Does the project include a management plan to protect or restore shoreline resources?
5.3 Improving views

- Does the project provide a new view point of the shoreline?
- Would the project enhance an existing view point or view corridor?

5.4 Meet demonstrated demand for new shoreline access and providing a variety of water-oriented types of access

- Is the project consistent with identified shoreline use demands?
- Is the project accessible to diverse community members, including diverse cultures, ages, abilities, income levels, and individuals and families?
- Would the project provide recreation opportunities that would bring residents, businesses, and tourists to the City?
- Would the project increase the diversity of public access opportunities in the given shoreline district or shoreline reach?

Maximizing public access funds

- Is the site already in public ownership and underutilized (such as a public street end)?
- Does the project include improvements to an existing park or facility such that its lifecycle is extended or its recreation value is increased?
- Does the project add recreational or educational value to other projects underway or planned?
- Does the project expand fiscal resources by leveraging other funding resources? Would funding this project attract additional funds, such as matching grant funds or special donations?
- Are funds identified for the maintenance and operations of the park or facility?
- Does the project provide opportunities for community sponsorship, education and/or volunteerism?
5.0 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

This section discusses strategies for implementing the priority projects identified in the City of Tacoma Shoreline Public Access Alternatives Plan (PAAL), an implementation timeline, and performance measures.

Implementing the projects identified in this Plan will require a broad base of community support, cooperation between public and private property owners, financial assistance from federal, state and local sources and City staff resources. Several factors will affect development of these projects and the full build-out of the public access system, such as funding availability, property acquisition, timing and sequencing of projects, permit activity, and public commitment.

Substantial capital expenditures will be required to accomplish and complete the overall system. Additional acquisitions or development which may be desirable or necessary for public benefit will increase these expenditures. All improvements identified in this plan will not occur simultaneously, but rather, strategically, depending upon funding sources and availability, environmental conditions, permitting, and community support.

It is also important to note that the Metropolitan Park District is the primary provider of public recreation and open space facilities. The District owns, operates and maintains parks, playgrounds, playfields, and other recreation facilities within the City limits. The City of Tacoma is responsible for serving the overall needs of the community, which includes public access and waterfront recreation. Therefore, close cooperation between the City and Metro Parks is essential to the implementation of this Plan.

The Shoreline Public Access Alternatives Plan (PAAL), including the guiding polices and proposed access projects, will be implemented through four primary methods. These are: 1) public funds and grants; 2) shoreline permit requirements; and 3) public access fund contributions; and 4) Public Agency Master Planning. The following section describes each of these implementation methods.

5.1 Public Funds and Grants

Funding the Shoreline Public Access Alternatives Plan will likely require funding from multiple sources. Some elements of the Shoreline Public Access Alternatives Plan may compete very well for some funding sources, but not be competitive, or eligible, for other funding sources. Also, some funding sources can be used for both capital improvement and maintenance needs while others are restricted for capital projects only. Generally, the PAAL will be implemented via existing park and recreation programs. The following is a brief description of potential funding sources.
5.1.1 General Fund – Available for both capital improvement and maintenance

Typically the General Fund has been used to fund operational expenses such as maintenance. The City’s operational expenses for enhancement programs, such as the non-motorized plan, urban forestry, and traffic calming are funded from the General Fund. However, the General Fund could also be used as a source of funding for public access projects if desired by the City Council.

5.1.2 Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) – Available for capital improvement

Real Estate Excise Tax has been used to help fund a limited number of transportation and recreation projects in Tacoma, such as some of the Foss Waterway development projects and repairs on both the Puyallup and Lincoln Avenue Bridges.

5.1.3 Grants – Available for capital improvement

There are a variety of grant funds which could be used for elements of shoreline public access projects. The City has been successful in the past securing grant funding for trails, including the Foss Waterway esplanade, boating facilities, park acquisition and development, and other transportation projects. Funding has been secured in the past from PSRC, Conservation Futures, WSDOT, RCO, and Congressional earmarks.

Typically the various grant programs target particular access elements, which requires partial funding from a number of these sources to assemble full funding for a public access project.

5.1.4 Bond issue – Available for capital improvement

The City has utilized internal bonding capacity, as well as voter approved bonds, for public improvements. Build Tacoma Together is a good example of the use of voter approved bonds for major capital improvements. A similar bond issue could be used to fund, or partially fund, public access to the shoreline.

5.1.5 Metro Parks bond issue – Available for capital improvement

Many of the City of Tacoma shoreline parks and recreation facilities are owned or maintained by Metro Parks Tacoma. Metro Parks maintains a 6-year comprehensive capital projects list to implement recommendations in the Metro Parks Strategic Plan; this capital program includes public access projects located along the shoreline. Most funding resources for these projects are limited in scope and can only be used to fund specific types of projects or improvements. Metro Parks continues to investigate all available funding options, including maintaining and expanding general fund support, aggressively seeking grants,
partnerships and donations, and being prepared to act as opportunities arise.

5.1.6 Gas Tax

Revenue generated from the gas tax is distributed to counties, cities and state accounts. The state receives about half of the total revenues collected. These are the funds which support the WSDOT highway programs as well as the Washington State Ferry System, which is deemed a state highway system by constitution. Highway construction, maintenance, preservation, administration and debt service on highway construction bonds are all funded by these revenues.

The other half of the fuel tax revenues are distributed directly to cities, counties and other agencies for roadway programs that are not part of the state highway system.

The City of Tacoma receives a proportionate share of the State Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (Gas Tax), based on population. The amount varies depending on the amount of fuel consumed. In 2005, the State Legislature approved a gas tax increase to replace the City’s transportation revenues lost as a result of Initiative 776.

Projected future gas tax revenues for Tacoma are estimated at $2.7 million for years 2008 through 2014.

5.1.7 Open Space Fund

The City Open Space Fund is utilized for the acquisition, restoration and management of open space lands and facilities. The fund is primarily generated from the sale of vacated City rights-of-way, as directed by Ordinance 20606 adopted in 1975. The Open Space Fund is utilized principally for habitat-related purposes. Property acquired vis-à-vis the Open Space Fund may also provide a low impact public access function.

5.1.8 Impact Fee – Parks

The Growth Management Act (“GMA”) provides a mechanism for local governments to impose impact fees on all new development to defray a portion of the costs arising from “new growth and development” for certain types of system improvements. Case law indicates that the nexus and rough proportionality requirements do not apply if local governments use this type of mechanism to collect incremental impact fees (as opposed to requiring dedications of land or easements). However, the statutory authorization for these fee programs imposes several limitations that are similarly designed to match required contributions with project impacts.

If the City decided to pursue this option, it would need to follow the process outlined in the GMA impact fee statutes to make sure that any fee imposed satisfies the statutory limitations and protections.

Because this type of fee program would have to be based on a determination that new development imposes new demands for public shoreline access, and because it would likely be difficult to distinguish the public
shoreline access generated by new shoreline development as distinguished from new non-shoreline development, it is likely that any such shoreline access impact fee program would have to be applied to new development throughout the City and not just to new shoreline development.

5.2 Permit Requirements

The Shoreline Public Access Alternatives Plan (PAAL) will also be implemented on a project-by-project basis through standard shoreline permit requirements. The TSMP requires public access for the following types of projects, when a shoreline permit is required:

1. Public projects;

2. Water-enjoyment and non-water-oriented uses and development;

3. Private water-dependent and water-related use or development when one of the following conditions exists:
   
   a. The project increases demand for public access;
   
   b. The project impacts or interferes with existing access by blocking access or discouraging use of existing access;
   
   c. The project impacts or interferes with public use of waters subject to the Public Trust Doctrine.

The type, amount and location of public access is determined on a case-by-case basis during review of shoreline permit applications (including land division). The public access requirement for any proposed shoreline development or use is determined by the Director based on a review of the specific proposal. The Director reviews the proposed uses and developments and makes specific findings demonstrating the essential nexus between the use or development and the permit conditions requiring public access. The findings will also include a determination that the permit conditions requiring public access are roughly proportional to the impacts caused by the proposed use or development. The public access requirement may be satisfied through the preservation of shoreline views, the establishment of public access easements to and along the shoreline, enhancement of an adjacent street-end or park or other consideration commensurate with the degree of impact caused by the development.

Typically, the preference is to have public access provided on-site. For development that occurs in areas with planned shoreline trail segments, the on-site preference contributes towards the completion of these systems. However, under certain circumstances, the Administrator may approve alternatives to on-site, physical access to the shoreline under the following circumstances. For example, new water-oriented uses and development occurring within the S-10 Port Industrial Area, or that are covered under a Public Agency’s adopted public access plan, are not subject to on-site public access preferences. The S-10 Shoreline District is not a preferred location for most
types of public access. Therefore, the off-site flexibility in meeting permit requirements allows permit applicants to provide access in a way that is consistent with public safety, Homeland Security requirements, and the planned access system.

The map on the following page depicts these preferences based upon the Shoreline District. The “On-Site” preferences correspond to areas with a planned trail system either along the shoreline or immediately adjacent, for example the trail may have to be located within or on top of a bluff along the Tacoma Narrows or Northeast Tacoma. Areas identified as having an “Off-Site” preference are typically areas where land has been given priority for water-oriented industrial uses.
Public Access Implementation Preferences for New Use and Development Within the Shoreline

TACOMA, WASHINGTON

Legend
- Shoreline Districts
- Public Access Preferences
  - Off-Site
  - On-Site
  - Roads
  - Streams
  - Parks/Public Open Space

Shoreline Districts
- S1a, Western Slope South, High Intensity
- S1b, Western Slope South, Shoreline Residential
- S2, Western Slope Central, Urban Conservancy
- S3, Western Slope North, Natural
- S4, Point Defiance Park, Natural
- S5, Point Defiance Park, Urban Conservancy
- S6, Ruston Way, Urban Conservancy
- S7, Schuster Parkway Transition, Urban Conservancy
- S8, Schuster Parkway, High Intensity
- S9, Thea Foss Waterway, Downtown Waterfront
- S10, Puyallup River, Urban Conservancy
- S11, Port Industrial, High Intensity
- S12, Hylebos Creek, Natural
- S13, Waters of the State, Aquatic
- S14, Wapato Lake, Urban Conservancy
- S15, Point Ruston/Slag Peninsula, High Intensity

Map data are the property of the sources listed below. Inaccuracies may exist, and ESA implies no warranties or guarantees regarding any aspect of data depiction.

SOURCE: City of Tacoma GIS, 2009; King County, 2005-2008.
5.3 Contributions to a Public Access Fund

Allowing contributions to a public access fund in-lieu of developing public access onsite is an innovative strategy for more effectively implementing public access objectives in a way that provides certainty for the development community while directing new access to areas that support the community’s vision for its shorelines.

The standard approach to public access is to require access on-site through the permit process, when supported by a demonstrated nexus, which often results in small public improvements (small view areas, benches, picnic sites) and/or isolated improvements in the midst of large scale port/industrial projects. Applying the standard permitting approach in these circumstances can result in suboptimal outcomes for both the property owner and the public. Conversely, where public access is most desirable, there is often little reasonably foreseeable development. Therefore, relying strictly on standard permit requirements could result in access that does not align with the community’s goals and vision in location or activity type. The following is a visual depiction of how this disconnect occurs.

The fee-in-lieu strategy prevents this cycle by directly aligning new development with the community’s desire for public access by creating a mechanism whereby new development activity can contribute directly to the community’s priorities. The use of a fee-in-lieu allows developers and property owners to contribute to a public access fund, in lieu of providing access on-site, that is managed by the City for the purposes of providing access where is it of the greatest benefit and in support of public demand.
Shoreline Permit Application

PUBLIC or PRIVATE

Public Access is required

Agency specific public access plan

Are there impacts to existing public access? or
Does project proposal create additional demand for public access? or
Does project include water-enjoyment or non-water-oriented uses?

YES

Public Access is required

No Public Access is required

Onsite Public Access

Are there security or safety constraints? or
Are there unavoidable environmental impacts? or
Is it incompatible with adjacent use/structures? or
Is the proposal in S-10?

NO

Onsite access is required

YES

Offsite mitigation options available

Determine how much access or contribution is required

- Shoreline district preferences
- Proportionality review
5.4 Public Access Master Plan – Limited to public agencies

The Washington Administrative Code provides additional flexibility for public agencies to plan for and incorporate public access and recreation as part of an agency master plan.

WAC 173-26-221(4)(c) states that “Where a port district or other public entity has incorporated public access planning into its master plan through an open public process, that plan may serve as a portion of the local government’s public access planning, provided it meets the provisions of this chapter.”

Public agencies’ public access plans should be consistent with both the policies and regulations of the Shoreline Master Program and the goals, objectives, and opportunities identified in the Public Access Alternatives Plan. Depending on the intended use of the plan and the level of detail, different mechanisms may be appropriate in different circumstances for adopting the master plan. The following are two options, but not the exclusive options, for adopting a public agencies public access plan:

1. Shoreline Amendment: A public agency can apply to the City of Tacoma seeking to amend the Shoreline Master Program and Public Access Alternatives Plan to incorporate said agencies public access master plan, either in its entirety or via reference. This option shall be processed according to the requirements outlined in the Shoreline Master Program, Chapter 1.5.

2. Inter-local Agreement: Consistent with RCW 39.34, a public agency could enter into an inter-local agreement with the City of Tacoma to adopt a public access master plan. Unlike a shoreline amendment, the inter-local agreement process does not require Department of Ecology approval. In addition to the joint powers identified in RCW 39.34.030, the agreement should identify anticipated levels of future use and development of the shoreline including the scope, scale, location and intensity of use and development, potential impacts to existing and proposed public access, proposed public access and recreation projects that are commensurate with the anticipated use and development of the shoreline under the duration of the agreement, procedural requirements for monitoring and reporting, and a review and finding by City staff that the proposed agreement is consistent with the City of Tacoma Shoreline Master Program and TMC 13.10.
6.0 MEASURING PERFORMANCE

To gain an understanding of its effectiveness, the PAAL calls for ongoing monitoring and reporting of progress towards goals, in coordination with the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Plan. This practice will provide information to be used to refine the plan and improve results. In addition, monitoring will increase the accountability of the City and its partner agencies and help build public understanding of issues, goals and challenges.

Data used to measure success is organized according to these goals. In general, the types of data to be used include public participation in or use of shoreline recreational resources, revenue/costs, facility and property type and condition, customer satisfaction and staff assessment. Measuring the City’s performance in implementing the PAAL will be coordinated with the Metro Parks Open Space Habitat and Recreation survey and monitoring efforts.

6.1 Provide accessible, convenient, safe, and attractive parks and facilities

- Percentage of community members and customers who rate shoreline park/facility safety, cleanliness and maintenance as good or excellent on customer satisfaction surveys.
- Percentage of shoreline parks and facilities with a staff condition assessment rating of good or excellent.
- Percentage of shoreline parks accessible via pathways, sidewalks and bike lanes.

6.2 Foster stewardship of community assets and historical/cultural resources

- Number of shoreline recreation opportunities that promote awareness, appreciation or stewardship of historical or cultural resources.
- Number of participants attending shoreline events or programs that promote or celebrate customs, traditions, arts/culture and history.
- Number of interpretive signs and facilities provided to inform residents about shoreline cultural and historical resources.

6.3 Provide affordable and high-quality recreation and educational experiences for a diverse community

- Percentage of customers or program participants reporting that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with...
• shoreline recreation opportunities in customer satisfaction surveys.

• Numbers of seniors, youth, members of diverse ethnic groups and people with disabilities participating in shoreline recreation programs and activities.

6.4 Partner in responsible economic and community development

• Number of total visitors visiting shoreline parks and recreational sites.

• Percentage of visitors who rate visits, services and programs at shoreline parks as good or excellent on customer satisfaction surveys.
## 7.0 PUBLIC ACCESS PROJECT LIST

### Issues to Resolve and Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CFP / TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Section 1: Tacoma Narrows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>West Slope Trail - Crystal Springs Creek Segment</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![Person]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Blue Trail Access Point</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![Water]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>West Slope Trail - Titlow Park Segment</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![Person]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Public Boat Launch</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![Boat]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>West Slope Trail - War Memorial Park Segment</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Person]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>West Slope Trail - Gold Creek Gulch Segment</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Person]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>View Platforms/Outlooks</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![Person]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Issues to Resolve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 2: Point Defiance Park

2.1 Point Defiance Trail System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>~ X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Guest Moorage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>~ X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Promenade ‘Missing Link’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 3: Ruston Way

3.1 Peninsula Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Point Ruston WaterWalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Mason Gulch Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>~ X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Transient Moorage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>~ X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Puget Gulch Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>P/C X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Buckley Gulch Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>~ X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Old Town Dock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>F/C X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Issues to Resolve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CFP/TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Chinese Reconciliation Park</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Garfield Gulch Trail</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4: Schuster Corridor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CFP/TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Schuster Parkway Multi-modal Trail</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bayside Trail</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Esplanade/Boardwalk</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Garfield Gulch Viewpoint</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Schuster Flyover</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beach Flyover and Pier</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 5: Thea Foss Waterway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CFP/TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Complete Esplanade</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>P/F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Fireman’s Park Hill Climb</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Passenger Only Ferry Terminal/Water Taxi</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11th Street Gateway — Murray Morgan Bridge</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Repair Esplanade</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>P/F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>West Foss Central Park</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15th Street Gateway — Prairie Line Trail</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues to Resolve**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Waterway Park</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>East Foss Central Park</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Wheeler-Osgood Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>East Foss Esplanade</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phasing**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- D
- X

---

**East Foss Shoreline**

- 2013
- 2013 Annual Amendment Application
- Exhibit B — Carried over from 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CFP / TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>11th Street ROW Boat Launch</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Sea Plane Float</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues to Resolve**

**Phasing**

### Section 6: Port Tideflats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CFP / TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Foss Peninsula Viewpoint</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Middle Waterway Habitat Observation</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Puyallup River Levee Trail</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Hylebos Creek Trail</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 7: Northeast Tacoma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CFP / TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11th Street Blue Trail Access Point</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Scenic Drive</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>View and Interpretive Elements</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>NE Tacoma Trail Network</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter 7: Project List

### Issues to Resolve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wapato Park</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>E/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phasing

1. 0-3 years
2. 3-6 years
3. 6+ years
D Depends on development site

### Issues
- **Environmental**
  - Substantial environmental mitigation
- **Right-of-Way**
  - Property or easement acquisition necessary
- **Railroad**
  - Adjacent or over railroad
- **Design**
  - Substantial design issues (e.g. structured path, steep grade)

### Cost Legend
- $ $0-$250,000
- $$ $250,000-$500,000
- $$$ $500,000-$1 million
- $$$ $1 million +

### CFP/TIP
- Project is identified in the Capital Facilities Program or Transportation Improvement Program
- X Annual Amendment Application #2013-05 Exhibit B -- Carried over from 2013
8.0 PERMITTING PUBLIC ACCESS PROJECTS

If you intend to develop a public access, recreation, or site amenity within a shoreline of the state as defined in TSMP 4.1, consult first with Planning and Development Services staff to determine if you need a shoreline permit; they will also tell you about other necessary government approvals.

To find out if your proposal is permitted by the Program, first determine which shoreline district and shoreline environment designation applies to your site. Then check TSMP 2.3 to determine if your proposal is exempt from a shoreline permit. If not, refer to Table 9-2 to see if the proposed use is allowed outright, allowed as a conditional use or prohibited. Then refer to the policies and shoreline district regulations in TSMP Chapters 6 through 9. In some cases your proposal or specific attributes of the proposal may be prohibited, but because of dimensional or other constraints, may be eligible for a shoreline variance (TSMP 2.3.5). Typically, only water-oriented recreation is permitted within the shoreline.

Although your proposal may be permitted by Program regulations or even exempt from specific permit requirements, all proposals must comply with all relevant policies and regulations of the entire Program as well as the general purpose and intent of the SMP.

For development and uses allowed under this Program, the Director must find that the proposal is generally consistent with the applicable policies and regulations, unless a variance is to be granted. When your proposal requires a letter of exemption, submit the proper application to the City’s Development Services Division. Processing of your application will vary depending on its size, value, and features.

Contact Planning and Development Services staff for additional information.
9.0 MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Most shoreline permits contain “special conditions” that ensure development complies with the TSMP and other regulations. One of the common permit conditions is that the authorized public access areas will be used properly, managed for the public’s safety and enjoyment, and reasonably maintained. The following are some common requirements for managing public access areas along the shoreline:

9.1 Reasonable Rules and Restrictions

Reasonable rules and restrictions may be imposed on the use of the public access areas to correct particular problems that may arise, such as lack of public safety protections or increased vandalism. Rules may include restricting hours of use and delineating appropriate behavior. Such limitations, rules and restrictions typically have to be approved by the Director upon a finding that the proposed rules would not significantly affect the public nature of the area, would not unduly interfere with reasonable public use of the area, and would tend to correct a specific problem that has been both identified and substantiated.

9.2 Responsibility for Public Access Areas

Once a permit is issued, the permittee is typically responsible for ensuring that the public access area and associated improvements are installed, used and maintained in accordance with the permit. Public access areas are required to be permanently guaranteed, usually through a legal instrument, for use by the public.

9.3 Uses within Public Access Areas

Shoreline spaces that are dedicated as public access areas are typically made available to the public for uses, such as walking, bicycling, sitting, viewing, fishing, picnicking, kayaking and windsurfing. If someone wishes to use the public access area for uses other than those specified by the SSDP, prior written approval by the Land Use Administrator is usually required.

9.4 Maintenance of Public Access Areas

Public access areas and improvements along the shoreline are required of to be maintained by and at the expense of the permittee(s). Exceptions may include situations where the off-site mitigation for public access is accomplished on publicly-owned lands or at existing publicly owned access areas. In such cases, the responsibility for ongoing maintenance may be assumed, by authorized agreement, by the appropriate public agency. Such maintenance usually includes: repairs to all path surfaces; replacement of any landscaping that dies or
becomes unkempt; repairs or replacement of any public access amenities such as seating areas, restrooms, drinking fountains, trash containers and lights; periodic cleanup of litter and other materials deposited within the access areas; removal of any hazards in or encroachments into the access areas and assuring that public access signage remains in place and is clearly visible. To reduce ongoing maintenance requirements, public access areas should be built with durable materials using high-quality construction methods.
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COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE NATION DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT DESIGN GUIDELINES TO PROMOTE THE HISTORIC, SCENIC, ARCHITECTURAL, AND/OR CULTURAL VALUES OF A PARTICULAR AREA. DESIGN GUIDELINES ARE BROAD STATEMENTS THAT INDICATE HOW DEVELOPMENT IN AN AREA SHOULD TAKE PLACE. DESIGN GUIDELINES ARE INTENTIONALLY BROAD: THEY ARE MEANT TO ALLOW CONSIDERABLE CREATIVE LATITUDE WHEN DESIGNING PROJECTS. WHILE NOT MANDATORY, THE GUIDELINES IN THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD BE FOLLOWED BY PROJECT DEVELOPERS AND DESIGNERS TO THE GREATEST EXTENT PRACTICABLE. THE FOCUS IS ON THE DESIGN OF PUBLIC SPACES AND THE PUBLIC REALM AND TO IMPLEMENT THE OVERARCHING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM. IN ADDITION, THE GUIDELINES ARE INTENDED TO MEDIATE THE INTERACTION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SPACES, BY LOOKING AT THE RELATIONSHIP/INTERACTION BETWEEN THE BUILDING SITE AND THE PUBLIC REALM.

VISION

GENERAL

The City of Tacoma has prepared these Waterfront Design Guidelines to illustrate how new development and redevelopment of the Dome to Defiance Waterfront can preserve and improve environmental quality; facilitate public access; create walkable, people-oriented public and private spaces; maintain an attractive, maritime aesthetic; and promote the overall quality of life for both residents and visitors. Implementation of these design guidelines will promote the use of identifiable, unifying design elements that will allow the Dome to Defiance Waterfront to be viewed as a whole, rather than a series of disconnected spaces.

PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION IS NOT LIMITED TO THE DOME TO DEFIANCE WATERFRONT – THE CITY'S PUBLIC ACCESS ALTERNATIVES PLAN OUTLINES A COMPREHENSIVE NETWORK OF PUBLIC ACCESS TRAILS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES. THESE GUIDELINES WILL ENSURE THAT NEW PUBLIC ACCESS FACILITIES ARE BEING DESIGNED TO CONSIDER SITE CONTEXT, PUBLIC SAFETY, A VARIETY OF USER GROUPS, AND APPROPRIATE PUBLIC AMENITIES. ULTIMATELY, STRONG DESIGN STANDARDS WILL BUILD A COMMON IDENTITY FOR PUBLIC ACCESS SITES THROUGHOUT THE CITY’S WATERFRONT, WHILE PROVIDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CREATIVE SITE SPECIFIC DESIGN INNOVATIONS THAT WILL ALLOW FOR A SENSE OF SERENDIPITY AS VISITORS EXPLORE TACOMA’S RICH WATERFRONT ENVIRONMENT.
The Thea Foss Waterway represents a unique opportunity for the City of Tacoma to create an attractive focal place for the enjoyment of the inland waters of Puget Sound within an urban context. The Waterway visually and physically connects surrounding districts. The Waterway’s historic past and working waterfront, combined with new cultural, recreational, residential, office and retail uses, will create a lively, urban environment. A linear waterfront park will link together a variety of attractive, ground level public activities and uses accessible to all of Tacoma’s citizens and to the region. Environmental cleanup and protection measures are being integrated into redevelopment, creating a safe, healthy, and sustainable environment. The rich industrial past of Tacoma’s waterway pervades the atmosphere of the waterfront. This history should be highlighted in infrastructure and development alternatives. These include designs that integrate working waterfront and maritime themes.
Schuster Parkway

Schuster Parkway has an active industrial area with an existing grain terminal fronting on deep water, with railroad, road and sidewalk. The district is bounded by dense residential neighborhoods, business districts and historic schools. The design vision for the S-7 Schuster Parkway Shoreline District is to establish a multi-use trail that connects the Ruston Way shoreline and the Thea Foss Waterway; enhance visual and physical access from adjacent hillside neighborhoods to the shoreline; accommodate multiple modes of transportation including bicycle and pedestrian options; incorporate stormwater and hillside seeps as a design feature; and include design treatments that promote public safety and legible public spaces.
The Schuster Parkway Transition Zone (S-6/7) is a newly created zone that takes into account historical uses and provides a buffer between S-6 Ruston Way and S-7 Shuster Parkway zones. The vision for the Transition Zone is to establish a multi-use trail that connects the Ruston Way shoreline and the Thea Foss Waterway; enhance visual and physical access from adjacent hillside neighborhoods to the shoreline; accommodate multiple modes of transportation including bicycle and pedestrian options; incorporate stormwater as a design feature; and include design treatments that promote public safety and legible public spaces. The design of public access facilities should give special consideration to the connectivity and quality of life of the historic neighborhoods, parks, and schools that are in close proximity to the water.
The Ruston Way shoreline is comprised of a mix of public and privately owned land, is close to existing dense residential neighborhoods and business districts, and is served by the local street network. The area is characterized by distinct physical features including gulches, steep slopes, intertidal beaches, and a salt water bay. Slopes rise steeply from sea level, offering spectacular views of the water and mountains. Residential neighborhoods are found at the base and on top of the steep slopes. The shoreline area is developed with a mixture of public and private uses including restaurants, offices, public facilities, and public recreation areas.

The vision for Ruston Way is to develop an active and attractive urban waterfront of mixed public and private development that meets community recreation needs and emphasizes the shoreline for public use. It is intended that the Ruston Way shoreline be developed as a unified waterfront that utilizes consistent landscaping, signs, materials, and design details to provide visual continuity and a sense of place.
Point Ruston/Slag Peninsula Shoreline

The vision for Point Ruston/Slag Peninsula is the development of a mixture of residential, and commercial uses with an open space system that builds on the rich heritage of Ruston. This new neighborhood will be a regional destination. A robust open space system with parks, plazas, tree-lined streets, view corridors, and a waterfront promenade will offer recreation opportunities and reconnect the public with the Point Ruston shoreline.
OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVE #1: Make public access USABLE

Shoreline access areas are most enjoyed when they are designed and built to encourage diverse, water-related activities along the shoreline. The varied conditions of the Tacoma waterfront and each site’s historical, cultural and natural attributes provide opportunities for creating projects with a “sense of place” and a unique identity. View opportunities, shoreline configuration and access points are factors that determine a site’s inherent public access opportunities.

Public access improvements should be designed for a wide range of users. While some shoreline areas are best suited for quiet and contemplative public spaces, others lend themselves to be used for large public gatherings, such as festivals, outdoor markets or exhibits. In remote natural locations, simple trail systems may be all that is needed. Public access should be designed to respect all visitors’ experiences of Puget Sound and the Tacoma Waterfront. Highly active uses should always be balanced with opportunities for passive activities, such as strolling, viewing and relaxing.

OBJECTIVE #2: Enhance VISUAL ACCESS to Commencement Bay, Tacoma Narrows and the shorelands

The shoreline and waters of Commencement Bay and Tacoma Narrows are a scenic resource that contributes to the enjoyment of daily life in the Tacoma and the region. As a special kind of ‘blue’ open space, Puget Sound acts as a unifying element of the entire region. The wide surface of Commencement Bay and the distant views it affords offer relief from the crowded, often chaotic, urban scene and help to create a sense of well-being. Probably the most widely enjoyed “use” of the Sound is simply viewing it from the shoreline, from the water or from a distant viewpoint. For this reason alone, the Sound is a major visitor attraction for the tourist industry and a Bay view can add substantially to the value of a home, office or commercial use.
OBJECTIVE #3: Maintain and enhance the VISUAL QUALITY of the water, shoreline, and adjacent developments

The visual quality of any shoreline development proposal should relate directly to a set of site-specific factors. Incorporating design principles such as human scale, architectural diversity and varied building massing can lead to well-designed waterfront buildings and shoreline access areas. The design character of public access areas should relate to the scale and intensity of the proposed development. For example, projects in high-intensity areas may include a complex and varied shoreline and dynamic water experiences. Conversely, in a natural setting or park setting, the serene visual quality of the Sound can be preserved and maintained by focusing on the site’s natural characteristics. Other factors can also contribute to the visual quality of the shoreline and adjacent developments. For example, landscaping with native and drought tolerant plants can provide texture and interest to the waterfront. Existing degraded shoreline edges and substandard shoreline erosion protection can be improved as part of new shoreline developments. Unsightly debris that mars the appearance of the shoreline such as plastic bottles, old tires and other refuse should be removed. Over time, the elimination of inappropriate uses and poor quality shoreline conditions and the implementation of well-designed developments will enhance the visual quality of Commencement Bay and the Tacoma Narrows.

OBJECTIVE #4: Provide CONTINUITY along the shoreline while also enhancing the UNIQUE SENSE OF PLACE of distinct sub-districts and shoreline areas

Access areas are utilized most if they provide direct connections to public rights-of-way such as streets and sidewalks, are served by public transit and are connected to adjacent public access or recreation areas. To create a comprehensive system of waterfront access, safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to the shoreline should be planned in collaboration with local governments. In addition, a variety and diversity of design features can create interest and ‘serendipitous’ moments. Public access design features should strike a balance between the unifying design elements that create a common identity for the Tacoma Waterfront, while also using the inherent character and attributes of shoreline sites and context of specific shoreline areas to promote a unique sense of place for subareas within the access system.

OBJECTIVE #5: Take advantage of the PUGET SOUND SETTING

Development along the shores of Commencement Bay and Tacoma Narrows should take maximum advantage of the attractive setting that the water provides. Over time, it is expected that more projects will take full advantage of the scenic water setting.

OBJECTIVE #6: Ensure that public access is COMPATIBLE WITH WILDLIFE through siting, design, and management strategies

In many locations around Commencement Bay and Tacoma Narrows, the shoreline edge is a vital zone for wildlife. Access to some wildlife areas allow visitors to discover, experience and appreciate the shoreline’s natural resources and can foster public support for resource protection. However, in some cases, public access may have adverse effects on wildlife (including flushing, increased stress, interrupted foraging or nest abandonment), and may result in adverse long-term population and species effects. The type and severity of effects, if any, on wildlife depend on many factors, including site planning, the type and number of species present and the intensity and nature of the human activity.

OBJECTIVE #7: Enroll PARTNERS in the planning and implementation of these guidelines.

The success of the waterfront access system and of these design guidelines is contingent on developing successful partnerships with other public entities and private parties in the ongoing planning, funding, and maintenance of these facilities. Metro Parks Tacoma, the Foss Waterway Development Authority, and the Port of Tacoma are all significant property owners and managers within the City of Tacoma waterfront. As specific public access projects are identified, ensure close coordination between these entities from site planning through to design, permitting, and construction.
USE OF THE PLAN

The Tacoma Waterfront Public Access Design Guidelines have been developed for use by:

- **Development Teams** – Developers, land planners, landscape architects, engineers, architects and other members of project teams. Development teams should be aware that, while this document covers issues dealt with in other City of Tacoma regulatory documents, this document is a supplement to—and not a replacement of—those other documents. Therefore, project developers and designers are responsible for complying with all other applicable regulatory documents, such as the Tacoma Municipal Code.

- **The Public**

- **Public Agencies** – City, county, special district, regional and state agencies involved in resource protection, land use planning, transportation and recreation.

- **FWDA Design Committee** – Foss Waterway Development Authority projects in the S-8 Thea Foss Waterway Shoreline District will use these guidelines when submitting a shoreline permit as part of the Foss Waterfront Development Authority (FWDA) design review process. Private or non-FWDA projects in the S-8 Thea Foss Waterway are encouraged to utilize the FWDA Design Committee for project review but are not required.

- **City of Tacoma Planning and Development Services and Public Works** – City staff will use these guidelines as a reference when evaluating shoreline permits for new projects within the applicable shoreline areas defined below and/or where public access is being provided in accordance with TSMP 6.5 and the Public Access Alternatives Plan. In addition, City staff will utilize these guidelines when expending public funds for the acquisition, development, or improvement of public access projects that are within shoreline jurisdiction or identified in the Public Access Alternatives Plan.
APPLICABILITY

The design guidelines are organized around three primary elements: Public Realm, Site Details, and Building Sites. These guidelines apply in distinct ways.

1. Design guidelines associated with the Public Realm and Site Details apply to new public access facilities when required by the Shoreline Master Program and Tacoma Municipal Code 13.10, and for projects identified and implemented under the Public Access Alternatives Plan. In some cases, public access projects may be implemented that are outside the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Master Program, but which further the connectivity of the access system or enhance public views of the water. Where identified in the PAAP, these projects will be subject to design review.

2. The design guidelines associated with Building Sites shall only apply to that area defined as the “Dome to Defiance” Waterfront, from Point Defiance in the north, to the 4th Street Ramp off Schuster Parkway, and continuing onto the east and west sides of the Thea Foss Waterway in the south. The Building Site Element establishes design guidelines to mediate the interaction and relationship between public and private development sites and the integrated public access facilities.

For the purposes of these guidelines, the Dome to Defiance subject area is divided into five distinct subareas:

- Thea Foss Waterway (which is split into West Foss and East Foss): Comprised of the S-8 Shoreline District
- Schuster Parkway shoreline: Comprised of the S-7 Shoreline District
- Schuster Parkway transition: Comprised of the S-6/7 Shoreline District
- Ruston Way shoreline: Comprised of the S-6 Shoreline District
- Point Ruston/Slag Peninsula shoreline: Comprised of the S-15 Shoreline District
- Point Defiance: Comprised of the S-5 Shoreline District
HOW TO USE THESE DESIGN GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

FORMATE

The design guidelines address three primary elements: Public Realm, Building Sites, and Site Details. Within each element, specific guidelines are presented in a consistent fashion, according to the model described below.

2.5 Transition Areas

Transition areas are the privately owned spaces between buildings and public spaces. Highly visible to passersby, transition areas should foster a lively, pedestrian-oriented atmosphere. The design of these areas should provide a seamless transition between public and private areas.

2.5.1 Transition areas should extend the design features of public spaces to the edges of buildings.

- Transition areas should use landscape plantings, materials, lighting, and furniture compatible with that used in the public spaces, but may be demarcated with different design features.

- Not applicable to industrial properties.
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1. PUBLIC REALM

The public realm along the Tacoma Waterfront serves numerous purposes. Besides providing public shoreline access and circulation, public spaces are needed for recreation, contemplation, and inspiration—not to mention a nice spot for lunch!

Spaces within the public realm should have some design features in common to provide identity and continuity. Continuity may also be expressed through the regular placement of site details. The Public Realm guidelines apply city-wide.
The Walkway should be an inviting, lively, and safe public space that is enjoyable all year, in all kinds of weather.

1.1 Waterfront Walkway

The term “Waterfront Walkway” refers to the walkway that is envisioned to encircle the Tacoma Waterfront from the East Foss to Point Ruston in the north. The primary intent of the Waterfront Walkway is to provide public shoreline access, with opportunities for active and passive public recreation. The Waterfront Walkway may sometimes be referred to as a “promenade” or “esplanade” in some specific shoreline areas.

The design of the Walkway should create a linear shoreline park that unifies the Tacoma Waterfront shoreline, joins larger public spaces, and relates to the designs and activities of upland and in-water facilities. The Walkway should be an inviting, lively, and safe public space that is enjoyable all year in all kinds of weather.

On the west side of the Thea Foss Waterway, the Walkway will primarily consist of an esplanade that runs immediately adjacent to the shoreline. Elsewhere, it is expected that the Walkway may not always be immediately adjacent to the shoreline due to site constraints. Indeed, the Walkway may at times need to head away from the shoreline and run adjacent to an inland street.

1.1.1 The Waterfront Walkway should be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and designed to safely accommodate a variety of users, including walkers, joggers, bicyclists, and roller bladers.

- Where space constraints only allow for suboptimal walkway width, the primary walkway can be designated for foot traffic and remain ADA compliant, while bicyclists and other wheeled users are diverted to a secondary route (such as a route along an adjacent street).

1.1.2 To bring continuity to the Walkway and ensure that it is easy to follow, similar site details can be provided such as the consistent use of active-use surfacing specified in Section 3.8, Surfacing Materials.

- Site details may be adapted adjacent to a specific development where it can be demonstrated that they continue the design theme of the development and are compatible with the site details provided along the Walkway on the other sides of the development site.

1.1.3 The design of the Waterfront Walkway should be flexible to allow the division of space for different types of paths, and for different users.
1.1.4 The location of the Waterfront Walkway should be flexible to allow location next to the water, where possible, or bypassing existing uses, where necessary.

1.1.5 Provide seating of various types along the waterfront.

### 1.2 Wooded Trails

In addition to the Waterfront Walkway, a system of wooded pedestrian and bicycle trails exists and will be further expanded in the Schuster Parkway and Ruston Way areas. Informal paths and trails in the gulches and along slopes in these areas permit pedestrian access to the waterfront from nearby residential neighborhoods. Part of the City’s designated bike path system runs along a portion of the waterward side of Ruston Way, from Alder Street to Marshall Street.

Improved pedestrian facilities in the adjacent slope and gulch areas will provide a greater opportunity for a more intimate contact with the shoreline environment for more people. A linking of the various areas of the shoreline by a system of paths will create a more continuous environment for pedestrians.

The following guidelines promote the development of an organized trail system on the slopes and in gulches, while ensuring that the trails are developed in a manner that preserves the natural wooded setting of the hillsides as much as possible.

1.2.1 Natural trails should consist of pervious surfaces such as packed cinder fine crushed gravel, wood fiber, or hogged fuel.

1.2.2 Carefully design and locate trails to preserve the natural wooded setting, maintain soil stability, minimize erosion, and avoid adverse effects on wildlife.

- Use design elements such as varying trail widths, paving materials, and site amenities to encourage or discourage specific types of activities.
- Use durable materials to reduce erosion impacts on adjacent habitats and to keep users from creating informal access routes.
- Provide spur trails to reduce informal access into and through more sensitive areas.
- Locate night lighting away from sensitive habitat areas.
- Use physical design features to buffer wildlife from human use.
- Manage the type of public use to reduce adverse effects.

This wooded trail in Point Defiance Park consists of pervious surface of packed cinder fine crushed gravel.

Wooded trails should be carefully designed to maintain the natural wooded setting while maintaining soil stability, minimizing erosion, and avoiding adverse effects on wildlife.
1.2.3 Bridges and raised boardwalks over waterways and tributaries can help maintain water flow for creeks, seeps, and wetlands.

1.2.4 Wooded paths and trails often are located within close proximity to single family residential neighborhoods. Trail location and design should be sensitive to the privacy concerns of area residents and incorporate CPTED principles where appropriate.

1.2.4 To address safety concerns, multiple points of access can be provided with improved trailheads incorporating signage and lighting.

1.2.7 Provide shelters and seating along the nature trails for user comfort and convenience.

1.2.8 Design and locate informational and directional signs for the trail areas that are compatible with the waterfront.

1.2.9 Consider safety needs when designing and locating bicycle and pedestrian paths.

1.2.10 Separate pedestrian paths from bikeway routes wherever possible and feasible to ensure the greatest amount of safety for both.

1.2.11 Where separate paths are not possible, combined bicycle/pedestrian paths should be of sufficient width to allow safe passage of both pedestrians and cyclists.

1.2.12 Landscape the bicycle/pedestrian path to define the path’s edge.

1.3 Trailheads

Good access to a path system is a key element for its success. Trailheads (formalized parking areas) serve the local and regional population arriving to the path system by car, transit, bicycle or other modes. Trailheads provide essential access to the shared-use path system and include amenities like parking for vehicles and bicycles, restrooms (at major trailheads), and posted maps. A central information installation also helps users find their way and acknowledge the rules of the path. They are also useful for interpretive education about plant and animal life, ecosystems and local history. See the City of Tacoma Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Guidelines for additional information.
1.3.1 Trailheads should be improved and include parking to avoid conflicts with surrounding land uses.

1.3.2 Trailheads should include common design elements and amenities to improve their appearance and function.

Include common elements:

- Interpretive display
- Sign bollard with identification/distance sign
- Trash receptacle

Optional common elements:

- Picnic table – single post, wooden top
- Bench

1.4 Community Gathering Places

Community gathering places are areas along the Waterfront Walkway intended for public assembly. Community gathering places should be flexible spaces that can be used either casually or for formal public events. Gathering places should be a range of sizes and provide a variety of user experiences, from communal spaces for larger group activities (such as plazas, open-air amphitheaters, or concert stages) to amenities that allow for smaller groups and individuals (such as picnic tables, children's play areas, waterfront viewpoints, and a variety of seating).

Gathering spaces should also encourage a broad range of activities such as volleyball courts, bocce courts, game tables, play areas, and contemplative viewpoints at intervals along the waterfront. These spaces should be designed so that they are suitable for a range of these diverse types of activities.

1.4.1 The preferred location for community gathering places is in areas where public access, view corridors, and major streets intersect the Waterfront Walkway and pier heads.

- These locations provide increased depth and width, receive ample natural light, are highly visible, and offer views of the Thea Foss Waterway, Downtown Tacoma, Mount Rainier, or Commencement Bay.
- Public gathering spaces can help define locations where an activity focus is desired.
- Linkages to surrounding open spaces and buildings can be created through passages, bridges, steps/ramps, paving patterns, and planting.

Community gathering places should offer a range of activities, from active uses such as sports facilities or performance spaces to passive places for seating or views.
1.4.2 To facilitate public access, community gathering places should be located at frequent intervals along the waterfront.

1.4.3 Community gathering places can be made easily identifiable through the use of significant visual structures (such as art, fountains, or viewing towers) or trees.

- The construction of significant visual structures is encouraged, particularly in primary public access/view corridors where such structures would not obstruct public access and might be visible from Downtown Tacoma or surrounding neighborhoods.
- Trees can help to spatially define a community gathering place, buffer a community gathering space from adjacent uses, and provide shade for users.

1.4.4 The design of community gathering places should allow for unobstructed circulation along the Waterfront Walkway.

1.4.5 Shelters can be considered a design element for community gathering places to maximize the public’s use of the Waterfront Walkway throughout all seasons.

- Shelters should be strategically located and respond to sun, wind, and rain.
- Shelters can be provided through built structures or through the planting of trees to provide a canopy or wind break.
1.5 Public Access Corridors

On the west side of the Thea Foss Waterway, 14 public access/view corridors run between Dock Street and the inner harbor line. These corridors provide visual and physical access to and from the Foss, as well as additional natural light to its west side. While public access/view corridors may, in limited circumstances, be the only feasible option for other functions (such as providing access to temporary marina loading and unloading areas), such functions should be accommodated in other locations when practical.

Along the Ruston Way shoreline, continuous uninterrupted panoramic views should be maintained to the extent possible as new development occurs. Existing views of the shoreline should be emphasized and integrated into proposed developments. In addition, viewpoints along the waterfront and at selected locations in sloped areas can create opportunities for scenic views.

Six public access/view corridors are designated along Point Ruston. While the location of these corridors may shift along the shoreline, they should maintain the established dimensions to ensure adequate corridors to the water. Weather protection features, public areas, and areas for public access are allowed in the corridors.

1.5.1 The entire width of public access corridors should be improved with appropriate site details and amenities, such as landscape plantings.

1.5.2 Public access corridors should provide internally consistent site details that complement those of adjacent public spaces in materials, colors, and design.

1.5.3 Where feasible, the in-water portion of a public access/view corridor should be improved with public facilities including piers, viewing platforms, and other such structures.

1.5.4 Outlooks at the end of a public access/view corridor should feature a walkway light, at least one bench or picnic table, a waste receptacle, a bike rack, and the design standard railing (if necessary).

1.5.5 Outlooks should be situated as close as possible to the shoreline ordinary high water mark to maximize views of the waterway.
1.6 Streetscapes

Streetscapes along the Tacoma Waterfront should do more than just transport vehicles. Typically, streets occupy approximately 25 to 35 percent of any dense urban environment. Being publicly owned, streets are one of the major areas that a city has to implement the design vision for a given area. As the Tacoma Waterfront is intended to be inviting to the public and open to pedestrian and bicycle use (as well as other forms of non-motorized transportation), the streets along the waterfront are intended to be a place for people. Of course, this needs to be balanced with a street’s vehicular function, but it is important that the street be seen as a space intended for moving people, in all forms of transportation, be it people in cars, people on foot, people on bicycles, people in trucks, or people on skateboards. Street design should accommodate all forms of moving people and produce what have come to be called “complete streets.”

More specifically, it is desirable that streetscapes along the waterfront be improved with a sidewalk that adjoins properties. In some cases, the sidewalk will serve as the Waterfront Walkway, where the Walkway cannot be accommodated on private property due to constraints such as hazardous material use or high security needs. Standards for the sidewalk in this case will need to be adjusted to accommodate the City of Tacoma street standards, give continuity to the Walkway design, and provide safety and clarity for the public user. Design guidelines and amenities, as outlined in this document, should be incorporated wherever possible. Additionally, the Downtown Element of the City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan provides guidance for developing complete streets. Streetscape projects along the Tacoma Waterfront should follow this guidance.

Streetscapes also provide the opportunity for scenic views along the Waterfront. Ruston Way, Schuster Parkway, and East D Street offer exceptional vistas for not only pedestrians and bicyclists but also daily commuters and weekend sightseers. It is desirable to have shoreline drives with low speeds and attractive landscaping that affords scenic viewing. These shoreline drives place continued focus on the water as an attraction and emphasize the uniqueness of the Foss Waterway, juxtaposed with the Downtown skyline.

1.6.1 Where necessary, the street should be reconfigured to allow for a continuous Waterfront Walkway.

- Coordinate this with the appropriate City of Tacoma departments and public and private landowners.
1.6.2 Where the Waterfront Walkway runs adjacent to the street, the Walkway should feature landscape plantings at its edge to buffer Walkway users from vehicle traffic.

- In areas without enough room for landscape plantings, railings or bollards should be used for buffering.

1.6.3 Where the public sidewalk is identified as the Waterfront Walkway, where appropriate and where space permits, design amenities such as waste receptacles, bike racks, and walkway lights should be located on or adjacent to the public sidewalk.

1.6.4 Where there is no practical alternative to having the Waterfront Walkway cross a street or driveway, the path should be clearly marked to ensure continuity of the Walkway and to notify vehicles of pedestrian and bicycle crossing.

- Treatments such as different paving surfaces, textured paving, lighted crosswalks, or painted surfaces can be used alone or in combination to alert users and vehicles of the Walkway’s presence. The trail may also be raised to increase visibility.
- The number of crossings should be minimized.

1.6.5 Public parking should be reconfigured, where possible, to allow the Walkway to locate on the shoreline side, except where the parking is intended for a vehicle viewing area.

1.6.6 Provide for safe, well-lit bicycle and pedestrian traffic in both directions.

1.6.7 Bicycle and pedestrian bridges over waterways and tributaries can be used to close gaps in the Waterfront Walkway.

- Design bicycle and pedestrian bridges to be compatible with surrounding land uses, habitats, and adjacent developments.
- The appropriate width of a bicycle and pedestrian bridge will depend, in part, on the level of use that is likely to occur at the site. However, multi-use bridges are usually at least 10 feet wide.

1.6.8 Where possible, streetscape projects should be consistent with the transportation element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines within the Mobility Master Plan (MoMaP) and connect pedestrian and bicycle circulation routes with other like routes to create a continuous multi-modal trail network.
1.6.9 Streetscape projects should be consistent with the Mixed-Use Centers Complete Street Guidelines, provided in the Downtown Element of the City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan.

1.6.10 When designing improvements, realigning, or widening streets, consider the scenic shoreline drives and try to preserve motorists’ views of the water.

- Use landscaping to balance pedestrian and vehicular views.

1.6.11 Public access at shoreline street ends should be designed to balance public access with private land uses.

- Where safety and/or liability concerns exist, visual access can be provided as an alternative.
- A clear delineation should be made between public and private land, and all public access should be provided on public land.
- Access may include non-motorized boating docks or floats, viewing platforms, seating, and other forms of uses that are not a nuisance to adjacent private uses.
- Public access can be formal (such as paved walkways, identification signs, and interpretive panels) or informal (such as a small footpath to the water or bench by the water).

1.6.12 Emphasize the use of Ruston Way as a low speed, scenic urban parkway that provides access to shoreline properties, accommodates through traffic, and offers viewing opportunities for the motoring public.
1.7 View Areas/Viewpoints

Tacoma’s relationship to the water is an important part of its distinct character and history. Significant views include those to Puget Sound, Mount Rainier, and back toward Downtown Tacoma and along the waterfront. These natural panoramas and views of the urban skyline enhance the aesthetic quality of the Waterfront Walkway and provide a connection to the water. Views of industrial areas allow users to see and understand Tacoma’s working waterfront.

Vantage points should be incorporated throughout the length of the Waterfront Walkway to support and enhance the public realm. Viewpoints should be understood as extensions of the Walkway but should not impede movement along the Walkway. These viewpoints often benefit from the incorporation of short-duration stop facilities that facilitate stopping, gathering, and viewing activities. These types of facilities could include seating, interpretive kiosks or educational signage, integrated water features, public art, and water access. These facilities also provide an opportunity to adaptively reuse building materials and elements from existing structures to reflect the historic and maritime character of the waterfront.
1.7.1  Incorporate viewpoints and view areas along the Waterfront Walkway.

- Integrate public access with viewpoints/view areas.
- Define viewpoints that are understood as extensions of the Waterfront Walkway without conflicting with the trail’s movement functions. Viewpoints can be clearly defined as spaces separate from the Walkway through the use of different materials, public art, stairs or other changes in elevation, and landscaping.
- Incorporate short-duration stop facilities such as moveable seats, space for vending carts, and/or access to the water.
- Viewpoints and view areas can be elevated above the walkway to enhance views. This can be paired with the incorporation of a flexible open space that can accommodate small events or gatherings.

1.7.2  Orient views with any key view corridors and/or major streets and street ends.

1.7.3  Emphasize panoramic waterfront views from the roadway, slopes, and shoreline areas.

1.7.4  Consider the residents’ view from the upper neighborhoods when designing and locating new developments along the shoreline or the hillside.

1.7.5  Balance viewpoints and view areas with shoreline vegetation and native plantings.

- Provision of views needs to be balanced with the need for habitat and erosion prevention when considering removing existing vegetation.
- To preserve more vegetation, view areas or viewpoints can be small.

1.7.6  Outlooks should be situated to provide public views of significant Port and industrial operations. Recognize the aesthetic and educational value of port/industrial operations.

1.7.7  Consider the view of the motorist when designing improvements, realignment or widening of the Ruston Way roadway in order to provide the passerby with views of the water.

1.7.8  Provide small bayside parking areas or pull-offs for limited in-car viewing, where compatible with existing roads and adjacent uses.
1.8 Public Access in Industrial Areas

While fulfilling the mandate of expanding public access and improving habitat, Tacoma must also remain sensitive to the need of supporting the economic development of industrial uses. The Port and other maritime and industrial uses are valuable assets. In some instances, these dual goals may seemingly be in conflict. Providing public access may pose some hazard to public users given the industrial nature of uses. Likewise, public access may interfere with private operations, increase liability for owners, and pose issues of security. This is not to say that public access cannot be provided in industrial areas but that it must be carefully designed to address competing needs.

Physical public access can be provided in a way that is inviting and safe for the public while remaining compatible with industrial activities. The design of access should address concerns regarding liability, interference with industrial activities, and security of facilities.

1.8.1 Security can be accomplished without negatively affecting the aesthetics of public access through careful, subtle, and sensitive design; the use of clever separation; and avoidance of obvious or harsh features such as chain-link fencing, guard houses, or razor wire. The best security will be imperceptible to users or the general public unless trespassed.

1.8.2 Public access to industrial areas can be limited through the use of fences, grade changes, or retaining walls.

- Transitional security strips may be used on the landside to separate the public Waterfront Walkway from private industrial spaces. This strip should be in harmony with the Walkway and not interrupt continuity.

- Fences and walls can be landscaped to reduce their visual impact on the Walkway and provide minimal visual obstructions.

1.8.3 The safe observation of industrial and maritime facilities and visiting vessels in operation can be provided for reasonable casual visitation when facilities are not being used for active loading/off-loading functions through overlooks, belvederes, decks, or piers. This will allow views of the working waterfront.

1.8.4 Convenient and attractive alternative routes through or around the maritime facilities should be provided for
the general public and passersby when security and safety dictate that certain areas be cordoned off from the public. Where reasonable, the facility should accommodate safe pier-side pedestrian access and recreational fishing opportunities.

1.8.5 Public access can be designed so as not to interfere with existing industrial activities.

- Separate incompatible uses on site. Visitor vehicle circulation and parking should be separated from industrial traffic so as not to negatively affect work activity.

- Visitor attractions can be concentrated in one part of the site.

- Clear signage/wayfinding and strong attractions will direct visitors and keep them out of private areas.

- Reinforce signage with design cues such as paving, crosswalks, lighting, and site amenities to distinguish areas of public access from private uses.

- Provide elements that benefit workers and existing uses such as better circulation and parking, convenient commercial services, improved lighting, and new site amenities.

1.8.6 Opportunities exist for the design of architectural and site elements that reflect and reinforce the site’s industrial character. Low-key design can preserve the working waterfront character.

1.8.7 Provide public access across boat yards and launch ramps in locations where safety precautions can be implemented.
1.9 Trail Safety and Security

Various design and programmatic measures can be taken to address safety issues on a shared-use path. For additional tips and strategies consult the City of Tacoma Mobility Master Plan Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Guidelines and CPTED (Community Policing Through Environmental Design) strategies.

1.9.1 Protect privacy of adjacent property owners

- Encourage the use of neighborhood friendly fencing and also planting of landscape buffers.
- Clearly mark path access points.
- Post path rules that encourage respect for private property.
- Strategically-place lighting, utilizing light shields to minimize unwanted light in adjacent homes.

1.9.2 Reduce crime through environmental design

- Place lights strategically and as necessary.
- Place benches and other amenities at locations with good visual surveillance and high activity.
- Create a “Path Watch Program” involving local residents.
- Select benches, bollards, signage and other site amenities that are durable, low maintenance and vandal resistant.
- Manage vegetation to allow visual surveillance of the path from adjacent properties and from roadway/path intersections.

1.9.3 Prevent unwanted vehicle access on the path

- Utilize landscaping to define the corridor edge and path, including earth berms or boulders.
- Use bollards at intersections.
- Pass a motorized vehicle prohibited ordinance and sign the path.
- Lay the shared-use path out with curves that allow bike/ped passage, but are uncomfortably tight for automobile passage.

1.9.4 Reduce litter and dumping

- Post rules encouraging pack-it-out practices.
- Place garbage receptacles at trailheads.

Surveillance from nearby buildings and pedestrian scale lighting can increase shared-use path safety.
2. BUILDING SITES

When being redeveloped, building sites, whether publicly or privately owned, should be developed in such a way as to take into consideration the special nature of the Tacoma Waterfront. Design teams for sites on the waterfront must recognize that a successful building will not only account for patterns of development on the actual site but will also successfully implement and contribute to the larger goals of the Tacoma Waterfront as a whole. It is desirable that the sites surrounding the Tacoma Waterfront acknowledge the larger patterns of development in the area, public access goals (as exemplified by the Waterfront Walkway), and view considerations (such as the public access/view corridors). Public spaces should be prioritized to minimize shadow impacts, and building massing and form should strengthen the existing public rights of way, including streetscapes and the Walkway. The building site guidelines focus primarily on the impact of building sites on public access rather than the style or materials of buildings.

The following guidelines primarily apply to the redevelopment of new mixed-used, residential, and commercial buildings along the “Dome to Defiance” portion of the waterfront. These types of land uses offer more opportunities for public access and therefore should be designed to improve public access. Industrial uses can still provide some limited public access, but given the character of this land use, many of the following guidelines may not apply.

2.1 General Considerations

2.1.1 New development of individual sites should enhance the shoreline’s positive and distinct features, unify shoreline areas visually, and give definition to subareas.

2.1.2 Development should improve the appearance of the shoreline for those who live and work there, making it a more attractive and interesting place to visit.

2.1.3 New development should be oriented to the water and relate to public access along the Waterfront Walkway.
2.2 View Considerations

The topography and structures in and around the Tacoma Waterfront provide numerous view opportunities, particularly of Mount Rainier, the Cascades, the Olympics, the Thea Foss Waterway, waterfront activities, Commencement Bay, Union Station and the Washington State Historical Museum, the Port of Tacoma industrial area, and Downtown Tacoma. While City regulations are in place to mitigate view impacts, the guidelines below are intended to maximize views to and from the Tacoma Waterfront.

2.2.1 Design and locate new shoreline uses to take full advantage of the waterfront views and location using design elements such as building orientation, windows, decks, and rooftop spaces.

2.2.2 Incorporate design elements such as transparency and preservation of view corridors to minimize view impacts on surrounding areas.

2.2.3 Building designs should explore creative ways of incorporating public access, such as through roof access points.

2.2.4 Views should be balanced with vegetation.

2.3 Shading Considerations

The intent of these guidelines is to minimize the shading of public spaces to ensure that the Waterfront Walkway remains a well-used public resource. The shading of public spaces is of particular concern on the west side of the Tacoma Waterfront because its location, topography, and north-south orientation result in early afternoon shadow conditions nearly year-round.

2.3.1 Buildings should minimize the shading of public spaces as much as practical.

- Techniques to minimize shading include the manipulation of building orientation, location, and shape.

2.3.2 In public spaces subject to early shading, sufficient artificial lighting should be provided.

- See the Lighting section of Chapter 3, Site Details.
2.4 Site Layout

Buildings should be thoughtfully positioned, programmed, and detailed to maximize the impact of the Tacoma Waterfront public experience. Considerations include: strengthening the profile of streetscapes by locating the building closer to the street, especially on streets parallel to the Tacoma Waterfront; providing more open space on the water side of a building; locating uses with the most public access on the streetscape or Waterfront Walkway sides of a building; and accentuating the pedestrian-friendly nature of a building at ground-level sides facing the streetscape and the Walkway.

2.4.1 To give the appearance of building façades being a similar distance from the streets, awnings, landscape plantings, entrance markers, modulation, and other design elements are encouraged.

2.4.2 Location of activities within a building should consider surrounding uses and activities both inside and outside the building. Potential conflicts arising from light, glare, noise, odors, or hours of operation can be avoided by separating uses and activities (vertically and/or horizontally), or by providing physical screening between uses and activities.

- Physical screening can be accomplished through landscape plantings, building construction, or other techniques.

2.4.3 The preferred location for open space is the waterward side of a building site.

2.4.4 Combine vehicular access points to minimize the interruption of pedestrian traffic and adverse visual impacts.

2.4.5 No parts of buildings should protrude into public spaces; however, weather protection features benefiting the public, art visible from public spaces, or building areas provided primarily for public access may be located in or over these areas.

Buildings should be sited to maximize the impact of the public experience along the Waterfront Walkway.
2.5 Pedestrian Orientation

Buildings along the Tacoma Waterfront are intended to feature design individuality, not to portray a strong unifying theme. Design continuity should primarily be established by the cohesive linear design of the Waterfront Walkway and streetscapes.

At the same time, the shoreline has a rich maritime heritage. The design and remodeling of structures should reflect the northwest marine character. To be compatible, design elements from public spaces, existing structures, and surrounding districts should be incorporated into all new developments. It is not intended that portions of existing buildings be replicated; instead, the creative, subtle integration of these elements is the objective. Additionally, the exterior appearance of buildings and building sites should incorporate treatments that make for a comfortable and interesting pedestrian environment.

The pedestrian orientation guidelines apply to the “Dome to Defiance” portion of the waterfront and do not apply to industrial uses.

2.5.1 Strong individual design is encouraged along the Tacoma Waterfront, especially design that creatively reflects the northwest marine character of the area, befitting the Waterfront Walkway’s value as a public resource. These characteristics can include integration or reference to proportions, materials, forms, textures, or colors from existing buildings. Continuity between buildings is encouraged, especially through logical transitions in building bulk, shape, and height, or by significant physical separation.

2.5.2 Buildings should be constructed of high quality, long lasting materials, particularly concrete, masonry, metal, or wood wherever possible, to preserve resources and reflect the long-term community values embedded in the Tacoma Waterfront. Wherever possible, the adaptive reuse of existing buildings and the use of historic building materials as part or whole of new building or development projects is encouraged.
2.5.3 When several buildings are proposed for a single development, the buildings should demonstrate internal compatibility while maintaining strong individual design. While buildings are not required to look identical, they should provide continuity of design through the use of such elements as building bulk, shape, and height.

- Common design themes should be demonstrated in materials, roof pitches, colors, building separation, and orientation of buildings.

2.5.4 Buildings should be oriented to existing public spaces such as plazas or courtyards. New buildings should be clustered so as to define active public spaces that relate to the Waterfront Walkway (see guidelines in Section 2.5, Transition Areas).

2.5.5 Whenever possible, buildings along the Waterfront Walkway should be oriented to the Walkway and create an inviting and interesting pedestrian environment; locate active uses such as retail, public activities, and employee gathering along the Walkway.

- Visible industrial uses and processes can highlight Tacoma’s working waterfront character.

- Windows and displays can provide visual interest and a connection between the Walkway and activities within buildings, particularly on the ground-level.

- Street furniture for ground floor retail and stoops and ground floor balconies for residential uses allow for opportunities for pedestrian social interactions.

2.5.6 The human-scale design of ground-level exteriors of buildings at a pedestrian level is encouraged to improve the quality of public access, encourage pedestrian activity, and provide visual interest/engagement.

- These details could include regularly spaced windows that establish a pattern or tall ceilings and display windows on the ground floor.

- Features that define the ground floor include trim, awnings or canopies, arbors or trellises, or overhangs.

- Façades can be articulated through the use of recessed entrances,

---

A human-scaled ground level along Thea Foss has design details including large display windows, transom windows, recessed entries, awnings, and lighting.

The Albers Mill Lofts building is oriented to the Walkway and helps define the public gathering space adjacent to the Glass Museum with large ground floor windows and a semi-private open space facing the plaza.
columns, scoring, change in materials, transom windows, roll up doors, arcades, decorative kickplates or belt courses, and/or signage.

2.5.7 Modulation (horizontal and vertical) and architectural features are encouraged to create interest and avoid long, flat façades along the Waterfront Walkway so that the space continues to feel safe and interesting to users. Generally, blank walls longer than 20 feet should be avoided.

- The use of blank walls should be minimized by the incorporation of architectural features of interest and utility, such as windows, building entries, and weather protection.
- Long walls that do not require windows or entries should be articulated in a way so as to break up long, monotonous planes. Building articulation can include changes in the roof line, building materials, facade setbacks, or fenstration pattern. Blank wall treatments include planter boxes, trellises, artwork, awnings, bay windows, and columns.

2.6 Transition Areas

Transition areas are semi-private zones where privately owned buildings abut public spaces. These spaces provide physical and visual separation between public and private spaces. The separation indicating the transition between public and private users can be made with seating areas, landscaping, artwork, or walkways. Transition areas should clearly delineate public and private spaces to provide greater legibility and help the public navigate what areas are appropriate for them to use. Their design, however, should provide a continuity of site details and provide a seamless transition from public to private areas. Highly visible to passersby, transition areas should foster a lively, pedestrian-oriented atmosphere.

2.6.1 Transition areas can be used to extend the design features of public spaces to the edges of buildings.

- Transition areas can use landscape plantings, surfacing materials, lighting, and other site details that are compatible with those used in adjacent public spaces to provide a continuity of site details but may demarcate the transition area with different design features to discern public from private space.
- Not applicable to industrial properties.
2.6.2 Transition areas are encouraged to be enhanced with artwork, fountains, landscape plantings, plazas (for public or private use), or other features promoting public enjoyment (active or visual).

2.6.3 Transition areas can be designed to allow for social interaction.

- Transition areas are the preferred location for activities such as outdoor dining or outdoor display.
- Fences, walls, and gateways in transition areas should be designed so that they visually separate but do not hide semi-private spaces.
- Low or stepped down planting areas and terraces or bioswales can be used to visually separate private and public development.
3. SITE DETAILS

Site details bring continuity and identity to the Tacoma Waterfront. The following guidelines are designed to ensure that the public realm and development sites remain functional for a range of users. Site details should have a clear function and exhibit a simple utilitarian design. Site details are encouraged to reflect the maritime character of the waterfront. Historic site details may be appropriate when related to historic structures. Exceptional care should be taken in the design, construction, and installation of all site details.
3.1 Green Shorelines

Beyond the important economic and social benefits provided by shorelines, they are essential ecological resources. Shorelines include habitats for diverse species of plants and animals, foraging and spawning habitats for marine species, and breeding and feeding areas for birds. The vast majority of the Puget Sound has hard or immobilized edges. Bulkheads and other seawall armoring have been used to make shorelines static, but this treatment actually destabilizes the shore processes and functions and is generally harmful to marine ecosystems. It also disrupts the sediment supply, impacting the nature and composition of nearby shorelines, and changes wave energy, increasing wake and washing away fine materials needed for habitat. To ensure that the region’s coastal resources are sustained, the integrity of shoreline ecosystems should be protected.

As population in the region continues and pressure to redevelop and modify waterfront property grows, impacts on the shoreline will increase. Additionally, current models of climate change suggest that sea levels will increase along with more severe episodic storm events. Instead of continuing to fortify the shorelines, design should seek softer, more natural edges that take into account impacts on coastal processes, adjacent properties, and nearshore habitat. Buildings, roads, and other development can be moved from bluffs or beaches to allow for natural shorelines. Large wood or gravel berms can provide protection from waves, while vegetation and improved drainage can stabilize slopes. This softer edge will have the added benefit of providing additional access to the water’s edge, offering places to set in a kayak, go for a swim or wade and build sand castles, and create a softer, natural aesthetic.

3.1.1 Replace existing bulkheads or design new shorelines with green shorelines that substantially improve habitat, maintain shore stability, and improve water access.

- Set back development including buildings, roads, and other development to reduce the need for shore protection and decrease the negative impacts from storm surges, flooding, and other episodic events.
- Natural riparian vegetation plantings offer a dual function as landscape design features and shore protection.
- Where erosion is a concern, consider using naturally sloped backshore, berms, or anchored logs to provide shore protection to allow sediment transport along the coast. Offset erosion with periodic beach nourishment, adding gravel roughly every 5 to 10 years.

SITE DETAILS

Softer shoreline edges provide additional access while conserving habitat and natural features and functions.

This soft shoreline along Ruston Way increases public access while also maintaining shore stability through the use of a naturally sloped backshore and anchored logs that stop erosion and allow sediment to travel along the coast naturally.

Microhabitat is created in Puget Sound with habitat panels and troughs attached to the sea wall to provide rough textured surfaces for organisms to attach to despite the hard shoreline.
3.1.2 Mowed turf areas should not be extended to the top of shore embankments.

3.1.3 Where possible, critical and/or sensitive habitat and natural features and functions of the shore zone should be conserved and rehabilitated.

- Avoid filling in intertidal and subtidal areas that offer critical habitat. Instead, use these habitat features as part of the landscape design and shore protection.

3.1.4 Native plants can be used to provide shade for juvenile fish, facilitate the food web by providing homes to insects that fish and birds can eat, provide refuge for animals, and help filter run-off. Non-native plants can be used where they are advantageous, or when native species cannot be found.

3.1.5 Where hard shorelines are used, they can be designed to provide habitat and mitigate wake energy through the use of porous, sloped, gentle, or terraced embankments or through a combination of horizontal and vertical surfaces.

- Create microhabitat to encourage the formation of a crust of filter-feeding marine organisms that function as a living water filtration system through the incorporation of cavities or crevices that retain water during low tide; the use of rough textured and porous surfaces such as mussel, oyster, and clam shells that facilitate the attachment of organisms; and/or integrated ecosystem-enhancing treatments such as oyster baskets.

Instead of filling in an intertidal area, the Chinese Reconciliation Park conserves this natural feature and uses it as a centerpiece of the design.

The use of native vegetation and natural shoreline features should be used to provide a buffer between the water and the waterfront walkway.

Extending mowed turf to the edge of a shore embankment should be avoided. Use native vegetation along the shoreline instead.
Riparian vegetation can be used to improve fish habitat in areas structural shoreline stabilization currently exists.

Source: Green Shorelines. City of Seattle. 2009.

Examples of “soft” shoreline stabilization techniques.

Source: Green Shorelines. City of Seattle. 2009.
3.2 Shoreline Edge Treatments that Provide Closeness to the Water

Shoreline treatments that provide closeness to the water are desired. While trails, waterfront promenades, and viewpoints facilitate access, shoreline edge treatments that allow the public to experience and appreciate the water offer more meaningful access. Access to the water can allow people to touch the water in various ways. Beaches offer the chance to dip your toes in the water or take a swim. Boat docks, floats, and launches let kayaks or canoes to set in. Tidal stairs or ramps allow people to discover the riparian ecosystem. Many of these treatments, such as a boat float or beach, do not require a large investment and can facilitate access at a marginal cost. The design of these waterfront elements should reflect guideline 3.1, Green Shorelines.

3.2.1 Provide diverse public experiences that allow visitors to touch the water first and foremost.

- Tidal stairs provide an easy way to get close to the water while also reducing wake energy. Given potential algae growth causing slippery conditions, tidal stairs should be proposed lower than where algae normally occurs. Likewise, grooved, pitted, and or roughened surfaces and handrails can be used to reduce the risk of slipping.
- Tidal ramps provide means for access to the water, allowing people to put in hand-powered boats or fish.
- Riprap can incorporate seating elements that provides closeness to the water.
- Beaches and coves provide simple, convenient access to people and human-powered watercraft.
- Low-profile floats, docks, and launches provide a safe point for launching and landing for human-powered watercraft.
- Piers provide closeness to the water and facilitate fishing and the discovery of nearshore ecosystems.

3.3 Wildlife Habitat

While improving public access along the Tacoma shoreline is a primary objective of these guidelines, often access can have negative impacts on wildlife habitat. These impacts may include flushing, increased stress, interrupted foraging, and/or nest abandonment.
Over the long term, these effects may adversely affect the wildlife population. The shoreline edge is a rich and often critical habitat zone for wildlife. Therefore, providing new means and points of access should be balanced with the goal of providing high-quality habitat.

In areas determined to be key habitat, access should be designed sensitively. Careful design can accomplish both objectives. For example, observation decks, boardwalks, and viewing platforms can provide public access with minimal negative impact on habitat. This type of public access will have the added benefit of allowing visitors to explore and appreciate Tacoma’s natural resources and foster public support for their protection. It should be noted that areas of critical habitat may provide visual access rather than physical access, or in-lieu access may be explored.

3.3.1 Wherever possible, retain existing marsh and tidal flats and restore or enhance wildlife habitat.

3.3.2 Plan public access in a way that balances the needs of wildlife and people, reducing or preventing adverse human and wildlife interactions while still providing public access to the shoreline where possible.

- Employ appropriate siting, design, and management strategies such as buffers or use restrictions.
- Use design elements such as varying trail widths, paving materials, and site amenities to encourage or discourage specific types of human activities.
- Provide spur trails to reduce informal access into and through more sensitive areas.
- Use durable materials to reduce erosion impacts on adjacent habitats and to keep users from creating alternate access routes.
- Periodic closures can be implemented to avoid effects on wildlife during sensitive periods such as breeding seasons.

3.3.3 Physical design features such as bridges and boardwalks that confine public use and provide predictability for wildlife can buffer wildlife from human use while still providing physical and visual access.

- Viewing platforms and fencing can allow some visual access while preventing physical access to both people and pets.

Bridges and boardwalks can confine public use to certain areas and provide predictability for wildlife.

This bird blind provides a viewing platform that offers the public visual access while minimizing the impact on animals.
## Washington Native Plants for Saltwater Habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achillea millefolium</td>
<td>Yarrow</td>
<td>4 inches - 3 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelanchier alnifolia</td>
<td>Serviceberry, Saskatoon</td>
<td>Up to 15 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilegia formosa</td>
<td>Red Columbine</td>
<td>Up to 3 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astrantia speciosa</td>
<td>Kinnikinnick, Bearberry</td>
<td>Up to 8 inches</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armeria maritima</td>
<td>Sea-Thrift</td>
<td>Up to 18 inches</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster subspicatus</td>
<td>Douglas Aster</td>
<td>Up to 32 inches</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex ovata</td>
<td>Slough Sedge</td>
<td>1 - 5 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilleja miniata</td>
<td>Red Paintbrush</td>
<td>8 - 32 inches</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerastium arvense</td>
<td>Field Chickweed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus douglasii</td>
<td>Black Hawthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschampsia cespitosa</td>
<td>Tufted Hairgrass</td>
<td>Up to 4 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleocharis palustris</td>
<td>Creeping Spikerush</td>
<td>Up to 3 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriophorum chamissonis</td>
<td>Chamisso's Cotton-grass</td>
<td>8 - 28 inches</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca rubra</td>
<td>Red Fescue</td>
<td>Up to 4 feet</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragaria chiloensis</td>
<td>Coastal Strawberry</td>
<td>Up to 10 inches</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaultheria shallon</td>
<td>Salal</td>
<td>3 - 7 feet</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindelia integrifolia</td>
<td>Entire-leaved Gumweed</td>
<td>Up to 32 inches</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum brachyantherum</td>
<td>Meadow Barley</td>
<td>Up to 3 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupinus polyphyllus</td>
<td>Large-leaved Lupine</td>
<td>3 - 6 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus fusca</td>
<td>Pacific Crabapple</td>
<td>16.5 - 40 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrica gale</td>
<td>Sweet Gale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picea sitchensis</td>
<td>Sitka Spruce</td>
<td>Up to 200 feet</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus contorta</td>
<td>Shore Pine</td>
<td>Up to 100 feet</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentilla anserina ssp. Pacifica</td>
<td>Silverweed</td>
<td>Up to 16 inches</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentilla gracilis</td>
<td>Graceful Cinquefoil</td>
<td>Up to 32 inches</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus parviflorus</td>
<td>Thimbleberry</td>
<td>Up to 10 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus maritimus</td>
<td>Seacoast Bulrush</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisyrinchium californicum</td>
<td>Golden-eyed Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago canadensis</td>
<td>Canada Goldenrod</td>
<td>Up to 5 feet</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Low Impact Development

Low impact development (LID) is an approach to stormwater management that emphasizes the conservation and use of existing natural site features integrated with distributed, small-scale stormwater control features to more closely mimic natural hydrologic conditions (Puget Sound Action Team, 2005. Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound). The use of LID techniques is highly encouraged along the Tacoma Waterfront, where feasible. Due to environmental constraints from industrial uses, however, LID will not be practicable for various sites along the shoreline. Please consult with the City of Tacoma Environmental Services Department before embarking on a LID project.

3.4.1 Reduce the amount of impervious surfaces by minimizing the building footprint, planning and grading the site to maintain natural drainage patterns and encourage the sheet flow of stormwater runoff over permeable areas, and using impervious surfaces such as permeable pavers or pervious concrete.

3.4.2 Whenever possible, preserve existing and provide new vegetated areas.

3.4.3 Direct stormwater runoff from impervious areas into vegetated or pervious areas on the site rather than into the City stormwater system.

- Soils used in stormwater control features should be appropriate for their intended function such as runoff infiltration, flow control, or water quality treatment.

3.4.4 Small-scale stormwater control features that use natural systems, processes, and materials are preferred.

- Such features include, but are not limited to: dry wells, filter strips, swales, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, soil amendments, tree-box filters, vegetated buffers, and green roofs.

3.4.5 Green (vegetated) roofs and green walls are highly encouraged along the Tacoma Waterfront.
3.5 Landscape Plantings

Landscape plantings are highly desirable along the Waterfront Walkway, roadways, and surface parking. Landscape plantings, besides just pleasing the senses, can perform many other functions. They can buffer pedestrians from passing vehicles, offer shade, provide wildlife habitat, and filter stormwater, to name but a few.

3.5.1 Native, drought-tolerant plantings are preferred (see list of native plants in Section 3.1, Green Shorelines).

3.5.2 Retaining existing trees in healthy condition and of appropriate species is encouraged.

3.5.3 Select plant varieties that require little maintenance for public improvements.

3.5.4 Landscape planting areas adjacent to the curb can buffer pedestrians from passing vehicles with street trees, low-growing landscape plantings, and groundcover.

3.5.5 Buffer parking areas from adjacent properties, the roadway, and the bicycle/pedestrian path with landscaped separators, where possible.

3.5.6 Encourage the use of plant materials within parking areas, provided views are not blocked.

3.5.7 Landscape plantings can be balanced with views by contemplating planting trees that, when mature, will not have canopies that significantly block pedestrian sight lines.

- Avoid planting trees that would require periodic topping to maintain views.

3.5.8 Use landscaping to enhance views and vistas and to screen undesirable features.

3.5.9 Trees are highly encouraged where appropriate.

- Trees should not block lighting fixtures.
- Evergreen trees provide enhanced year-round wildlife habitat, stormwater management, and protection from inclement weather.
- Deciduous trees provide fall color and allow for increased light penetration in winter.
3.5.10 Tree roots should be protected where they may be subject to damage.

- Tree wells should be flush with the paving and a minimum of 4 feet by 4 feet to allow adequate soil area for root growth.

- Structural soil should be installed under paving to allow tree roots to grow out of the tree well under the adjacent walkway without causing the pavement to heave or buckle.

- While not preferred, tree grates can be utilized for decorative purposes.

3.5.11 Coordinate public and private landscaping improvements to create a unified visual character and appearance.

3.5.12 Strongly encourage landscaping the Ruston Way roadway, where appropriate, to create a parkway imagery.

3.6 Art

The Tacoma Waterfront vision embraces public art projects, particularly at public access/view corridors, community gathering places, outlooks, and along the Waterfront Walkway. As many of the nation's most successful public art programs have demonstrated over the past decades, public spaces that bring people together are greatly enhanced by the introduction of art.

The Tacoma Waterfront Design Guidelines seek to integrate art that is clearly discernible as art, yet may also have a variety of other qualities, which may include:

- FUNCTION, such as shelter, safety, or lighting.

- PLAY, such as playground equipment, skateboard areas, bicycle racks, and objects for pets or children to interact with.

- EDUCATIONAL, engaging the history of the Tacoma Waterfront, its environmental state (both past and present), or the evolving functions of the shoreline.

- ENVIRONMENTAL, engaging sustainable materials/systems, such as bioswales, permeable paving, cisterns, solar, or wind.

- SENSORY/ACTIVE, engaging all or as many of the senses as possible of those interacting with the artwork.

Art greatly enhances public spaces and brings people together.
An important value for the Tacoma Waterfront is to strive to incorporate deeper levels of meaning into the art pieces that may or may not be discernible upon first glance. Of particular importance is to engage deeper levels of meaning in the waterfront area, including:

- HISTORY, especially maritime history.
- TRANSPORTATION, multi-modal and evolving.
- KINETICISM, especially regarding the rich marine movements of both natural and human systems.
- EXCHANGE and TRADE, as an international port.
- ENVIRONMENT, especially the rich and varied marine life present in the Foss and Commencement Bay.

3.6.1 The use of public art is highly encouraged, particularly at public access/view corridors, community gathering places, outlooks, and along the Waterfront Walkway.

3.6.2 Art, particularly when interactive or kinetic, should be sited at a location appropriate for its function and expected active and visual use.

3.7 Children’s Play Areas

Gathering areas can include a variety of play areas that may reflect the location through themes, such as maritime or working waterfront. Specific use areas require specific materials to comply with applicable codes and standards.

3.7.1 Children’s play areas and playgrounds should include elements to stimulate interactions, creativity, and imagination, such as play structures and materials that foster social play.

3.7.2 Play areas can be designed so that they are universally accessible for children with physical disabilities.
3.7.3 Tot lots can be provided for toddlers (ages 1–3) that offer age-appropriate play areas with different types of play components, allowing parents or guardians to interact or assist. These tot lots should be separated from other children’s play areas to prevent incidental accidents while still within sight distance so parents or guardians can oversee different age children simultaneously.

3.7.4 Preferred locations for play areas are as part of larger community gathering areas.

3.7.5 Play areas should be designed with consideration for a variety of children’s abilities and skills.

3.8 Site Furnishings

According to the Tacoma Municipal Code, all public access sites city wide shall provide site furnishings appropriate for the intended use of the access site, the estimated demand, site context, and hours of use. The following specific site furniture models are preferred for the Dome to Defiance shoreline. A palette of preferred site furnishings is presented below. Used together, these elements will define a unique and discernible identity for the Waterfront Walkway. However, alternative models can be used if they are of equivalent or better quality, design, or function. Alternative site furnishings can be used to create unique subdistricts within the larger Tacoma Waterfront.

Benches

3.8.1 Benches should be considered for public access/view corridors, community gathering places, parks, and at various locations along the Waterfront Walkway.

- At certain locations, benches are required. Please see the Tacoma Municipal Code.

3.8.2 One of the two design standard benches specified below should be used.

- The preferred reversible-back bench is FairWeather model TF-3.
- The preferred bench backless bench is FairWeather model TF-1.3.
- For both benches, arms should be forest green and galvanized. All other metal surfaces should be galvanized steel. Wood slats should be sustainably harvested ipe or cumaru, or other sustainably harvested wood.
- East Foss benches should be 4 feet in length.
Lighting

In times of limited visibility, artificial lighting has a tremendous influence on visual character and human activity. The lighting guidelines are intended to:

- Provide safe, well-lit pedestrian surfaces 24 hours a day.
- Reduce light pollution.
- Reinforce the marine industrial history and character of the waterfront.
- Address night lighting.

3.8.3 Coordinate public and private lighting standards to achieve a unified effect.

3.8.4 Areas specified below should provide the corresponding minimum average light level.

- Waterfront Walkway: 1 foot candle.
- Commercial areas: 1 foot candle.
- High-volume pedestrian areas (such as bus stops): 2 foot candles.
- Parking areas, entries: 2 foot candles.
- Parking areas, internal: 0.5 foot candles.

3.8.5 Encourage the use of energy-saving lighting methods.

3.8.6 Light levels, direction, and shielding can be used to avoid impacts on the shoreline environment and to reduce impacts on residential units.

3.8.7 The lighting fixture specified below should be used along the Waterfront Walkway, along public access/view corridors, and at outlooks.

- Se’lux MRTC-17-GV.
- In portions of the Walkway designated as esplanade, lights should be located on the waterward side of the esplanade at a maximum spacing of 60 feet on center.
- Walkway lights are not required at public access/view corridors or other public spaces where special location lighting may be provided.
3.8.8 Special location lighting can be used to identify prominent features, gathering spaces, or intersections.

3.8.9 Parking areas and pedestrian walkways should be illuminated to ensure user safety.

3.8.10 The following pedestrian streetlight guidelines should be used.

- Se’lux MRTC-19-GV
- Pedestrian streetlights should be located on the waterward side of the street at a maximum spacing of 80 feet on center.

3.8.11 Vehicular street lighting should be consistent per City standards.

3.8.12 In parking areas, lighting should be provided by non-glare, full cutoff, controlled-source fixtures per City standards.

3.8.13 Where lighting is appropriate along wooded trails, low-wattage or special area lighting should be used to reduce impacts on wildlife.

- Use lighted bollards or low-mounted fixtures for path lighting, as appropriate to minimize glare or unwanted shadows resulting from conflicts with vegetation.
- The following average light level should be used for wooded trails: 0.5 foot candles.

Bollards

Use bollards where they would facilitate the safe and efficient movement of vehicles and pedestrians.

3.8.14 The bollard shown should be used for typical applications.

- A 36-inch-tall, 8-inch-diameter, steel-pipe bollard with a conical steel top. All painted forest green (Pantone #5605C).
- Removable bollards are encouraged where appropriate.

3.8.15 For East Foss public access/view corridors or for special applications, the lighted bollard shown should be used.

- Louis Poulsen DOCK-B, natural aluminum.
Drinking Fountains

3.8.16 Public drinking fountains are encouraged to be adjacent to or integrated with buildings.

3.8.17 Where applicable, the drinking fountain shown should be used.
  • Haws 3500D, evergreen.

Picnic Tables

3.8.18 Where applicable, the picnic table shown should be used.
  • FairWeather model F-4

Bike Racks

3.8.19 The bike rack shown should be used.
  • Hess Tendo, galvanized steel

Waste Receptacles

3.8.20 The design standard recycling container should be used.

3.8.21 The waste receptacle shown should be used in most cases.
  • TimberForm Profile Series model 2894-P, with evergreen powder coat.
3.9 Surfacing Materials

Surfacing materials provide both continuity and variety for the Tacoma Waterfront. In general, surfacing should feature a higher design and construction quality than more typical projects. Special surfacing materials, such as cobblestones, decomposed granite, or pervious materials, are encouraged, with consideration for color and low impact development techniques (please see the Low Impact Development section of this chapter).

3.9.1 Active-use areas, such as the Waterfront Walkway and sidewalks, should typically use the surfacing specified below.

- Cast-in-place concrete with broom finish, hard-screed joints in a 4-foot by 4-foot grid pattern.

3.9.2 For boardwalks, the surfacing materials specified below are preferred.

- Six-inch-wide planks made of ipe or cumaru or other sustainably harvested wood.

3.9.3 Special surfacing materials, such as granite, cobblestones, and gravel may be used where the materials are appropriate for the intended use.

- Special surfacing materials are especially appropriate at crosswalks where the Waterfront Walkway must cross a street or driveway, and to distinguish the Walkway from adjacent private spaces.

Special surfacing materials above are used to distinguish portions of the Walkway. The materials are appropriate for the intended use of the spaces.

This cast-in-place concrete with a broom finish in a four-by-four foot grid along the Walkway is the standard surfacing material for active-use areas.
3.10 Fences/Screens

3.10.1 It is preferred that permanent fences erected to separate public from private areas are made of concrete, brick, metal, or other approved materials (not chain link) and maintain views rather than create a wall effect.

- Green (vegetated) fences are highly encouraged.
- Not applicable to industrial properties.

3.10.2 At industrial properties, the creative treatment or screening of chain-link fences and alternatives to chain-link fences are encouraged.

3.10.3 Permanent refuse, utility, or service installations should be screened with fences of wood, iron, concrete, landscape plantings, or other approved materials (not chain link) to the minimum height necessary.

- These installations should be located away from public spaces, particularly the Waterfront Walkway.
- Not applicable to industrial properties.

An example of successful screening of utilities in Tacoma. Screening is provided through the combination of a fence of wood and iron, not chain link, and landscape planting.

Several examples of permanent fences that are more attractive alternatives to chain link fences. The first two fences maintain views and incorporate landscape materials and artwork to improve the aesthetics of the site. The last fence is an example of how industrial properties can maintain site security without negatively impacting the adjacent sidewalk.
3.11 Marina Gates

3.11.1 Marina security gates should be located on access ramps or other locations where they do not impede public circulation, particularly circulation on the Waterfront Walkway.

3.11.2 Marina security gates should be transparent.

3.11.3 Provide safety and security without the use of industrial materials, such as razor wire, barbed wire, and chain-link fences.

3.12 Guardrails

Views of the water are an invaluable public resource along the Waterfront Walkway. The design of railings should therefore reflect the character of access along the Waterfront Walkway. Public access to the water should be provided for all people regardless of age or physical abilities. While sometimes necessary for safety, railings should, to the extent possible, not obstruct views. Railings can be reduced in height to allow children or those in wheelchairs unobstructed views. Railings can also be designed to increase transparency, limiting the width of rails and stanchions and reducing the amount of opaque materials. In some areas along the Walkway, it may be preferable to use low walls that serve a dual function of safety and providing seating.

3.12.1 Where possible, guardrails should be designed to provide visual access, encourage interaction with the water’s edge, and promote diverse shoreline treatment.

- To design guardrails that allow maximum views of the water, guardrails should not exceed 3.5 feet in height and should use no more than 30% opaque or solid elements.
- If under 2 feet, walls may be solid to encourage seating along the water.

3.12.2 Guardrails and handrails that relate to the architectural or landscape style of the public access area are preferred.

3.12.3 Materials that are high-quality, durable, and suitable for the marine environment that will resist rust over time should be used whenever possible.
3.13 Signs

Clear and consistent signs should direct the public to locations of interest along and adjacent to the Tacoma Waterfront.

Logos

3.13.1 The Thea Foss or Ruston Way design standard logos should be used on area signage, bike racks, waste receptacles, benches, and other Waterfront Walkway site details.

3.13.2 Where applicable, the logos shown here should be used.

Building Sites

3.13.3 Whenever possible, signs should be similar to the building and/or building site in design, color, and materials. Strong signage that clearly calls out the identity of users is encouraged.
**Directional**

3.13.4 Signs should be located, oriented, and scaled primarily for pedestrians.

3.13.5 Directional and location signs should identify civic buildings, community gathering places, public parks, and other locations of public interest.

3.13.6 Directional and location signs should identify the Waterfront Walkway. Such signs should use the City-approved Walkway signage.

- A directional sign should be posted where a public access corridor leading to the Walkway intersects a public street.
- A location sign should be posted where a public access corridor intersects the Walkway intersects, and at any other locations where a sign would assist the public in understanding the intended Walkway route.

3.13.7 Directional and location signs should identify shoreline public access locations not associated with the Waterfront Walkway. Such signs should use the state-approved shoreline public access signage shown at right.

**Educational/Interpretive**

3.13.8 Where appropriate, informational, educational, and interpretive signs relating to the history of the Tacoma Waterfront and Tacoma’s maritime history are encouraged.
3.14 Parking and Staging Areas

To improve the continuity of the waterfront, enhance public access, and ensure an attractive shoreline, parking and staging areas should be redeveloped over time. In general, no new surface parking lots should be developed, with the exception of industrial uses. New parking should be provided in structures as opposed to surface lots and should be located on the upland side from the Waterfront Walkway so as not to negatively impact the public realm.

3.14.1 Areas devoted to parking should be minimized and their visual impacts should be mitigated through siting, design, and careful planning.

- Parking can be provided in structured garages on the upland side of the Waterfront Walkway.

- Where appropriate, surface parking can be provided on the upland side of the Waterfront Walkway. Parking areas should be reasonably sized and adequately screened from pedestrian ways with landscaping, fencing, trellises, and/or walls.

- Large expanses of parking can be broken up visually by planted medians with shade trees. Medians should be located so that they buffer pedestrian circulation routes while still respecting views to the water.

- Rather than developing parking incrementally on a project-by-project basis, shared parking can be used to provide for the efficient utilization of valuable waterfront land.

3.14.2 Signage should be used to distinguish public parking and staging areas from private parking areas to ensure proper use.

3.14.3 Provide staging areas along the Waterfront Walkway for convenient access.

3.14.4 Points of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians and/or bicyclists should be minimized.

- Where possible, driveways can be consolidated by interconnecting parking and sharing parking to reduce the number of curb cuts.

- The paving of the pedestrian walk should be continuous to indicate that pedestrians have priority over vehicles crossing the Walkway.

- Vehicle access should have to ascend a driveway apron to reach level of pedestrian/bicycle travel.

- Carefully design parking areas to maximize the number of stalls provided while using a minimum of the limited available space.

Currently along Ruston Way, parking is often provided on the waterway side of the Walkway. This is not preferred as it reduces public access and poses points of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians and bicyclists.

The use of shade trees and landscaped islands should be used to break up large expanses of pavement and soften the visual impact of parking areas.
May 7, 2014

Appendix A: List of Commenters

Appendix B: Oral Testimony Received on March 19, 2014

Appendix C: Written Comments Received through March 21, 2014 and Supplemental Comments Received Thereafter
The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on March 19, 2014, concerning the Proposed 2014 Annual Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code and kept the record open through March 21, 2014 to accept written comments.

A Public Review Document was compiled and made available for public review prior to the public hearing. The document includes the complete text and staff analyses of the nine applications (or proposed amendments), the Preliminary Determination of Environmental Nonsignificance and the environmental checklist associated with the applications, as well as relevant background information.

This report was prepared for the Planning Commission’s review and discussion on April 2, April 16 and May 7, 2014. The 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 proposed amendments as contained in the Public Review Document. In addition to public comments, there are internal-review comments provided by various City departments. Those comments and the corresponding staff responses and suggestions are also compiled in the report.

The report includes three appendices. Appendix A provides a list of the commenters; Appendix B summarizes the oral testimony received at the public hearing on March 19, 2014; and Appendix C compiles written comments received through March 21, 2014 as well as supplemental comments received thereafter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Commenters (Appendix A)</th>
<th>Staff Responses and Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports the proposal.</td>
<td>Rose, Kingsbury, Pedersen/Mirra</td>
<td>• Support noted. Staff note that all the commenters expressed support for the MUC designation, including those who also raised specific questions or issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Calls for policies and mechanisms to provide for the inclusion of housing that is affordable to lower income households.</td>
<td>Pedersen/Mirra</td>
<td>• Comments noted. The Planning Commission has signaled that housing affordability is an important issue. The AHPAG’s support for the designation, along with their call to develop policies and mechanisms to provide for affordable housing is significant, as the AHPAG is the City Council’s appointed advocates on affordable housing. See below for additional discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicants provided summaries of their efforts to address two issues of significance to this proposal:

Transit:
- Bike storage being provided with current building permits; courting a bike shop;
- Preparing to comment on Pierce Transit’s 2040 Plan (having already provided transit improvements on Ruston Way).

Affordable Housing:
- Engaging with Tacoma Housing Authority to develop strategies for housing for people earning less than 80 percent Area Median Income (AMI);
- Exploring affordable housing types like micro-apartments, along with amenities like Zipcar and a bicycle shop;
- Analyzed rents in relation to the Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) Program;
- Drafted an informal market survey on micro-apartments.

• Comments noted. The Planning Commission had previously signaled that while Point Ruston is generally consistent with the City’s MUC goals and policies, two significant issues remain for further consideration—transit and affordable housing. The applicants had indicated their intention to work on these issues during the comment period. Their comments express a commitment to addressing them and lay out a list of actions.

• Staff note that providing transit service is outside the applicants’ direct control. They have built bus stop pads in preparation for future service on Ruston Way and are engaging with Pierce Transit’s planning efforts. Furthermore, the discussion has broadened to accommodating other alternatives to travel by car. The site is well-connected to bike/pedestrian facilities, and the applicants have asserted they are working on approaches such as Zipcar and bike rentals. In staff’s view, the characteristics of the development and the applicants’ commitments to take action substantially meet the transit-oriented and multi-modal intents of the MUCs.

• Likewise, staff note the applicants have expressed their commitment to a range of affordable housing strategies. Furthermore, based on comments received there is strong support for the MUC designation itself, even on the part of the AHPAG and another commenter who called attention to specific issues. On April 2nd, the Commission directed staff to work with the applicants on an approach that would move the MUC designation forward while providing assurances to the public that the affordable housing issues will be addressed. Staff and the applicants have collaborated on the following proposed approach:
  1. Designate Point Ruston as an MUC.
  2. Add a policy in the Comprehensive Plan indicating that the MFTE program will become available upon adoption of an affordable housing Development Agreement between the property owner and the City.
  3. Add a note to TMC 13.17 indicating that the MFTE program will become available subsequent to adoption of the Development Agreement.

• Point Ruston LLC has provided a letter including proposed policy language (attached).
Concerned about consistency with Shoreline Permit and FSEIS approvals. Cites instances in which the City is considering approving development actions that would depart from those approvals.

| White | Comments noted. Staff's analysis is that the issues raised here do not have direct bearing on the proposal to designate Point Ruston as a new MUC. Though the City of Ruston does identify a potential conflict with the amount of surface parking as it relates to the goals of the Mixed-Use Center, Ruston is primarily identifying potential conflicts between the attached site plan and the approved shoreline permit and existing FEIS. Long Range staff referred the comments to Jana Magoon, PDS Current Planning Manager, who provided the following response: The proposed designation of Pt. Ruston as a Mixed-Use Center does not alter the approved shoreline permits, the shoreline regulations applicable to the proposed development, or the existing FEIS. The City of Tacoma will continue to utilize the maps associated with the FEIS and approved shoreline permits to evaluate development of the site. Maps submitted with this application, in so much as they deviate from approved plans, are not approved through this process. |

| 2. Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies (Application #2014-02) | Hancock, Phillips | Support noted. |

4. Affordable Housing Policies and Regulations (Application #2014-06)

- Supports the code changes proposed, which will help to achieve affordable housing goals.
- The AHPAG is prepared to continue the review of affordable housing recommendations next year.

Pedersen/Mirra

- Support noted. This proposal is intended to implement AHPAG recommendations. The AHPAG helped to guide this effort as the City Council's appointed body working on affordable housing issues.
- Staff continue to meet regularly with the AHPAG with the intention of developing a package of recommendations for the inclusion in the 2015 Annual Amendments. The subjects will include Affordable Housing Incentives Code and Program, including bonuses and incentives; and, affordable building/residential infill strategies, including cottage housing, detached Accessory Dwelling Units, Planned Residential Districts updates, and other proposals.

Brown

- Supports the Small Lots proposals.
- Roof line options are limited for narrow houses, how will that issue be handled?

- Support and comments noted. The proposed amendments include minor modifications to the Small Lot Standards provisions on rooflines. The changes are intended to provide additional flexibility while meeting the intent of minimizing overshadowing of neighboring properties on small lots. Staff spoke with Mr. Brown and he stated he is comfortable with the proposed approach.

Rody

- Does not support requiring a street tree as part of small lot standards.

- Comments noted. The proposal would add a requirement that one street tree be planted on development of lots more than 10% smaller than the applicable standards. Street trees enhance residential neighborhood character and soften the built environment, which is appropriate with higher densities. Staff note that the proposed Landscaping Code updates would allow flexibility including the fee in lieu option if planting trees is problematic on a specific site.

5. Container Port Element (Application #2014-07)

Supports the proposal

McAbey

- Private terminals or transportation infrastructure are not addressed.
- Foss Peninsula is identified as a Transitional Zone.

Brackett

- Upon further discussion with the Chamber of Commerce and the Port of Tacoma, staff clarifies that the Container Port Element primarily addresses the “Port Industrial Area” pursuant to the Growth Management Act. Staff also suggests that “Transitional Zone” be revised as “Industrial/Commercial Buffer Area” throughout the draft Container Port Element.
### 6. Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element (Application #2014-08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments related to specific sections of the draft, including:</th>
<th>Coughlan/Cutting</th>
<th>Fraser, Sutalo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Open Space System – TPU and Port lands have a role</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>Staff concur with the majority of MPT’s and Ms. Sutalo’s comments. These comments will help ensure the OSHRE reflects recent progress and policy direction, which is one of the key objectives of this effort. Staff recommend the following changes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Update canopy cover goal to be consistent with “30 by 30”</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Clarify the Open Space System section as follows (page 7/230): This system of open space lands is made up of both public and private ownerships. On the public side, the City and Metro Parks are the primary owners of most of those lands categorized below. However in addition, the Tacoma School District owns school properties that serve residents’ recreation needs during non-school hours. The Port of Tacoma, Tacoma Public Utilities and other public agencies also manage open space and recreation assets…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Update community gardens program discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Change Policy OS-GI-1 Green Neighborhoods (page 15/238): Establish an achievable goal to increase the forest canopy cover by 2028 to a citywide percentage that achieves Tacoma’s vision as an environmentally sustainable community. Achieve 30 percent citywide tree canopy cover by the year 2030, as called for in the Urban Forest Policy Element. Determine the existing canopy coverage and Develop a process to monitor progress toward achieving the identified goal. Update the goal as progress is made. Amend the Comprehensive Plan to adopt the specific canopy goal once it is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Habitat stewardship outreach and training – reflect ongoing progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Update the Community Gardens discussion (page 16/239) to reflect the evolving relationships between the City, MPT and the Pierce Conservation District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Implementation and funding – reflect evolving roles among agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Update OS-HA-11 Habitat Stewardship Outreach and Training (page 21/244) to reflect ongoing progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Add the following to the Implementation and Funding section (page 23/246): Several City departments work in collaboration to achieve the objectives of the OSHRE, in partnership with MPT and other public agencies. In general, MPT is the primary provider of parks and recreation amenities. For the City’s part, the Environmental Services Department is in the lead for natural open space conservation and restoration, and the Planning and Development Services Department promotes active recreation. The City, Metro Parks and other agencies collaborate in multiple ways, and continue to explore collaborative approaches to better achieve Tacoma’s parks and open space vision and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Transfer of General Government Property – reflect evolving roles among agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Views – clarify policy direction on vegetation management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Plans for Specific Areas – clarify intent of this section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Measuring and Reporting Progress – provide more detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fraser, Sutalo |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Update OS-CW-2 Transfer of General Government Property (page 27/250) to reflect that properties deemed unnecessary for their current function should be evaluated for designation as open space, and in some cases for transfer to MPT or other entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Update OS-LF-12 Scenic Views – Private Benefit (page 29/252) to indicate that tree topping or removal on public land for private view benefit should not be allowed unless as part of a coordinated plan that achieves view, habitat, environmental, slope stability and other objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Update OS-LF-13 Scenic Views – Public Benefit (page 29/252) to indicate that significant public views are described in the Urban Forest Policy Element (see Policy UF-SA-1 Public Views Established, page UF-17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The intent of this section is to create a mechanism to formally recognize and keep track of adopted park and open space plans which were sponsored or developed by the City. This list will need to be updated as additional plans are created, and includes a &quot;catch-all&quot; reference to MPT’s Strategic Plan as a whole. No direct purview over MPT’s plans is intended or stated. However, this section does express general support for MPT’s plans which would become applicable when City actions affect them (such as partnerships, resource sharing, and discretionary permit review).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hansen |

|   | Invasive non-native plant species are harmful to habitat health. The City should allow more leeway for volunteers to promptly remove them, and should have maintenance in place to keep new populations from taking hold. |
|   | The City must be more proactive in preventing encroachments into community natural areas. |
|   | Comments noted. The OSHRE calls for removal of non-native, invasive plants and supports the Green Tacoma Partnership to empower volunteers. While the need is great, significant progress has been made to address invasive plants in open space areas. The Open Space Inventory is being transferred to Environmental Services Department in order to provide more resources for habitat restoration efforts. Code updates have made it significantly easier for volunteers to work within city open space. However, on the issue of City review there is a balance—it is also important to consult with City staff when working in critical areas and on public lands. The CAPO reflects that—many restoration activities are now allowed, but with PDS staff review. |
|   | The City has taken action numerous times in the past to address private encroachments into city-owned lands. As the Open Space Inventory is transferred to the Environmental Services Department, this issue can be further explored. |

| PDS |

<p>|   | Staff recommend adding an entry in the proposed Open Space Projects list for enhancements to Tollefson Plaza. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7. Sustainability Code Amendment</strong> (Application #2014-09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clark, Tremblay</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• View UWT as a campus and provide flexibility to meet new requirements within the campus footprint and not at a building by building level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A new building on campus should not trigger campus wide improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide flexibility for providing ADA capable EV parking spaces when ADA parking spaces are not present or feasible due to site constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Sustainable Tacoma Commission supports the adoption of the proposed amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should also include actions to protect and sustain the City’s natural areas and green belts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify that single-family housing is specifically exempted from the proposed electric vehicle requirements, as intended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multifamily housing typically utilizes assigned parking spaces, which creates additional logistical complexity and potential cost impacts for providing EV charging infrastructure. Lafranca

The proposal would require electric vehicle capacity for 10% of the parking spaces provided. The proposal does not specifically require that these spaces be designated up front, but rather that the electrical capacity and infrastructure is provided in such a manner that 10% of the parking stalls could be converted for EV use in the future. This may entail running conduit to multiple levels of a parking garage such that wiring could be extended to specific parking spaces in the future.

In reviewing the proposals and the public comments, there are several alternatives that the Commission could consider:

i. First, clarifying the standards such that it is clear that specific parking spaces are not required to be designated for EV or equipped with the infrastructure.

ii. Amending the proposed code to require only the conduit and junction box. This may allow some accommodation for Level 2 chargers in the future as new development typically includes excess electrical capacity, without imposing additional costs for transformers or electrical panels/subpanels.

iii. Reducing the quantity requirement (from 10% to 5%) or changing the requirement from the amount of “parking provided” to the amount of parking required, which would effectively reduce the area in which the code applies.

iv. Lastly, the Commission could consider tabling all or some portion of the amendments. However, staff feels that there is strong policy support currently in the Comprehensive Plan for supporting the development and use of non-pollution generating modes of transportation. In the public testimony, the primary concerns have been with the application of the code to multifamily dwellings, not commercial or other institutional uses. Therefore, the Commission could consider reduced standards or tabling the standards for multi-family and proceeding with the standards for design/location/accessibility as well as quantity requirements for non-residential uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should consider utilizing incentives to promote EV rather than regulations</td>
<td>Lafranca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the proposal does not provide additional incentives, an incentive-based strategy has been deployed nationally and state-wide. According to a report published by the Western Washington Clean Cities Coalition and the Washington State Plug-In Electric Vehicle Task Force in 2011, state market incentives include multiple sales tax exemptions and exemptions from leasehold excise taxes. In addition, the build out of public EV infrastructure in Washington State is occurring at a rapid pace, providing improved access to charging stations to extend trips. In 2009 Ecototality was awarded over $100 million from the U.S. Department of Energy to deploy chargers in major cities and metropolitan areas. The project provided 8,300 residential level 2 charging stations through grants and over 6,300 public-use level 2 charging stations. Lastly, according to the “Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan for the State of Washington,” Washington State benefits from several competitive advantages in the EV market, including an ideal climate for batteries and low electricity prices compared to other regions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring EV infrastructure is wasteful when markets can change quickly and technology is constantly changing.</td>
<td>Lafranca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While other technologies may be introduced into the auto market, there is an existing, and growing, market for plug-in electric vehicles. Both federal and state policies support the continued development of plug-in electric vehicle infrastructure and forecasts are optimistic that vehicle sales will continue to increase. Over the past 5 to 10 years there has been a convergence in plug-in vehicle technology, and while there are still exceptions, most major automakers are utilizing the same standards for charging systems. The proposal addresses only plug-in electric vehicles and does so in a way that is consistent with market forecasts, which expect growth in plug-in electric vehicles sales but with an expectation that these sales will still only represent a fraction of the vehicles on the road. One distinction between plug-in electric vehicles and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles is that the plug-in electric vehicles require a more decentralized fueling system, typically at a place of residence or a destination, whereas refueling of hydrogen cell vehicles will still occur at fueling stations. It is unlikely that the City’s land use regulations would need to be updated to accommodate hydrogen fuel cell vehicles as the City currently regulates fueling stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Advisory Group believes the proposed bicycle facility requirements are a huge step forward for active transportation in Tacoma. Applauds efforts to support non-pollution generating transportation options.</td>
<td>Cook, Symer, Halverson, Kuehn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support is noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend reconsidering how the proposals apply to existing parks and popular destinations to assure that the facilities are available for the public.</td>
<td>Cook, Symer, Halverson, Kuehn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Staff Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Supports bicycle parking requirements and would like to see the City promote more car-sharing opportunities.</td>
<td>Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for the proposed updates.</td>
<td>Coughlin/Cutting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • The City must not allow any tree cutting in public areas, especially in natural areas.  
  • Planting native trees should have precedent, planting non-native trees near natural areas destabilizes the habitat. | Hansen | • Comments noted. The OSHRE and Urban Forest Policy Elements provide the City's policy direction on these issues. While both call for strong protection for trees on public lands, they also recognize that other considerations including public views, addressing hazards and public access must be balanced with this goal.  
  • Comments noted. Staff note planting natives is allowed but not required in the proposed code updates. Natives are not always the most appropriate choice. However, these comments raise an important issue in regards to tailoring development standards, including landscaping requirements, within designated Habitat Corridors to better promote habitat health. This issue will be continued in future policy discussions. Meanwhile, the City has made progress on developing best management practices for city-owned natural areas. |
| Questions regarding requiring utilities to provide street trees:  
  • Recognizes the City’s intent to improve streetscapes through tree planting (Payne).  
  • Utilities projects that replace sidewalks should be exempt from street trees requirements (Prussen).  
  • Utility ratepayers should not be required to pay for street trees.  
  • It is reasonable for utilities to replace anything damaged or removed (Payne). | Payne, Guthrie, Prussen | Comments noted. The street trees proposal is based on the following logic:  
  • Through multiple actions, the City Council has made it clear that street, sidewalk and right-of-way improvements are to follow the principles and guidelines of Complete Streets. Per the City’s guidelines, a Complete Street includes street trees as a basic component.  
  • Through this effort it has been established that the City is expected to lead by example. Consistent with that intent, it follows that the public sector should generally be treated in at least an equivalent manner as the private sector in terms of development requirements. In the case of streets, leading by example clearly includes implementing Complete Streets principles including street trees. Pursuant to Complete Streets principles, this proposal would require street trees in association with new subdivisions of land for private development. Street trees are already often required with development of property and buildings.  
  • Staff note that the Environmental Services and Public Works Departments have initiated an update to Title 9 which provides direction on trees in public rights-of-way. There will be an opportunity through that effort to revisit the Landscaping Code to ensure consistency and to revisit the policy issues. |
If utilities providers are required to meet street tree requirements, the following comments apply:

1. Avoid conflicts with infrastructure and utilities.
2. Clarify thresholds for when requirements apply.
3. Planting and maintenance of trees would have staffing and cost impacts.
4. What this really means for utilities doing work in the right of way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payne, Guthrie, Prussen</th>
<th>1. Comments noted. While space is limited within rights-of-way, the proposal seeks to avoid or minimize landscaping and infrastructure conflicts by requiring adequate space and conditions based on tree size and species, and by requiring specific separations from utilities and infrastructure. Staff note the recommendation to increase the separation requirement from utilities to 10 feet. However, this could greatly limit the area available for tree plantings. Similarly, it is staff’s understanding that large trees can be appropriate within the right-of-way when the requirements are met. Therefore, no changes are recommended at this time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Comments noted. Staff concur that the following language provides a more functional threshold and recommend that the following replace the current draft language in Section 13.06.502.B.2.b (page 18/340). Street trees are required when:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Constructing new permanent roadways, excluding residential Local Improvement Districts; alterations to the width of existing permanent roadways; constructing new sidewalk; replacing more than 50% of an existing sidewalk along a site’s frontage (when 50 linear feet or more is being constructed). In the case of sidewalk replacement, street trees shall be required proportionate to the linear footage of sidewalks replaced. In addition, include the following definition in Section 3.06.700.P: Permanent Roadway. Roadway constructed with a designed full depth subgrade and road surface section with an established curb and gutter alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Comments noted. It is clear that planting, maintaining through establishment and replacing street trees will have staffing and cost implications. While some utilities providers do not currently do this type of work, others do. This may lead to a discussion about collaborating to meet the planting and/or maintenance requirements. Similarly, staff recognize that interfacing with property owners also takes resources. The City’s Urban Forestry Program is one resource to support those efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. In summary, street trees would be required for full new permanent roadways and substantial sidewalk segments, not for maintenance, partial roadway improvements or other utility projects. Utility providers would, over time, see some increases in staffing and funding dedicated to street trees. However, collaboration with other agencies may help, and the flexibilities of the proposed Landscaping Code may also provide solutions to specific challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• No concerns. | • Noted. |
MPT provided comments on the following issues:

1. Plant material selection – natives, climate-adapted, invasive species, avoid utility conflicts
2. Tree variety – must be achieved on a city-wide scale
3. Credits and flexibility – Tree Retention

1. Comments noted. Requiring climate-adapted species simply means it is more likely that plants will survive. The definition of noxious weeds is included in the Definitions section. Staff concur that a future update of Title 9 is necessary to make the two sections consistent. Staff concur that proposed TMC 13.06.502.C.2 Plant Material Selection, e. Trees (2) should be updated to... varieties that do not exceed 25 feet in height at 25 years of age (page 20/342). Staff will develop a Climate-adapted definition and provide it at the next Commission meeting.

2. Comments noted. MPT raises excellent points in regards to the advantages of achieving variety on a city-wide scale. However, city-scale approaches require advance planning (called for in the Urban Forest Policy Element but not yet completed) and City resources. Furthermore, in staff’s view there are still significant benefits to be achieved from tree species diversity at the site level. These include reduced risk from disease, habitat health, and (in some cases) aesthetic benefits.

Staff recognize that boulevards planted all in a single species are often highly regarded. However, a large development site planted entirely with a single species has not been cited as an example of attractive landscaping. The tree variety requirement is already in the code and has not generated concerns from the development community. Furthermore, we understand that the aesthetic feeling of a majestic boulevard with consistent trees can be achieved with multiple species. Finally, flexibility options in the proposed code allow for streetscape, area-specific or self-managed agency plans to depart from the General Standards so long as the overall intent is met.

3. Staff concur and recommend the following change to TMC 13.06.502.D.2 Tree Retention: Remove the minimum 6 inch size requirement for tree retention credit and allow trees of the same size for equal credits (page 22/344).
4. Credits and flexibility – Self-managed Agencies

Fraser, Sutalo

4. Comments noted. Staff met with MPT to discuss the provisions of the Self-managed Agency section. We understand that MPT wishes this tool to be a major incentive for public agencies to engage in urban forest planning, and one with as straightforward process as possible. Staff developed the following refinements to the draft based on MPT’s input (page 22/344):

TMC 13.06.502.D.6. Self-managed Agencies. An optional process for additional flexibility is available for public agencies with urban forestry programs and plans. This option is intended to encourage public agencies to take a leadership role in implementing urban forestry goals and policies. This flexibility can facilitate more intensive development of a particular development site, while meeting the urban forestry policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the intent of the landscaping code by planting the required landscaping at another site in the agency’s permanent control.

a. To initiate this optional process, public agencies must submit a request to PDS to be designated as a self-managed agency, including the agency’s urban forestry plan, an overview of its urban forestry program, and an analysis demonstrating general consistency with the Urban Forest Policy Element of the Comprehensive Plan and landscaping code. The request must designate the areas where required landscaping would be planted. The general landscaping requirements of this section apply. Plantings already required by a separate regulatory authority may not count toward meeting the requirements of this section. Upon review, the Director will issue a Determination regarding the consistency of the request with the Comprehensive Plan and code intent. If approved, the Determination shall grant self-managed agency status for up to five ten years, subject to reevaluation. The Director reserves the right to withdraw the self-managed agency status should the intent not be met.

b. Self-managed agencies may choose to plant landscaping required as part of a particular development proposal in a another location specified in per their urban forestry plan. This flexibility can be utilized at the agency’s discretion on subsequent site-specific development proposals. Each request to utilize this process as part of a development proposal review shall make reference to the approved Determination, be supported by running totals of landscaping planted in this manner, and include status updates on ongoing health of such landscaping.

c. Landscaping Buffers, when required, must be provided on the development site and cannot be shifted to another site. In addition, to the extent feasible, some portion of required street trees and parking lot landscaping shall be planted at the development site, or if shifted from the development site shall be planted in proximity to impervious surfaces, in order to achieve commensurate stormwater benefits.
| 5. Overall site planting – required number too high for tree growth | Fraser, Sutalo | 5. Comments noted. Staff note that in an urban environment, trees tend not to live as long and therefore reach their full potential size. The proposed number of trees required (one Small Tree per 200 sf, one Medium Tree per 300 sf, and one Large tree per 400 sf) was established using the current requirement of one tree per 300 sf as the starting point. Thus, the proposal does not necessarily increase the required number of trees. In addition, staff note that trees required according to these ratios may overhang parking lots or other areas. However, staff note that the Overall Site Requirement may prove challenging to park and open space sites under the proposal since parks are often planted with grass and trees (rather than shrubs) to increase visibility and accessibility. Therefore staff recommend exempting Park and Open Space uses from the Overall Site Landscaping requirement (page 23/345). |
| 6. Buffers – required number too high for tree growth | | 6. Comments noted. There is a balance to be struck between short-term visual screening and long-term growth potential. In the case of the Buffer requirement, screening is explicitly the primary intent. Therefore, the requirements are calibrated to maximize short-term screening. That being said, staff recognize that the prescriptive standards of this section could limit plant selection and design options. Therefore, staff recommend that an additional option be added to the buffers section (TMC 13.06.502.E (page 25/347) allowing alternative planting plans that meet the intent of providing a substantial vegetated buffer (for the Commission’s consideration – 50% within 5 years and 80% at full maturity). |

| • Clarify exemptions in the Landscaping requirements table. | PDS Staff | • Staff recommend the following changes: TMC 13.06.502.E – Exemptions: (1) Single, two and three-family developments, unless in association with a full plat or a short plat with 5-9 lots, are exempt from all landscaping requirements (page 23/345). |
| Self-Managed Agencies – planting should be within the city | Planning Commission 04-02-14 | Modify TMC 13.06.502.D.6. Self-managed Agencies to indicate that landscaping planted in alternative sites must be located within the City of Tacoma. |
| Planting strips less than 4 feet wide | Planning Commission 04-02-14 | Modify TMC 13.06.502.C.2 Plant Material Selection, and TMC 13.06.502.C.3 Installation and Maintenance to allow trees to be planted in existing planting strips a minimum of 3 feet in width (reduced from 4 feet in the draft proposal), with additional staff review for species selection to avoid infrastructure conflicts. |
| Native Plant selection adjacent to Habitat Corridors | Planning Commission 04-02-14 | Modify TMC 13.06.502.C Plant Material Selection to require native plant selection as follows: • Within designated Habitat Corridors: At least 50% native species. • Adjacent to Habitat Corridors (within 20 feet): At least 25% native species. • Allow flexibility to follow adopted plans to address slope stability, habitat health, streetscape or area-wide plans. |

- Concern over the proposed setback requirements for pipestem lots as it could limit the size of buildings which would inhibit development and counteract the Growth Management Act.

- Mr. Lafranca also objected to the proposed height restriction for pipe stem lots which would restrict the height of homes built to 25 feet or no more than the average height of the dwellings on each abutting property line.

- Staff’s analysis has shown that the proposed setback requirement 10 feet on all sides in all districts with the exception of 15 feet in the R-1 District will, in most cases, result in a narrower building footprint but will not result in a reduction of building area and will often result in a larger building footprint. The smallest footprint a home could have on a newly created pipe stem lot would be 30 feet by 80 feet on a 50 x 100 foot lot (the narrowest lot width allowed). See below for illustrations of how building footprints on pipestem lots would change through the proposed regulation. The intent of the setback regulation is to provide additional buffering for adjacent properties due to the varied building orientation of buildings on pipe stem lots and proximity to other existing development. An example of this is where a side lot line abuts a rear or side lot of the adjacent lot.

- The proposed language regarding the height limitation of buildings on pipe stem lots to 25 feet or no more than the average height of the dwellings on each abutting property is to address neighborhood cohesiveness and character. The proposed regulation will allow new buildings on pipe stem lots the same rights as abutting property owners while ensuring new buildings are in-line with the existing character of the neighborhood.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarify Designated Pedestrian Streets within the South Downtown Subarea Plan Boundaries</th>
<th>PDS Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A code change recommended in the South Downtown Subarea Plan is the designation of primary pedestrian streets in the South Downtown Subarea Plan area. Within the Downtown Districts of South Downtown the only designated Primary Pedestrian Street is Pacific Avenue, north of South 25th Street. As South Downtown gains population and employment, the numbers of pedestrians are anticipated to increase. To meet this need additional streets were identified for Primary Pedestrian Street Designation and are proposed through this Code Cleanup Application:  
  ✓ South Jefferson Avenue between South 21st Street and South 25th Street  
  ✓ South 25th Street between I-705 and South Fawcett Avenue  
  ✓ East ‘C’ Street  
  ✓ South ‘C’ Street  

Further, as the Urban Commercial Mixed-Use – Tacoma Dome (UCX-TD) was rezoned to the Downtown District zoning designation of Downtown Mixed-Use (DMU), pedestrian streets associated with the former UCX-TD zoning were removed. It is the intent of the South Downtown Subarea Plan to redesignate these streets as Primary Pedestrian Streets consistent with the Downtown District code, Tacoma Municipal Code section 13.06A.052. The streets which will be redesignated/remain primary pedestrian streets in the Dome District are:  
  ✓ Puyallup Avenue - All portions within the downtown mixed-use center  
  ✓ East 25th Street - All portions within the downtown mixed-use center  
  ✓ East 26th Street - All portions within the downtown mixed-use center  
  ✓ East D Street - All portions within the downtown mixed-use center |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of the boundary of the Regional Growth Center</th>
<th>PDS Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The boundary of the Downtown Regional Growth Center has been adjusted to reflect the removal of the northern half of the land area on the west side of the Thea Foss waterway. (Map for illustration purposed only)  

Subsequently, all Downtown Regional Growth Center maps within the Comprehensive Plan will be redrawn accordingly. This will affect maps listed within the following Comprehensive Plan Elements:  
  ✓ Proposed Container Port Element (Application #2014-07)  
  ✓ Growth Strategy and Development Concept  
  ✓ Generalized Land Use  
  ✓ Transportation  
  ✓ South Downtown Subarea Plan |
The Health Department has no objections to the proposal as presented.

The Department of Ecology recognizes this is a non-project action and recommends that:

- Developers or city planners contact Ecology to determine if the property or facilitates planned for development have known or suspected environmental contamination;
- Consider adopting future policies related to the Tacoma Smelter Plume; and
- Include the Ecology’s procedures and guidelines associated with the Model Toxics Control Act as conditions of approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harp</th>
<th>Ecology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment noted</td>
<td>The City does contact the Ecology through such venues as the pre-application process and the SEPA comment periods, and keeps track of the consent decree or agreed order under the Model Toxics Control Act in association with the individual projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Environmental Policy Element of the Comprehensive Plan contains policies speaking to the prevention of contamination and cleanup of identified contaminated sites through partnership with the Ecology to improve the quality of Tacoma’s environment. Such policies include E-ER-1 Comprehensive Cleanup Strategies, E-ER-2 Contaminated Sites, E-FW-23 Superfund Cleanups, and E-ER-7 Intergovernmental Partnerships. The City may consider adding future policies addressing specific sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The conditions from the Ecology are dependent on the specific project. The City is in the process of discussing with the Ecology about how and when to require soil testing and work under the Model Toxics Control Act for compliance with the contaminant cleanup standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices:

### A. List of Commenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Testimony Received at the Public Hearing on March 19, 2014 (listed in order of testifying)</th>
<th>Subjects of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Milt Tremblay, University of Washington Tacoma</td>
<td>Sustainability Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jeremiah Lafranca, Master Builders Association</td>
<td>Sustainability Code; Plan and Code Cleanup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Katherine Sutalo, Metro Parks Tacoma</td>
<td>Open Space Element; Urban Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Curtis Hancock, Metro Parks Tacoma</td>
<td>Point Defiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kell McAboy, Port of Tacoma</td>
<td>Container Port Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Christine Phillips, BCRA</td>
<td>Point Defiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. J. J. McCament, Point Ruston</td>
<td>Point Ruston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Comments Received by March 21, 2014 (listed by last names in alphabetic order)</th>
<th>Subjects of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reggie Brown(^{(1)})</td>
<td>March 7, 2014 Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reggie Brown(^{(2)})</td>
<td>March 7, 2014 Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Patrick Clark, University of Washington Tacoma</td>
<td>March 21, 2014 Sustainability Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loren Cohen, Point Ruston</td>
<td>March 19, 2014 Point Ruston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Phil Coughlan and Nick Cutting, Sustainability Tacoma Commission</td>
<td>March 11, 2014 Open Space; Sustainability Code; Urban Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Doug Fraser, Metro Parks Tacoma</td>
<td>March 21, 2014 Urban Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Doug Fraser, Metro Parks Tacoma</td>
<td>March 21, 2014 Urban Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mark Guthrie, Tacoma Public Utilities - Water</td>
<td>February 27, 2014 Urban Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Scott Hansen, Puget Creek Restoration Society</td>
<td>March 21, 2014 Open Space; Sustainability Code; Urban Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Brad Harp, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department</td>
<td>March 11, 2014 SEPA Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ken Kingsbury, West End Neighborhood Council</td>
<td>November 18, 2013 Point Ruston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Gary Pedersen and Michael Mirra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kari Prussen, Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ken Rody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Leslie Ann Rose, Citizens for a Healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Rob White, City of Ruston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Gary Brackett, Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Loren Cohen, Point Ruston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Jeremiah Lafranca, Master Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Summary of Oral Testimony Received at the Public Hearing on March 19, 2014**

**C. Written Comments Received during the Comment Period through March 21, 2014, and Supplemental Comments Received Thereafter**
Summary of Oral Testimony
Received at Planning Commission Public Hearing
March 19, 2014

(1) Milt Tremblay, University of Washington Tacoma:
Mr. Tremblay thanked the Commission and staff for working with the University through the annual amendment process. He stated that for the most part the changes proposed are positive and the University supports and even wants to go above and beyond the requirements. He suggested that the City continue to look at the University as a campus; for example, regarding the bicycle parking and electric vehicle parking, not every building on the campus may need to meet these requirements, if the requirements are already met at a neighboring building.

(2) Jeremiah Lafranca, Master Builders Association (MBA):
Mr. Lafranca thanked the Commission and staff for working on the amendments and for keeping the MBA and the Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group involved in the process. Regarding the application of “Sustainability Code Amendment”, Mr. Lafranca pointed out that the electric vehicle parking requirements for multi-family housing may become a logistical issue if the spots are installed before the residents move in, which may cause additional cost later if they need to be moved, and that electric vehicles should not be government regulated, but an incentive-based program, as the future of electric vehicles is uncertain with other new energy-efficient vehicles emerging. Regarding the application of “Plan and Code Cleanup”, Mr. Lafranca was concerned that the proposed setback requirements for pipestem lots would limit the size of buildings which would inhibit development and counteract the Growth Management Act.

(3) Jennifer Chin:
Ms. Chin expressed her desire for more car-sharing opportunity in Tacoma, as well as much more bicycle parking.

(4) Katherine Sutalo, Metro Parks Tacoma (MPT):
Ms. Sutalo expressed appreciation to staff for collaborating with MPT and other agencies to work on the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element and the Urban Forestry Landscaping Code Update. She stated that MPT is concerned that the Overall Site Landscaping Requirements would not leave the trees enough space to grow; that the Plant Materials Selection would not achieve the intent and would actually foster less diversity of trees; and that tree diversity would best be addressed City-wide and not lot-by-lot. She also commented that the Self-Managed Agency provisions that MPT worked with the City to create in January are not reflected in the final proposal and that the current language calls for more detailed oversight of agencies by the City. MPT looks forward to working with City Staff to create a version of the Self-Managed Agencies provisions that better reflect the cooperative relationship that MPT has with the City and other agencies.

(5) Curtis Hancock, MPT:
Mr. Hancock spoke in favor of the Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies. He pointed out that Point Defiance is an obvious destination in itself and that the Development Regulation Agreement (DRA) is an excellent vehicle to facilitate the continued development of the park, rather than using piecemeal conditional use permits.

(6) Jennifer Halverson Kuehn, Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Advisory Group (BPTAG):
Ms. Kuehn expressed BPTAG's support to the Sustainability Code Amendment, particularly bicycle parking related provisions. BPTAG applauds the City in their effort to recognize and encourage transportation modes that have the least environmental impact. BPTAG believes that adopting these policies will advance the vision of the Mobility Master Plan and create a healthier living environment for the residents of the City.
Kell McAboy, Port of Tacoma:
Ms. McAboy expressed the Port of Tacoma’s support for the new Container Port Element and thanked City staff for collaborating with the Port in developing the element.

Christine Phillips, BCRA:
Ms. Phillips pointed out that BCRA has been working with MPT and the City on the proposed amendments associated with the application of “Point Defiance Park Land Use Policies” and setting the foundation for the Development Regulation Agreement, which is a big-picture plan that includes indication for environmental mitigations and covers all aspects of major development of the Point Defiance Park for the next 20 years.

Kris Symer, BPTAG:
Ms. Seymour commented that BPTAG would like to see an enhancement in bicycle parking within public spaces, and make sure this is happening even when no new or significant infrastructure is occurring.

J. J. McCament, Point Ruston:
Ms. McCament thanked the Commissioners and staff for visiting Point Ruston in December 2013. She provided a follow-up on the issues raised in December relating to transit and affordable housing. Regarding transit, Point Ruston has started construction on Building 1A, which will provide ample parking for cars, bicycles, motorcycles, along with the recruitment of a company that would rent and/or sell bicycles for people to use along the Waterwalk. Point Ruston is also preparing a response to Pierce Transit’s Long-Range Plan 2040, indicating that the LID improvements on Ruston Way include bus stops. Regarding affordable housing, Point Ruston has discussed with the Tacoma Housing Authority on ways to provide affordable housing for those earning less than 80% of Average Median Income. Point Ruston has also done research about regional micro-apartments, analyzed current rents at Point Ruston in context of the 2014 Affordable Housing Availability and Income Limits, looked at competitive properties that are using the multifamily tax-exemption, and drafted an informal survey to gain information regarding the local acceptance of micro-apartments.
Hey Elliot,

This is a great idea. It will have a great impact on small lot development. There are several properties that I would like to purchase right now that fit this criteria. How soon can it go into affect if adopted? Would they consider some test examples?

Thanks
Reggie

---

Hi Reggie, my pleasure I thought you would be interested!

Here’s the most recent packet. The official version will be released next Wednesday, but I don’t anticipate any changes to this version. It will be out for public review from now until March 21st and I’d welcome any questions, comments or suggestions. Let us know if you think this is a good idea. The small lot items are in there with several other issues.

All the best,
Elliott

Elliott Barnett
Associate Planner
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98407
(253) 591-5389

Hey Elliot,
Thanks for the info.
Reggie
One more thing Elliot. How will roof lines be handled. The roof line options become somewhat limiting with 25ft wide home. Gable roof north south or a hip roof north south.

Hi Reggie, my pleasure I thought you would be interested!

Here’s the most recent packet. The official version will be released next Wednesday, but I don’t anticipate any changes to this version. It will be out for public review from now until March 21st and I’d welcome any questions, comments or suggestions. Let us know if you think this is a good idea. The small lot items are in there with several other issues.

All the best,
Elliott

Elliott Barnett
Associate Planner
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98407
(253) 591-5389

Hey Elliot,
Thanks for the info.
Reggie
To: City of Tacoma Planning Commission

From: Pat Clark

RE: 2014 Code Revisions

As mentioned at Wednesday night’s Planning Commission hearing, the University of Washington Tacoma will continue to partner with the City of Tacoma in supporting citizen’s access and ability to utilize alternative forms of transportation, as well as provide landscaping that enables a sustainable environment.

In the spirit of partnership we request the following measures be codified in a way that is both measured and reasonable. Here are a few bullet points for your consideration:

1. **VIEW UWT AS A CAMPUS** - The Downtown Area-wide Subarea Plan is a strong example of how to support the growing and diverse needs of a campus. UWT, because of its size, complexity and continual growth does not have the fiscal and physical flexibility to incorporate every site specific upgrade, on a building-by-building level. We do, however, have the ability and desire to comply with required and aspirational improvements within the campus footprint.

2. **PROVIDE FOR INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT** - Many of the tables provided in the proposed code updates are more aspirational than practical in terms of required quantities. This is particularly true for the number of E/V charging stations, bike racks and street trees. As a minor tenant improvement does not trigger a full building upgrade, a new building on our campus should not require the total number of required elements that are identified for an entire campus. We commit to provide these elements as they become needed, but installing specified numbers, campus-wide, that are currently listed is not only fiscally impractical, but it could severely impact our ability to provide for other programmatic needs, thus our ability to serve students.

3. **Allow for Physical Realities in Requirements** - As you are well aware, our campus, like much of Tacoma, is built on a hillside. The total elevation change between Pacific Avenue and Tacoma Way, within our campus footprint, is 160 feet (The equivalent of 16 stories). Due to this significant grade change, many of our parking lots have a cross-slope that makes it extremely difficult to site a compliant ADA parking spot within that particular lot’s footprint. In treating UWT as a campus, we have been able to accommodate the needs of individuals with disabilities, by aggregating our ADA parking on those lots that meet the slope and grade requirements. This could impact our ability when developing ADA accessible or "capable" Electric Vehicle ("EV") parking spaces in the future.

On behalf of the University of Washington Tacoma, we thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback that enables the City of Tacoma in developing sensible codes and regulations. If you have any questions, please contact Milt Tremblay at (253) 692-4754 or at milt@uw.edu.

Sincerely,

PATRICK D. CLARK, RPA, CCIM
Director Campus Planning & Real Estate
University of Washington-Tacoma

Box 358431 1900 Commerce Street Tacoma, WA 98402
tel 253.692.5660 fax 253.692.5661 http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/finance-administration/division-finance-administration
March 19, 2014

TO: Chair Sean Gaffney, Tacoma Planning Commission

FROM: Loren Cohen, Point Ruston

RE: Point Ruston MUC Application – Public Hearing

First, thank you to the Tacoma Planning Commission for making the time to tour Point Ruston last December; it was our pleasure to host the group and we never turn down an opportunity to show folks what we’ve been doing to redevelop the former Asarco site into a vibrant urban neighborhood.

The December 18 memo we provided to the Commission provided specific information regarding our efforts to address transit and affordable housing at Point Ruston. The following brief summary will update you on our continuing efforts.

Transit
- Construction began in January 2014 on Building 1A, which includes a 9-screen Century Theatre, 10,000 sq. ft. of ground floor retail, 138 residences and 275 parking stalls. Ample on-site parking / storage for bicycles, motorcycles, and vanpools continues to be a priority, along with the recruitment of a bicycle shop that would sell and rent bikes for those wishing to cycle the Waterwalk, and points beyond.
- Pierce Transit’s Long Range 2040 Plan year-long planning process was kicked off in February, and Point Ruston is preparing a response to Pierce Transit’s request for stakeholder input. As transit funding is restored and expanded in the future, Point Ruston’s recent transit improvements built on Ruston Way as part of the Point Ruston LID are in place and ready for use.

Affordable Housing
Since our meeting with the Commission in December, Point Ruston has:
- Met with the Tacoma Housing Authority to discuss working together to provide affordable housing for those earning less than 80% of Area Median Income (AMI). Representatives from Point Ruston and THA are following up to identify opportunities, stumbling blocks, and process.
- Gathered information regarding regional micro-apartment developments including a tour of Via 6, a new high-density mixed use building in downtown Seattle with studio apartments as small as 465 sq. ft. and on-site amenities including a bike shop, and Zipcar availability.
- Analyzed current rents at Point Ruston within the framework of 2014 HUD guidelines for affordable housing published by the City’s Housing Office and reviewed market rents for competitive properties currently utilizing the City’s MFTE program.
- Drafted an informal market survey that can be used to gather feedback regarding local acceptance of alternative residential units such as micro-apartments and mini-flats.

In closing, Point Ruston continues to embrace economic diversity and remains highly motivated to include affordable housing as a residential market segment within the Asarco redevelopment.

Sincerely,

Loren Cohen
December 18, 2013

TO: Chair Sean Gaffney, Tacoma Planning Commission

FROM: Loren Cohen

RE: Point Ruston MUC Application
    Follow-Up: Affordable Housing & Transit

The following summary is in response to information requested by Planning Commission members at their November 6, 2013 meeting regarding provisions for transit services and affordable housing at Point Ruston.

Transit

- In response to Pierce Transit’s comments during the Point Ruston FSEIS process, and in conjunction with LID improvements, Point Ruston built a 10’ multi-modal trail (pedestrians / bicycles) as well as bus pads on both sides of the Ruston Way frontage. Bus shelters, signage, and any other necessary modifications will be constructed when transit funding allows service to begin.

- Bicycle parking is included in the streetscape standards for Point Ruston, and the initial construction of the Point Ruston Waterwalk provides a multi-modal path for pedestrians, cyclists, skateboarders, etc. with several bike racks installed and more planned as the Waterwalk is finalized over time.

- Bicycle storage for employees and residents will be a component in individual buildings as well. For instance, a bicycle storage area accommodating approximately 30 bicycles was built in the Copperline parking garage to serve both residents and employees living and/or working within the mixed-use building. The Copperline’s bicycle storage is proving to be an important and well-used amenity.

- Point Ruston is purchasing several bicycles that will be loaned out to visitors visiting the property. On a much larger scale, Point Ruston is interested in participating in a bike loaner program that the City has been exploring for possible implementation to serve a much larger geographic area for those wishing to ride a bicycle from one destination to another but not interested or able to own a personal bicycle.

- Prior to bus transit service, we are interested in recruiting a bicycle rental facility, identifying new approaches to bike storage for employees and residents, working on a zip car program when demand warrants, working with future employers at Point Ruston to implement a Commute Trip Reduction program, and we have expressed our willingness to explore the possibility of being a terminal for water taxi services should that eventuate in our community.
Affordable Housing

Point Ruston is highly motivated to include affordable housing as a residential market segment within its waterfront development. We are dedicated to exploring affordable housing options to see what is realistic and feasible within the framework of the financial obligations incurred when building on a remediated site, and to better understand the impact and benefit of the multi-family tax exemption program available in Tacoma’s Mixed Use Centers.

Affordable housing research activities over the next two months:

1. Explore alternate residential products such as such as micro-apartments, mini-flats, aPodments, ‘foldable’ apartments (for instance, the kitchen table folds up into the bed that folds up into the wall), etc.
2. Visit existing alternate residential developments in our region to better understand construction costs and marketability (Seattle examples: Footprint Wallingford; 1300 University, and, 1715 NW 58th Street)
3. Conduct informal market survey to determine acceptance of alternative residential units.
4. Price out construction costs and complete pro formas, including estimated benefit of multi-family tax exemption, for selected residential products.
5. Schedule meetings with affordable housing providers such as Tacoma Housing Authority, Mercy Housing, etc. to explore potential partnerships. Discussions to include the possibility of an affordable housing provider owning and managing affordable units at Point Ruston; understanding the elements of a public/ private partnership; discussing how an agreement might be structured; potential funding sources; management and maintenance responsibilities; construction standards, schedule, etc.

We anticipate completing our research and being able to make an informed commitment to affordable housing at Point Ruston prior to the public hearings for the 2014 City’s Comp Plan Amendments tentatively scheduled for February-March 2014.

Summary

It is important to reiterate our reasons for seeking the MUC designation for Point Ruston, and to once again articulate the difference for this developing neighborhood with and without the MUC designation.

- The City of Tacoma drives economic development and job creation to the Mixed-Use Centers and Point Ruston’s master development plan, completed environmental review and land use approvals make it a competitive property for local and regional economic development recruitment efforts.
- MUC’s are priority areas for future transportation improvements, transit services, and utility infrastructure improvements.
- MUC designation promotes higher residential densities and the City’s Multi-Family Tax Exemption program strengthens affordability and accelerated development of residential housing for residents in more diverse economic segments.
• Accelerated residential and employment development will bring multi-modal transit services sooner.
• The transition from a heavy industrial use to a mixed-use community is 30 years in the making; accelerated development brings properties back on the tax rolls sooner than later.

In short, the MUC designation will make a positive difference with measurable benefits not only for the proposed Point Ruston MUC but for the entire community as well.

Sincerely,

Loren Cohen
March 11, 2014

Tacoma Planning Commission

RE: 2014 ANNUAL UPDATES AND AMENDMENTS
Open Space Element Update, Sustainability Code Amendment and Urban Forestry Landscaping Code Update

The Sustainable Tacoma Commission expresses its support for the following updates and amendments of various environmental policies in the hopes of developing a more efficient, beautiful, and environmentally-friendly city.

**Open Space Element Update**

- Updates to the following sections: Open Space Definition; Open Space System; Vision; Community Gardens; Waterfront Open Spaces and Shoreline Access; Habitat Areas; Strategic Action Program; Partnerships; Acquisition and Management of Land and Facilities; and Implementation
- New section titled *Plans for Specific Areas*
- Refine Open Space Projects and Open Space Inventories lists and incorporate them into the Element

**Sustainability Code Amendment**

- Electric vehicle parking and infrastructure provision—includes design and location standards and accessibility and parking quantity requirements
- Bicycle start and end of trip infrastructure—includes the separation of auto and bicycle parking requirements, the distinction between short- and long-term bicycle parking, and the creation of shower and changing facilities at long-term bicycle parking sites
- Setback and height exception for exterior insulation
- Low-impact development barriers

**Urban Forestry Landscaping Code Update**

- Increase quality and quantity of planted trees and other vegetation
- Optimize health, survival, and maintenance of trees
- Incentives and flexibility to better connect the desires of site and city
- Provide an understandable and predictable approach to the landscaping code
Thank you for considering these important changes. All of our efforts will lead us towards reduced greenhouse gas emissions and a more livable, healthy community.

Sincerely,

Phil Coughlan
Nick Cutting
Co-Chairs
Sustainable Tacoma Commission
March 21, 2014

Mr. Lihuang Wung  
City of Tacoma  
Planning & Development Services  
747 Market Street, Room 345  
Tacoma, WA 98402

Dear Mr. Wung:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the determination of nonsignificance for the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code Amendments for 2014 proposal (SEP2014-40000218532). The Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the environmental checklist and has the following comment(s):

**TOXICS CLEANUP: Marv Coleman (360) 407-6259**

If development of property or facilities is planned for property that has known or suspected environmental contamination, it must be reported to Ecology’s Environmental Report Tracking System by calling (360) 407-6300. Prior to development of property, it is highly recommended that the developer or city planners contact Ecology to determine if the property is listed on Ecology’s databases. For assistance and information about determining if a property has environmental issues, contact Marv Coleman at the phone number given above or email at mcol461@ecy.wa.gov.

**TOXICS CLEANUP/TACOMA SMELTER PLUME: Elizabeth Weldin (360) 407-7095**

Ecology recognizes this is a non-project action.

The City of Tacoma is located in an area that may have been contaminated with heavy metals due to the air emissions originating from the old Asarco Smelter in north Tacoma (visit Ecology’s Tacoma Smelter Plume map search tool: https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/smeltersearch/).

Soil contamination from the former Asarco smelter poses a risk to human health and the environment. Children are at especially high risk from direct exposure to contaminated soil. Construction workers, landscapers, gardeners, and others who work in the soils are also at risk.

Ecology recommends that the City of Tacoma consider adopting future policies related the Tacoma Smelter Plume.

Ecology recommends that the City of Tacoma include the following as conditions of approval:
• Sample the soil and analyze for arsenic and lead. The applicant shall contact Elizabeth Weldin with the Southwest Regional Office (SWRO), Toxics Cleanup Program at the phone number given above or via email at ewel461@ecy.wa.gov for guidance about soil sampling within Tacoma Smelter Plume. The soil sampling results shall be sent to the City of Tacoma and Ecology for review.

• If lead or arsenic are found at concentrations above the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) cleanup levels (Chapter 173-340 WAC); the owners, potential buyers, construction workers, and others shall be notified of their occurrence. The applicant shall also contact the Environmental Report Tracking System Coordinator at the Ecology SWRO at (360) 407-6300. The MTCA cleanup level for arsenic is 20 ppm and lead is 250 ppm.

• If lead, arsenic and/or other contaminants are found at concentrations above MTCA cleanup levels, the applicant shall:

1) Enter into the Voluntary Cleanup Program with - Ecology prior to issuance of any site development permits for this proposal and/or the initiation of any grading, filling, or clearing activities. For more information on the Voluntary Cleanup Program, visit Ecology’s website at: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/tcp/vcp/vcpmain.htm.

2) Obtain an opinion letter from Ecology stating that the proposed soil remediation will likely result in no further action under - MTCA prior to the issuance of any site development permit and/or the initiation of any grading, filling, or clearing activities. The issued site development permit plans shall be consistent with the plans reviewed and deemed consistent with MTCA by Ecology. The applicant shall provide to the City of Tacoma the opinion letter from Ecology.

3) Prior to finalizing site development permits, provide to the City of Tacoma “No Further Action” determination from Ecology indicating that the remediation plans were successfully implemented under MTCA.

If Ecology determines this project should not be part of the Voluntary Cleanup Program, Ecology will contact the City of Tacoma and discuss possible options.

• If soils are found to be contaminated with arsenic, lead, or other contaminants, extra precautions shall be taken to avoid escaping dust, soil erosion, and water pollution during grading and site construction. Site design shall include protective measures to isolate or remove contaminated soils from public spaces, yards, and children’s play areas. Contaminated soils generated during site construction shall be managed and disposed of in accordance with state and local regulations, including the Solid Waste Handling Standards regulation (Chapter 173-350 WAC). For information about soil disposal contact the local health department in the jurisdiction where soils will be placed.

The link below provides a fact sheet that explains more how the arsenic and lead clean-up levels were set and why Ecology sees that they are protective for human health: https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1109095.html.
For assistance and information about Tacoma Smelter Plume and soils contamination, contact Elizabeth Weldin at the phone number given above or via email at ewel461@ecy.wa.gov.

Ecology’s comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they may not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

If you have any questions or would like to respond to these comments, please contact the appropriate reviewing staff listed above.

Department of Ecology
Southwest Regional Office

(SM:14-1045)

cc: Marv Coleman, TCP
    Elizabeth Weldin, TCP
Dear Peter,

In response to the Planning Commissions public review process, I am forwarding to you our comments on the Open Space Element Update currently being reviewed by the Planning Commission. As with the Landscape Code that I sent earlier, these comments had been shared earlier with your staff but I want to make sure that they are entered into the record for consideration. We appreciated the opportunity to review the draft document as it was being developed and extensive interaction with your staff to update the Open Space and Recreation element of the Comprehensive Plan. Following are the Metro Parks comments that we have discussed with Elliott Barnett.

Open Space System, p. 7: It may make sense to specifically reference TPU and the Port within the Open Space System because of the significant amount of land including open spaces that they own and operate.

OS-GI-1 Green Infrastructure, p. 15 refers to increasing the City’s canopy cover by 2028; that should either be changed to 2034 for the 20 years of this plan, or to 2030 to match the Urban Forestry Policy Element. Also, this section calls for existing canopy cover to be analyzed, and it was analyzed, in 2011 – the OSHRE might call for analyzing it on a regular basis, though.

OS-CG-1 Community Gardens, p. 16: This section should mention the MOU between MPT, COT and Pierce County with the Pierce Conservation District that sets up the framework for PCD to manage the Community Gardens Program for the entire County. Perhaps something like this:

Tacoma currently has over 35 community gardens, including 11 on City-owned property. The City partners with Metro Parks and Pierce County to support management of community gardens by the Pierce Conservation District. Gardens are operated by MPT, churches, community groups, schools and other organizations.

OS-HA-11 Habitat Stewardship Outreach and Training, p. 21
The language in this section should recognize that good work is already happening. COT should continue to partner, and continue to inform citizens of the need for stewardship.

Implementation and Funding, pp. 23-24

The Implementation and Funding section should reflect the intent of the upcoming MPT/COT interlocal agreement for open space management. Open Spaces fit into the category of parks and recreation, and MPT is the true provider of these services in the City. The City is beginning to shift
the appropriate properties to MPT ownership and provide the capital to make the management of these properties sustainable.

The OS-PF section needs to recognize the transition of the 452 acres recently to the Environmental Services Division in the City. These properties are “Open Space” and will not be funded with “Open Space Fund” dollars. OS-PF-6 notes the use of Environmental Services funds to manage Open Spaces that serve stormwater functions, but that could be placed within OS-PF-2 that mentions the Open Space and Wetland Mitigation Funds. There should be more discussion about the long term goals for the Environmental Services properties.

OS-CW-2, Transfer of General Government Property, p. 27
OS-CW-2 refers to transferring General Government-owned habitat lands to the Open Space program, but in fact some properties were transferred to Environmental Services. This strategy for preserving and maintaining habitat lands, as well as a strategy for transferring odd parcels and unimproved ROWs adjacent to park land to MPT, should be mentioned here, and possibly in the OS-PF-2 (and 6) and OS-LF-2 (Open Space Inventory) sections as well.

Metro Parks would also like to see some discussion in this section about evaluating adjacent unimproved ROWs and odd parcels in mixed-ownership Open Spaces for transfer to a single agency’s ownership and management.

OS-LF-12 Scenic Views – Private Benefit, p. 29
This section has not been changed from the original OSHRE, but it is more specific/detailed than a policy should be, and we are concerned that it may conflict with what the City wants to achieve with the Stadium-Schuster slope management plan. Consider this alternative:

Removal of public trees for the purposes of retaining or creating private views should not be allowed, but limited tree management may be allowed for this purpose if it is part of a coordinated approach resulting in net habitat enhancement for the area.

OS-LF-13 Scenic Views – Public Benefit, p. 29:
This section should explain where to find the list of existing public views.

Plans for Specific Areas, p. 30:
The second paragraph of this section states, “Inclusion in this section is intended to convey the City Council’s support for and recognition of the policy direction in these plans, and to convey that they are planning and implementation priorities. Inclusion in this section lends support to applications for City approvals such as Conditional Use Permits, Rezones and Development Regulation Agreements meeting the intent of these plans, as well as the policies of the OSHRE. This section also provides a forum for the Council to refine their policy direction on a given site, in consultation with the Planning Commission and other stakeholders.”

The section seems like the City is inserting itself into the specifics of other agencies’ plans. The City Council doesn’t really have any purview to provide “policy direction” on any of Metro Park’s plans, beyond those that are included in the City’s TMC.

Plans for Specific Areas. This section (in addition to the comment above) is not complete.
There are many other plans that should be recognized if this is going to be viewed as a conclusive list. What is the purpose of this section?

**Measuring and Reporting Progress, p. 32:**
Progress Report Card- what is specifically being measured? What are the specific goals, outcomes, and metrics that can be compared and what is the baseline being used for evaluation. (We understand that this is flushed out more in the procedures, but a general overview of the intended result could be good.)

Details:
- Schools go by the name ‘Tacoma Public Schools’, not the Tacoma School District.
- In Section II – Definitions, why delete the statements that water quality, soil stability, groundwater recharge, and support for fisheries are open space functions worth preserving? Maybe those functions could be incorporated into the remaining definitions?
- Open Space Goals (p9) refers to the Needs Assessment in the Supporting Documents section, but neither thing exists.
- OS-LF-1 still refers to the Strategic Action Program.

Thank again, Peter for this opportunity to review the proposed changes to the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element. We look forward to working with the City to address these issues. We look forward to working with you on revisions as this moves through the adoption process.

Sincerely,

Doug Fraser
Chief Planning Manager
Metro Parks Tacoma
4702 S 19th Street
Tacoma, Wa. 98405

Phone: (253) 305-1019
FAX: (253) 305-1098
dougf@tacomaparks.com

Creating Healthy Opportunities to Play, Learn and Grow
www.metroparkstacoma.org
Dear Peter,

The following are comments that Metro Park’s has developed in response to the public comment period by the Planning Commission on this code issue. Most of these comments we have shared earlier but we wanted to take this opportunity to provide them for your records. Metro Parks would like to express our appreciation to your staff for their extensive interaction with us and with others to update the City’s Landscaping Code. Our staff reviewed this document for technical qualities and for its potential effects on MPT operations and offers these comments.

13.06.502 C 2. Plant Material Selection. b. Native and climate-adapted landscaping. All required landscaping shall be climate-adapted. The retention and use of natives is encouraged and permitted for any and all landscaping. Invasive species, as identified in the UFM, shall not count toward meeting required plantings. Noxious weeds are prohibited from being planted in required landscaped areas.

City staff may not be able to assess which plants are climate adapted, since our climate is changing: The USDA and Sunset are both having difficulty keeping their climate hardiness maps up to date. Since the code requires plants to be kept alive, plant suitability will be self-regulating.

The blanket approval of native plants conflicts with TMC 9.19 (greatly in need of revision), which outlaws all willows and cottonwoods and the native bigleaf maple.

Noxious weeds should be defined within this code as those on the Pierce County Weed Control Board’s list at the time of permit application.

13.06.502 C 2. Plant Material Selection. e. Trees (2) … Trees under power lines shall have a maximum mature height not greater than 25 feet.

‘Maximum mature height,’ according to the nursery industry which supplies the plant descriptions, is the average height at 10 years. This height may double by 20 years. Trees planted near power lines should be varieties that do not commonly exceed 25 feet in height at 25 years of age.

13.06.502 C 2. Plant Material Selection. e. Trees (3) Tree variety.

The majestic double rows of a single tree variety, such as within Thea’s Park and along North 30th Street west of Proctor, will never be repeated or expanded in Tacoma if this rule is adopted. Metro Parks agrees that a diversity of tree types is very important, but this code does nothing to increase that diversity: developers could still plant mixtures of the 4 most common species in Tacoma, but a uniform planting of an uncommon tree species would not be allowed. The city of Vancouver BC has long boulevards of single species, and achieves
diversity by using a different tree on each street. Metro Parks believes that species diversity is best addressed in that way, at a city-wide scale, not by preventing design unity on individual sites.

Also, please note the misuse of the plural *genera* where the singular *genus* is called for, and the fact that since there is only one meaning of the word *genus*, it need not be defined in the code’s glossary nor capitalized.

13.06.502 D. Credits and Flexibility, 2. Tree Retention. *To be eligible for this credit, trees must be at least 6 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH) at the time of plan submittal.*

Requiring retained trees to be at least 6” in diameter makes no sense: developers would need to remove perfectly good trees less than 6” to make room for the new trees (at 1.5” to 2.5” diameter) that will be required.

13.06.502 D. Credits and Flexibility, 6. Self-managed Agencies. Metro Parks was generally in accord with the self-managed agency provisions in the mid-January draft of the landscaping code. But something changed between January and February. The language in the current draft of the self-managed agency provisions calls for more detailed oversight of other agencies by the City, such as reviewing program operations, which go beyond the scope and qualifications of the City to administer. Instead of asking consistency with City urban forestry goals and policies, it asks agencies to specifically demonstrate consistency with the City’s Urban Forestry Policy element, which is a set of policies and procedures guiding City action, and not generally applicable to other agencies.

On a more technical note, designating the areas where required landscaping will be planted is not feasible as part of a request for self-managed agency status. Metro Parks has current condition assessments and target planting goals for each of its 75 sites, but specific planting plans are developed only with a budget and appropriate plan review. Showing the alternate locations where an agency proposes to shift required landscaping is reasonable within a request for landscaping flexibility on a specific project, but not as part of a global request to be considered a self-managed agency.

Under section 6b, the Director of PDS can deny a request for flexibility if a self-managed agency cannot demonstrate that previous shifting of required landscaping has been successful. Self-managed agency status can then be extended or revoked on the basis of performance, which is reasonable. But the current draft of section 6a adds a five-year limit on approval of self-managed agency status, and allows the Director of PDS to revoke that status at any time within those five years without specifying why. With these changes, the intent of self-managed agency status has shifted from cooperative sharing of urban forestry leadership to City oversight and control of agency programs, and as such is unlikely to be used. Metro Parks looks forward to working with City staff and other agencies to develop a self-managed agency procedure that works for all parties.

13.06.502 E Landscaping requirements applicable to Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Mixed-Use Districts. Overall Site Landscaping.
Metro Parks is concerned that the minimum number of trees required, listed in a few places in Section E, will not leave enough room for them to grow. At the density required, Large Trees would have to be less than 23 feet apart, and Medium Trees less than 20 feet apart, which is more appropriate spacing for small trees.

13.06.502 E. Landscaping Buffers, Planting – when abutting R-District
This section requires a screen of conifers to be planted 10 feet apart. Trees that will reach 8 feet wide at 5 years, as this code requires (Section C2e(4)), will tend to be 20 feet wide at 20 years, and are liable to be unhealthy at 10-foot spacing.

Thank you, Peter for this opportunity to review the proposed changes to the Landscaping Code. We look forward to working with staff to address these issues as this document moves through the adoption process.

Sincerely,

Doug Fraser
Chief Planning Manager
Metro Parks Tacoma
4702 S 19th Street
Tacoma, Wa. 98405

Phone: (253) 305-1019
FAX: (253) 305-1098
dougf@tacomaparks.com

CREATING HEALTHY OPPORTUNITIES TO PLAY, LEARN AND GROW
www.metroparkstacoma.org

~ 482 ~
This (see below) just came back this morning, Elliot.

Mark Guthrie
Water Program Specialist
Tacoma Water - Tacoma Public Utilities
253-396-3152

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Foss, Cindy" <CFOSS@ci.tacoma.wa.us>
Date: February 27, 2014 at 9:15:51 AM PST
To: "Guthrie, Mark" <MGuthrie@ci.tacoma.wa.us>
Cc: "Lindgren, Tony" <tlindgren@ci.tacoma.wa.us>, "West, Ray" <rwest@ci.tacoma.wa.us>, "Sugiyama, Bill" <bsugiyam@ci.tacoma.wa.us>, "Hinzman, Bob" <BHINZMAN@ci.tacoma.wa.us>
Subject: RE: Dist Ops Landscape Code comments

Mark,

Our additional comments are noted below after review of the updated Landscape Code.

The following questions from the original request were not addressed:

- Who will manage the homeowner/business owner contact and expectations? -- such as where trees will be planted?
- How will we make sure that trees are not planted by water structures such as meter boxes, hydrants, etc.?
- It would be helpful to have utility exemptions called out where appropriate.
- What is a PMI District?
- There is nothing in the plan about road maintenance, only capital road projects. What happens for jobs such as main failure, hydrant replacement and service renewals?
- What is the definition of a capital street improvement project?
- If we participate in a road project and install water main do we pay for the installation and maintenance of
trees? Will this hold off the completion of projects until the trees no longer require follow up?

In addition our concern is what this really means for utilities doing work in the right of way. There is one section that talks about when this code applies and pages on what to do if it applies. The section on what this applies to (second section on the first page) is not clear. Typically utilities are working in the right of way – not developing property for their use.

If this does require use to plant trees when doing work; the maintenance of trees could have a huge staffing impact. Also, the relationship with those in the area we are working could be impacted when we plan a tree where they used to park, plant a garden, etc.

Thank you
Cindy

From: Foss, Cindy
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2014 1:29 PM
To: Guthrie, Mark
Cc: Lindgren, Tony; West, Ray (rwest@ci.tacoma.wa.us); Sugiyama, Bill (bsugiyam@ci.tacoma.wa.us); Hinzman, Bob (BHINZMAN@ci.tacoma.wa.us)
Subject: Dist Ops Landscape Code comments

Mark,

Distribution Operations comments and questions on the Landscape code are below:

Who will manage the homeowner/business owner contact and expectations? -- such as where trees will be planted?
How will we make sure that trees are not planted by water structures such as meter boxes, hydrants, etc.?
It would be helpful to have utility exemptions called out where appropriate.
What is a PMI District?
There is nothing in the plan about road maintenance, only capital road projects.
What happens for jobs such as main failure, hydrant replacement and service renewals?
What is the definition of a capital street improvement project?
If we participate in a road project and install water main do we pay for the installation and maintenance of trees? Will this hold off the completion of projects until the trees no longer require follow up?

“replacement of more than 50% of existing sidewalks” – 50% of what, in front of the house, the whole block?

What is considered a full roadway section?

Thank you for coordinating this for us.

Cindy

Cindy Foss | Tacoma Water
Asst Water Distribution Operations Mgr
253-502-8682 | cfoss@cityoftacoma.org
March 21, 2014

Planning Commission
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA. 98402

Honorable Planning Commission:

The Puget Creek Restoration Society (PCRS) protects, enhances and restores the Puget Creek Watershed and similar streams, wetlands and green spaces. We serve the South Puget Sound communities and invite their participation through hands-on restoration, research, education, advocacy, and by promoting a sense of stewardship.

Our organization represents over 3,000 members and volunteers located in the City of Tacoma and who are deeply concerned with wetland, stream, green space and nearshore issues in the City.

Thank you for allowing us to provide input into this process. We request the following conditions be incorporated into the project and response to our questions be developed:

Pertaining to Planning Commission Public Hearing on Proposed Amendments:

#6 Open Space Habitat and Recreation Element—Our first comment is that the maintenance of invasive non-native plant species such as Himalayan and Evergreen Blackberry; English Laurel and Holly; English Ivy and Clematis; English Morning Glory/Hedge Bindweed; Japanness Knotweed; Reed Canary Grass; Spurge Laurel; Poison Hemlock and Herb Robert needs to get looked at different by the City. These plants are extremely invasive and destabilize and destroy native habitat and thus need to have a classification by the City as: remove when found and have maintenance in place to keep new populations from taking a hold. Having a code in place to allow that will help in keeping existing restored areas from getting influx of new populations and give those working in fields more le-way in protecting and maintaining areas. Even in the critical areas as those are the most sensitive.

Also the City must take a more pro-active role in not allowing encroachment by private residents into the community natural areas and increase fines and mitigation.

#7 Sustainability Code Amendment—Must also include more responsive and supportive action in helping to protect and sustain the natural areas and green belts as these are hand-in-hand with health and active living
# 8 urban Forestry landscaping Code Update—The City must not allow any tree cutting in public areas especially in the natural areas as the natural areas are finite in what is there and any decrease of canopy is not benefiting support and sustaining these natural areas. Planting of native trees is what should have the must president as that is what supports wildlife and our ecological functions in this region. Thus planting of non-native trees adjacent or close to natural areas allows for the influx of non-native seeds etc. into the natural areas and destabilizes the habitat.

Without further clarification of the impact that the process has on the natural systems, the Puget Creek Restoration Society cannot support this process; however, if the plan were to incorporate our comments, questions and concerns in these documents we would reconsider our position.

I write as a Member of the Board of Directors of Puget Creek Restoration Society, which has evaluated the proposed project. We will appreciate your office’s full consideration of our position, and we look forward to working with you in making Tacoma a better place for everyone.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. You can reach us at (253) 779-8890 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Scott M. Hansen-B.S., M.A., M. S., (Ph.D.-student)
Ecologist/Member Board of Directors
March 11, 2014

Lihuang Wung
City of Tacoma
lwung@cityoftacoma.org
Tacoma, WA 98402

RE: SEP2014-40000218532; SR0173850
City of Tacoma

Dear Lihuang Wung:

The Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department's Environmental Health Program received the above mentioned checklist on March 03, 2014 and has reviewed your proposal.

There are no objections to the proposal as presented.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond. If you have further questions, please contact me at (253) 798-2851 or by e-mail at bharp@tpchd.org.

Sincerely,

Brad D. Harp
Environmental Health Division

BDH:sfr
Thank you for including me but we won’t be able to attend today’s meeting. We have reviewed the document and it does not appear to have much impact on our group. Thanks for keeping us in the loop.

Marcie Hedman  | Tacoma Power

Assistant Transmission & Distribution Manager

T&D Electrical Services Manager

P: (253) 502-8486  | C: (253) 230-9368

F: (253) 502-8648  | http://www.mytpu.org/tacomapower/electrical-permitting/

Hi everyone, I’m looking forward to talking with you this afternoon. Please note, the packet Ryan forwarded out was not the most recent one with the full proposal. I think everyone’s probably got it by now but just in case, here it is again.

Talk to you soon!

<< File: Urban Forestry Section - 2014-10.pdf >>

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Flynn, Ryan
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:31 AM
To: Seabrands, Dan; Kammerzell, Jennifer; Hedman, Marcie; Barnett, Elliott; Payne, Jeff S (jeff.payne@pse.com); Prussen, Kari; Pooley, Desiree; Ward, Erik; Sugiyama, Bill; Flynn, Ryan; Boudet, Brian
Subject: Review Proposed Urban Forestry (Street Tree) Ordinance with Elliott Barnett
When: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 3:00 PM-4:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: Tacoma Water, Conf 2A (TPU, 2nd Floor behind Permit Counter)

All,

This meeting is a follow up to the conversation initiated at the last Infrastructure Meeting
regarding the Urban Forestry (Street Tree) Ordinance. It will be a good opportunity to provide Elliott your comments and raise any concerns you may have.

Attached please find the most recent rendition of the Urban Forestry Ordinance language.

Thanks,

Ryan Flynn

<< File: D3 Attach-D Urban Forestry (2-19-14).pdf >>
Dear Chair Gaffney:

On September 19, 2013, the West End Neighborhood Council heard a proposal by Pt. Ruston LLC with J.J. McCament et al, stating their proposal to designate a portion of the former ASARCO property as a Mixed-Use Center. The West End members feel that Pt. Ruston will be a great addition to our area and knowing that the residential area included in this design will make a Mixed-Use Center of high quality, we voted unanimously to support this amendment.

We feel strongly that this redevelopment will be a significant improvement to the area, and bring in a high quality of mixed-income housing, along with the Mixed-Use Center, on land that has previously been closed to the public for many years. The remediation of this area has been remarkable and we look forward to the creation of a vibrant, bustling waterfront area that will eventually bring many new people and businesses to our neighborhood.

If we can be of further help in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact either myself at 253-278-3398, or Ginny Eberhardt at 253-224-6967.

Sincerely,

Ken Kingsbury, Chair
West End Neighborhood Council

cc: J.J. McCament
March 14, 2014

Planning Department
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

Planning Commission and City Planners:

This letter is in reference to the proposed Sustainability Code Amendments for 13.06.510(F) regarding Electric vehicle parking requirements. On behalf of the Master Builders Association of Pierce County (MBA Pierce), thank you for your consideration of these comments.

MBA Pierce and its members would like to express concern over the proposed code changes and the resulting problems they would cause. The following provisions within the proposed amendments have been identified specifically as being areas of concern for the building industry:

1. **Ch. 13.06.510(F)(1)** “Application: The following requirements apply to all new development and alterations that, within a two-year period, exceed 50 percent of the value of existing development or structures, as determined by the Building Code, unless specifically exempted herein. The standards do not apply to remodels that do not change the exterior form of the building. However, if a project involves both exterior and interior improvements, then the project valuation shall include both exterior and interior improvements.”

MBA Pierce contacted city staff and confirmed that the stated intent of this section was to provide requirements for multi-family housing, offices, institutional buildings, retail and shopping centers and auditorium, stadium and theater locations which are all listed in subsections (2) and (3). Subsection (1) references “all new development and alterations” which could be interpreted to include single-family housing since it is not specified that these requirements apply only to those listed properties in the subsequent subsections and single-family housing is not listed as being “specifically exempted”.

MBA Pierce requests that this be clarified in the language to ensure that it is not misinterpreted to include single-family housing in the future.

2. **Ch. 13.06.510(F)(2)** “Multifamily uses shall provide electric vehicle infrastructure for 10% of the parking spaces provided, such that a future level 2 charging station can be accommodated.”

The proposed language will result in infrastructure that will not be utilized or located in the proper location at multi-family dwellings and will result in an unnecessary expense on the
building industry. Multi-family housing normally requires assigned spaces, meaning there is no guarantee that the electric vehicle infrastructure will be placed in the appropriate parking spot or in a close proximity to the condo or apartment where the resident owning the electric vehicle is living. Additionally, this creates the problem of dividing out the electric bill if a resident moves into a housing unit that has an electric meter which does not correspond with the electric vehicle parking space. This means that the builder will then have to move the electric vehicle infrastructure later on to eliminate these issues, creating further expense. These regulations would be better instituted as incentives for building electric vehicle infrastructure at a time where a resident actually requests to have it installed.

Furthermore, requiring electric vehicle infrastructure in an industry where technology is constantly changing would be wasteful. For example, automakers are set to introduce hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in 2015 and companies such as Toyota, Hyundai and Honda believe that fuel cells will be the fuel of the future. Please see the below articles discussing this technology:


These articles illustrate how quickly the market can change in regards to technology and why something such as installing electric vehicle infrastructure should be market-driven as there is no guarantee that within the coming years this technology will not be replaced by another more efficient alternative fuel source such as hydrogen fuel cells. The proposed multi-family housing electric vehicle parking requirements discussed above will add expense to development and will result unnecessary hardships when other incentive-based avenues are available to achieve valuable environmental goals.

MBA Pierce requests that the Planning Commission reconsider the various provisions of this ordinance before moving this forward to City Council.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeremiah J. Lafranca, Government Affairs Manager

Cc: Sean Gaffney, Chair
    Donald Erickson
    Stephen Wamback
    Erle Thompson
    Tina Lee

Scott Winship, Vice-Chair
    Benjamin Fields
    Chris Beale
    Alexandria Teague
March 18, 2014
Planning Department
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

Planning Commission and City Planners:

This letter is in reference to the proposed Land Use Regulatory Code Amendment to 13.04.095 regarding pipestem lots. On behalf of the Master Builders Association of Pierce County (MBA Pierce), thank you for your consideration of these comments.

MBA Pierce and its members would like to express concern over the proposed code changes and the resulting problems they would cause. The following provisions within the proposed amendment have been identified specifically as being areas of concern for the building industry:

1. **Ch. 13.04.095(D)(3)(a)** “Pipestem lots shall have the same setback along all lot lines. In the R-1 District the setback shall be 15 feet. For all other districts the setback shall be 10 feet.”

The proposed language will limit the potential development of pipestem lots. The setback requirements would prevent building on some pipestem lots due to size restrictions that would result and would thus interfere with Tacoma’s goals of creating more infill to prevent urban sprawl. These new standards would leave property underdeveloped which could be otherwise utilized to prevent potential home buyers from building homes elsewhere and thus resulting in a more adverse environmental impact.

MBA Pierce requests that the Planning Commission reconsider this provision and seek more involvement from the building community before moving this forward to City Council.

2. **Ch. 13.04.095(D)(3)(b)** “The height of the main building on a pipestem lot shall be no taller than 25 feet or no more than the average of the height of the dwellings on each abutting property line and shall not exceed the height of the zoning district.”

The proposed language interferes with a property owner’s rights to have the same height restrictions as other homes within their zoning district. This creates a discriminatory standard that would prevent a homeowner on a pipestem lot from being able to maximize the potential of their property due to the decisions of neighbors that moved in prior to them building their own home. Additionally, when this subsection is combined with subsection (a) listed above, the ordinance will result in limiting development of pipestem lots in general. The amendment would result in significant restrictions on the size of the home with the listed setbacks and then adding

www.mbpierce.com
in height restrictions will prevent the development of many pipestem lots and as mentioned above will not correlate with Tacoma’s goals of achieving a greater level of infill. MBA Pierce would ask the Planning Commission to consider the goals of the Growth Management Act (GMA), which seeks to prevent urban sprawl and encourage compact development.\(^1\) Pipestem lots are an effective way of eliminating sprawl by utilizing properties to their fullest potential. Another goal of the GMA is to direct new housing into existing urban areas to ensure there are adequate public facilities.\(^2\) Tacoma is the major urban center in Pierce County and accepting growth by increasing density will serve the city’s goal of creating more infill and will correlate with GMA goals of building near adequate public facilities. The proposed amendment adversely impacts potential development, thus leaving properties underdeveloped which will not further the goals of the GMA nor will it assist Tacoma in creating more infill.

MBA Pierce requests that the Planning Commission reconsider the various provisions of this ordinance before moving this forward to City Council.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Jeremiah J. Lafranca, Government Affairs Manager

Cc:  Sean Gaffney, Chair
      Donald Erickson
      Stephen Wambach
      Erle Thompson
      Tina Lee

Scott Winship, Vice-Chair
Benjamin Fields
Chris Beale
Alexandria Teague

\(^1\) RCW 36.70A.020(2) Reduce sprawl. Reduce inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.

\(^2\) RCW 36.70A.110(1) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas. Urban growth may also be located in designated new fully contained communities as defined by RCW 36.70A.350.
Hi, Elliott,

First, I just want to thank you for meeting with us last week and allowing all of the utilities to ask questions and provide responses to the proposed new Urban Forestry Landscaping Code.

It is my reading of the language that it is the City’s primary intention to enhance (beautify) street landscapes that are either being fully reconstructed, or are subject to development by third parties as part of their respective frontage improvement requirements. PSE recognizes the City’s desire to improve streetscapes and does not want to interfere with that goal but we would like to point out a few items for consideration.

Planting trees over existing utility infrastructure creates some potential issues for the utilities; it makes it harder to access our facilities and to perform necessary maintenance and operations procedures. It also creates issues when we go to install new, or upgraded, facilities; the space within the City’s ROWs are becoming increasingly crowded and it is harder and harder to find alignments in which we can place our facilities without the added complication that street vegetation presents to us. The separation requirements set forth in the new language is helpful in terms of recognizing existing utility infrastructure but it doesn’t take into account that new, or upgraded, infrastructure needs room for safe placement. We also encourage the City to reconsider the planting of any ‘large’ trees in the ROW because of how root structures can get entangled with utility infrastructure and also create problems for street curbs and sidewalks.

We also believe that utility ratepayers should not be subject to incurring the cost of making ‘new’ landscaping improvements to the ROW. We agree that we should replace anything that we damage, or remove, as a result of maintaining and operating our facilities but we do not think it is reasonable to require utility ratepayers to shoulder the burden of providing new improvements to the ROW. In those instances in which we do have to replace vegetation (hopefully restricted to existing vegetation) we believe it would be beneficial if the cost associated with the improvements was identified on the permit so that funds could be provided in lieu of taking on the responsibility of installing and maintaining vegetation until it has sufficiently taken hold.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that utilities be exempted from the newly proposed vegetation requirements in the Urban Forestry Landscaping Code.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on this matter and am available to discuss any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Jeff Payne
Puget Sound Energy
March 20, 2014

By hand
By e-mail: planning@cityoftacoma.org

Tacoma Planning Commission
747 Market Street, Room 1036
Tacoma, WA 98402

Re Comments on proposed 2014 amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We write to comment on the proposed 2014 amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code that the Planning Commission will consider this Spring. We hope our comments are helpful to you.

We offer these comments on behalf of the City’s Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group. The City Council initially convened this group on April 27, 2010 by Resolution 38071. That resolution asked the group to propose policies that would promote the preservation or development of affordable housing in the City. The group submitted its recommendations to the City Council on December 3, 2010. See Policy Recommendations to the City Council (December 3, 2010). If you have not yet reviewed our recommendations, we ask you to do so. On May 17, 2011, by Resolution 38263, the Council reconvened the group so it can remain available as a source of further advice and assistance while the City considers the group’s recommendations.

Among its recommendations, the group proposed principles and acknowledgments to govern City policy. See Policy Recommendations, section 3.1. By Resolution 38264, on May 17, 2011, the City Council directed the Planning Commission to incorporate these into the City’s Comprehensive Plan. We enclose a copy of that resolution.

We comment on the following two proposals:

1. **Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center: Application #2014-01**

   We favor the proposal to designate as a Mixed-Use Center that portion of the Point Ruston development located in the City of Tacoma. Among other benefits, this designation would make available to the project the City’s multifamily tax exemption and its companion provision for the inclusion of affordable housing for lower income households. Point Ruston is an impressive and ambitious project that will bring housing...
and commercial development to the site. It and the City need policies and mechanisms that would provide for the inclusion of housing that is affordable to lower income households. This inclusion would serve several purposes, all of them congenial to the goals and civic purposes of the project. **First**, it would help to economically and racially integrate the new community. This diversity will add to its vibrancy. It will also make it more closely resemble the City’s population. **Second**, such inclusion would provide housing for the low wage workers who will staff the commercial establishments of the community. Nearby housing affordable to them will reduce their commutes and diminish traffic congestion along Ruston Way. **Third**, such inclusion would help alleviate the City’s acute shortage of affordable housing.

We urge the planning commission to approve Point Ruston’s Mixed-Use Center application and in other ways to be alert for mechanisms to include affordable housing in the project’s market rate mix. We refer you to our Policy Recommendations for ways to do that.

2. **Affordable Housing: Application #2014-06**

   We also favor the four changes pertaining to affordable housing.

   - **Parking Exemption for Group Housing, Student Housing and Small Multi-Family Housing.**

   We support the proposal to exempt from parking requirements group housing, student housing and certain small multi-family housing up to 20 dwellings or 50 percent of the total dwellings in a building, whichever is greater. Such housing can be a valuable part of the City’s affordable stock. Occupants of such housing often do not need parking. Parking requirements can be expensive, especially when they are not necessary. We favor letting the developers of such housing judge the amount of parking the market will require.

   - **Update and Reduce Parking Requirements for Group Housing and Multi-Family Housing**

   For the same reasons, we support the proposal to reduce the parking requirements for group housing and multi-family housing.

   - **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)**

   We support the proposals to encourage the development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and make them more feasible in more locations. ADUs can serve three purposes, all of them valuable to the City’s effort to promote affordable housing options. **First**, ADUs can provide affordable rental housing. They are generally small in size and
suitable for small households that cannot pay for a full sized apartment. Second, ADUs allow a homeowner to supplement his or her income with a rental income. This can make homeownership more affordable to a wider income range of homeowners and home purchasers. This option may be especially useful to seniors who may need an extra income to afford their homes. Third, ADUs can allow caregivers to live in close proximity to seniors who may need that help to remain in their homes.

ADUs can serve all these purposes in a way that is architecturally compatible with single family housing patterns.

- *Update Small Lot Standards*

We support the proposal to make the rules governing small lots more flexible. We also support the reasons for the proposal: it will promote responsible infill development and promote the development of housing that is more likely to be affordable. The companion design standards should make this form of housing compatible with the neighborhood without unduly imposing more design strictures than those that govern other types of housing.

We also wish to express our appreciation for the City’s planning staff. We know this effort requires their careful thought and close attention to detail. It is not easy to polish these proposals so they further the City’s policy goals and fit with the rest of the City’s complex code and planning documents. We also know that the staff are not situated to receive appropriate thanks for their hard work. We extend ours.

We also appreciate the efforts of the Planning Commission. We hope our comments are helpful. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know. In
particular, we look forward to the Commission's review of our remaining recommendations. These include:

- Affordable Housing Incentives Code and Program
- Affordable Housing Inclusionary Proposals
- Affordable Building/Residential Infill strategies (including cottage housing, detached ADU's, Planned Residential Districts).

We look forward to this further work with you.

Cordially,

City of Tacoma Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group

Gary Pedersen
Co-Chair

Michael Mirra
Co-Chair

Cc: City Councilmember Lauren Walker
    T.C. Broadnax, City Manager
    Ian Munce, City of Tacoma
Environmental Services and Tacoma Water have the following joint comments and requested changes on the proposed landscaping code.

1. The purpose for this change is to clarify the definition of capital street improvement projects consisting of full subgrades and road surfaces with established alignments. In temporary roadways with no permanent alignment yet established (such as oil mat roads and asphalt roads with no curb and gutter), the planting of street trees, and ensuring survival of those trees, will be very difficult. The right of way adjacent to pavement in temporary roadways is often used by residents for gravel parking shoulders, ditches, or other features that would not be conducive to planting trees.

Revise Section 13.06.502.B.2.b to read:

b. Constructing new permanent roadways, excluding residential Local Improvement Districts; alterations to the width of existing permanent roadways; constructing new sidewalk; replacing more than 50% of an existing sidewalk along a site’s frontage. In the case of sidewalk replacement, street trees shall be required proportionate to the linear footage of sidewalks replaced.

Include the following definition in Section 3.06.700.P:

Permanent Roadway. Roadway constructed with a designed full depth subgrade and road surface section with an established curb and gutter alignment.

2. The mere construction of new sidewalk is not intended to necessitate the street tree requirement. Rather the construction of new sidewalk in excess of a certain length would necessitate the street tree requirement (example: for an off-site improvement the construction of new sidewalk along 50% of the site frontage would necessitate the street tree requirement; for projects within the right of way the construction of new sidewalk along 50% of the project’s length would necessitate the street tree requirement).
While constructing, repairing, or replacing utilities within the right of way it is sometimes necessary replace existing sidewalk to facilitate the construction of items including but not limited to fire hydrants, water services, side sewers, and curb ramps. We request that sidewalk replaced in order to construct these items be explicitly exempted from the street tree requirement.

3. When performing maintenance or repair on a water meter or fire hydrant, it is common that Tacoma Water staff would need to excavate around the meter box/vault or fire hydrant. By allowing trees to be planted with 5 feet of an underground utility it increases the potential that tree root systems may be damaged during maintenance activities. To reduce the opportunity for the trees to be damaged and trees to damage utilities, we request the separation between trees and underground utilities be increased to 10 feet.

Revise Section 13.06.502.C.2.e.2 to read:

Species shall be selected to avoid or minimize potential conflicts with infrastructure and utilities. Trees under power lines shall have a maximum mature height not greater than 25 feet. New tree plantings shall be a minimum of 2 feet from pavement (curb, sidewalk, alley, street), 5 feet from a structure, 10 feet from underground utilities, and 10 feet from light standards. The UFM contains additional guidelines on this subject.
Thanks Jana,

I reviewed the code changes and it looks like they basically would follow the small lot design standards already in place for the 45’ wide small lots that we have now. The only one I thought was not necessary was the required one street tree for the small lots. Some of the time this area may be used for a driveway if an alley isn't there and if the new residents don't water it the tree will probably die depending on the time of year. We usually landscape our properties to make it very attractive anyway. Seems like another requirement that isn't really necessary and if the trees die nobody will care anyway.

Thanks for the chance for imput.

Ken Rody

(253)-318-5711

On Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 9:32 AM, Magoon, Jana <JMAGOON@ci.tacoma.wa.us> wrote:

Ken,

Thought you would want to know we are proposing some changes to our land use regulations related to lot width. There is discussion of allowing as small as 35 feet in width without a variance. I believe you have to maintain at least a 4,500 square foot lot. And, of course, there would be design requirements. The purpose of the proposed change is to limit the number of pipe-stem lots. The idea being the preferred development pattern is houses fronting on streets. I also left a message for Roy. The comment period for the proposed changes ends on March 21st. If you think this is a good thing, I encourage you to send comments. Elliott Barnett is the Planner assigned to shepherd this change through our legislative process. I included him in this e-mail. He could give you more information. His phone number is 591-5389.

Jana Magoon
Development Services | City of Tacoma
PHONE/CELL: 253.882.9713 | FX: 253-591-5433
jmagoon@cityoftacoma.org
December 3, 2013

Mr. Elliott Barnett
Planning Services Division
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

Re: Application #2014-01 – Point Ruston Mixed-Use Center

Dear Mr. Barnett:

This letter is in support of the above referenced application to amend the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations in order to designate the portion of the Point Ruston mixed-use development located in the City of Tacoma as a Mixed-Use Center.

CHB considers that the application is appropriate as the Point Ruston redevelopment site meets the definition as stated in TMC 13.17.010.C.: “Mixed-use center” means a center designated as such in the land use element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. A mixed use center is a compact identifiable district containing several business establishments, adequate public facilities, and a mixture of uses and activities, where residents may obtain a variety of products and services.”

Point Ruston is located within the S-15 Point Ruston / Slag Peninsula Shoreline District, characterized in the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) as an Urban Environment with a High Intensity Environmental Designation. The SMP defines a mixed-use project as: “... developments which include a combination of components, such as residential uses, hotels, marinas, habitat improvement actions, public access provisions, and other uses”. Additionally, several references in the SMP describe Point Ruston as a “mixed-use center.”

The planned redevelopment of the Point Ruston site which is currently underway is consistent with the City’s intent and purpose in creating the Mixed-use center designation.

We urge the City of Tacoma Planning Commission to favorably consider Point Ruston’s application and approve the MUC designation.

Sincerely:

Leslie Ann Rose
Senior Policy Analyst

cc: J.J. McCament
March 15, 2014

Planning Commission
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

To the members serving on the City of Tacoma’s Planning Commission:

As you consider the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code, please accept our vigorous support of the suggested changes to the Sustainability Code Amendments (section 13.06.512) pertaining to bicycle parking.

We appreciate that the proposed standards for bike parking are independent of vehicle parking requirements, which sends the message that cycling will always be an encouraged form of transportation. We understand that people ride for different reasons and want to have a safe place to store their bikes once arriving at a destination. The specific standards relating to short and long-term parking, as well as the design and location of bike parking facilities, are valued additions. The proposed levels of bike parking, changing space, and shower facilities also seem appropriate (Tables 13.06.512 E and E:7). Overall, these changes are a huge step forward for active transportation in Tacoma.

We recommend one change regarding the trigger of "new construction and substantial alterations." We would like additional assurance that basic bicycle parking improvements will apply to popular public destinations such as parks—even though a significant remodel may not be planned. It is important that our city’s public gathering spaces provide visitors arriving by bicycle a safe and designated location to lock up their bikes.

Thank you for considering our input. We are excited to see proposed changes that incorporate guidelines envisioned in the Mobility Master Plan. We believe these updates reinforce the city’s goals of sustainable development, healthy living, transportation mode shifts, and greenhouse gas reduction.

Feel free to contact us with any questions and thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
City of Tacoma Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Advisory Group

David Cook, Co-Chair
Kris Symer, Co-Chair
Justin Camarata
Janet Higbee
Anne James
Aaron Knight
Jennifer Halverson Kuehn
Paul Nordquist
Kendall Reid
Brandi Riddle
Dear Mr. Barnett,

Thank you for providing the City of Ruston with the opportunity to submit comments on Point Ruston’s request for designation as a Mixed Use Center which is currently in review by the City of Tacoma. We appreciate the collaborative working relationship that has developed between Tacoma and Ruston on this project and look forward to continued cooperation between our jurisdictions as build out of this important project continues.

Generally speaking, the City of Ruston is in support of the Mixed Use Center designation and is pleased to see that Point Ruston is progressing with its project and we are hopeful that the issues identified within this letter can be addressed without delay. Since the project is located within the Tacoma boundary which is adjacent to the City of Ruston boundary, Tacoma asked Ruston staff to perform a cursory review. This review results in our sharing the following concerns.

1) **SEPA (FSEIS) Compliance – Parks, Open Space and View Corridors**
   The proposed building foot prints in the pending Tacoma applications, (see applicant’s Exhibit C) have been modified from the FSEIS site plan, (see staff report Exhibit B), without SEPA review or approval. More specifically, a number of pedestrian areas within these view corridors have been eliminated and replaced with driveways and/or parking lots. This represents both a degradation of expected quality of public space and a net decrease in overall open space for the project. As you will recall, Point Ruston FSEIS figures 6 and 10 (attached) require a specific amount of acreage to be developed as public promenade, interior public access, public roads and open/green space, which applicant’s exhibit C proposes to reduce.

Further, it is the City of Ruston’s opinion that the proposed increase in surface parking is in conflict with one of the intended goals of Mixed Use Centers, which is to decrease a projects dependence on single occupant vehicle use and increase dependence on public transportation. Replacement of pedestrian plaza space with unanticipated surface parking lots will not help to encourage utilization of public transportation. Instead, the applicant should be required to withdraw applicant’s exhibit C from this application and commit to adhere to existing promises to provide
all parks, open space and view corridors as proposed and approved during the review of the FSEIS. See attached Figures 1 and 2 for additional details regarding additional inconsistencies.

2) **SEPA (FSEIS) Compliance – Cumulative Traffic Impacts**

The Point Ruston site plan (staff report exhibit B) identifies the footprint, general location, and size of buildings within the overall Point Ruston project. It appears from applicant’s exhibit C that some of the proposed buildings may have increased footprints, densities, and/or overall gross square footage. Has Tacoma evaluated what additional impacts will result from these proposed increases? Has the applicant provided a revised traffic impact analysis to determine appropriate additional mitigation beyond what was addressed under the current FSEIS? The City of Ruston recommends that the City of Tacoma require a revised concurrency evaluation prior to a recommendation for approval of this application. Requiring this evaluation would be consistent with the Tacoma Municipal Code chapter on concurrency.

Again, the City of Ruston thanks you for the opportunity to submit our feedback on these pending applications. In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Rob White
Planning Director
City of Ruston

Attachments:

City of Tacoma Staff Report Exhibit B
Applicant’s Exhibit C
City of Ruston Review Comments Figure 1 - FSEIS Building Site Plan Comparison with Unapproved Plan
City of Ruston Review Comments Figure 2 – PRMDP Inconsistencies
FSEIS, Figure 6 - Public Access Plan
FSEIS, Figure 10 – Park Enhancements
NOTE: THIS MAP REPRESENTS A COMPARISON OF THE APPROVED FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (FSEIS) TO BUILDING FOOTPRINT CONFIGURATIONS REPRESENTED ON RECENT PERMIT SUBMITTALS. MINOR POSITIONAL SHIFT OF BUILDING LAYOUT IS NOT IDENTIFIED AS A DEVIATION FROM THE FSEIS.
1. ORD. 1264 DESIGNATES ALL OF YACHT CLUB ROAD AS A PUBLIC ROAD.

2. ENCROACHES INTO REQUIRED VIEW CORRIDOR.

3. BUILDING FOOTPRINT IMPedes UPON APPROVED PUBLIC PROMONADE.

4. INTERIOR PUBLIC ACCESS RESTRICTED WITH UNAPPROVED BUILDING FOOTPRINT AND PARKING LOT.

5. OPEN SPACE APPROVED BY ORD. 1264 UNAPPROVED BUILDING FOOTPRINT REQUIRES SITE PLAN AMENDMENT.

6. TOTAL SQUARE FOOT REDUCTION OF PUBLIC/OPEN SPACE DUE TO PARKING/DRIVEWAY ADDITIONS NOT YET DETERMINED.
From: Gary Brackett [mailto:Gary.Brackett@tacomachamber.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2014 11:38 AM
To: Boudet, Brian
Cc: David Schroedel
Subject: RE: Container Port Element

Brian,

I am appreciative of your outreach, both to the Chamber’s Government Affairs Committee and your follow-up in response to my questions. I am sharing these points with you as they are the position the Chamber will advocate in the ensuing adoption process.

Likewise, I was appreciative of the outreach efforts made by your staff in the formulation of the Container Port Element (CPE) and the preparation of the Draft Container Port Element September 2013. I am also disappointed that none of the points I raised at that time are reflected in the current version of the CPE.

I recognize that during the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update, the Port of Tacoma and City of Tacoma delayed development of a required Container Port Element as the CPE’s purpose was getting entangled in that controversial issue.

In adopting the SMP, the Council adopted an extension of the S-10 industrial zone for the full length of the E. Foss Peninsula from the tip at NuStar Terminal to the Murray Morgan Bridge, finalizing action expected from a Tacoma Comprehensive Plan Amendment in 2005.

The purpose of a Container Port Element is “to ensure that local land use decisions are made in consideration of the long-term and widespread economic contribution of our international container ports and related industrial lands and transportation systems (emphasis added) to ensure that container ports continue to function effectively alongside vibrant city waterfronts.” (RCW 36.70A.085)

In the City’s Draft Container Port Element, the City has focused exclusively on Port of Tacoma container terminals and directly related transportation systems - not to include other industrial lands and terminal types and their transportation systems.

This is most noticeable in two areas:

1) **The absence of any identification of private terminals or transportation infrastructure.**  
The Foss Waterway contains private commercial terminals as do other waterways.

“Related … transportation systems” have been deemed to include the Port’s grain (commodity) terminal on the west bank of the outer Foss Waterway/Commencement Bay shoreline and planning has accommodated that facility. No similar consideration has been given any private commodity terminal in the port-industrial area, unless by happenstance.

2) **The identification of the Foss Peninsula as a Transitional Zone.**
A) There is no adjacent land to the west of the Foss Peninsula – only the width of the Thea Foss Waterway. At its mouth the Foss Waterway is about 715 feet wide (nearing twice the distance to dead center field at Safeco Field). At the point of the Murray Morgan Bridge, the Foss waterway is about 600 feet wide (the length of two consecutive football fields). The proposed transitional zone serves only to buffer the upland land use from the shoreline, which is already buffered through the SMP. **If the establishment of a transition zone is imperative, the Foss Waterway can serve that purpose.**

B) The area to the north of the Foss Peninsula is physically and visually separated from the area south at E. 11th Street. The Murray Morgan Bridge lands on the east bank of the Foss Waterway at an estimated 30 feet high, supported by multiple columns and rows of support structure, tapering to an embanked slope to ground level at about E. D Street. The additional width of this multi-lane arterial obviates any need for any additional transition. Even so, that transition can be accomplished on the south side of E. 11th Street, as it is so designated.

C) The Council unanimously adopted action to implement Council Resolution 36702 of 2005, where they agreed to a "barrier" composed of updated building and development regulations along E. D Street to serve as a deterrent to conflict between industrial development to the east and expected residential development west along the Foss Waterway shoreline.

The **industrial lands to the east of E. D Street should not be included in an overlaid transitional zone** as mitigation is placed on the users of those lands of development to the west of E. D Street.

If I may address any questions or clarifications as to these points, please call on me.

Sincerely, Gary

**Gary D. Brackett, CCR**  
Manager, Business and Political  
Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber  
950 Pacific Ave., Ste. 300, Tacoma WA 98402  
P.O. Box 1933, Tacoma WA 98401-1933  
Phone: 253-682-1720  
Fax: 253-597-7305  
Email: garyb@tacomachamber.org  
Web: www.tacomachamber.org  
*Business in Motion*
April 9, 2014

SENT VIA EMAIL

TO: Brian Boudet, Planning Division Manager
   City of Tacoma
   bboudet@cityoftacoma.org

FROM: Loren Cohen, Manager of Legal Affairs
      Point Ruston, LLC
      loren@pointruston.com

RE: Point Ruston Mixed Use Center

Thank you for taking the time to discuss the proposed ‘Point Ruston Mixed Use Center’ with JJ McCament and myself. As we discussed, it is a worthwhile goal to provide a broad range of housing choices throughout the City’s neighborhoods. As Point Ruston redevelops the former Asarco smelter site into a high-density urban neighborhood, its goal is to include a mix of housing choices by proving a range of product types, sizes, and price points that span the City’s residential housing market segments. We believe that a diversity of housing choices increases a neighborhood’s vibrancy, and strengthens its character. Therefore, in the context of the redevelopment of this former industrial site, Point Ruston is committed to providing housing that is affordable to a wide cross-section of the market, including to families that are at, or below, the area’s average median income.

Point Ruston submits the following draft policy language within the context of the City’s adoption of the proposed Point Ruston Mixed Use Center as a component of the City’s 2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendment:

In keeping with the City’s goal of providing housing throughout its neighborhoods that is affordable to a wide cross section of the market, and as a condition of qualifying for the Multi-Family Tax Exemption program within the Point Ruston Mixed Use Center (MUC), any project seeking to qualify for the Multi-Family Tax Exemption program within the Point Ruston MUC shall enter into a Development Agreement with the City that establishes goals for the provision of such housing. Essential elements of the Development Agreement shall include, but not be limited to, (i) establishing goals for the provision of affordable housing and a diversity of housing choices within the MUC (i.e., range of product types, sizes and price points); and (ii) establishing a mechanism for monitoring the fulfillment of such goals (i.e. reporting requirements).

We look forward to receiving your comments, and appreciate your guidance in this matter.

cc: Peter Huffman, phuffman@ci.tacoma.wa.us
    Elliott Barnett, elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org
    J.J. McCament, jj@mccamentandrogers.com
April 10, 2014

City of Tacoma
Attn: Stephen Atkinson
747 Market Street
Tacoma, WA 98402

Dear Mr. Atkinson,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Bike Parking Code Amendment in the 2014 Comprehensive Plan Update. And thank you for taking the time to present to our Board of Directors in February.

Downtown On the Go—a Tacoma-based transportation advocate—would like to express support for the increased requirement for bike parking in mixed-use, residential and commercial developments. Access to parking is an important prerequisite to choosing to ride a bicycle and increased access to parking will increase the number of cyclists in Tacoma.

A thriving downtown, one that encourages new development and new business, is part of our vision for Tacoma. Encouraging sustainable development in downtown Tacoma saves developers money and helps realize this vision of a community that focuses on people rather than cars. Bike parking is an increasingly attractive amenity to potential residents and we continue to see an increased demand for bike parking. Providing accessible bike parking is essential to bicycle usage and is an inexpensive addition to a new development. However, we encourage you to include some flexibility in how and where the bike parking is located. To that end, we want to encourage the city and developers to use Downtown On the Go as a resource in designing and providing bike parking, in order to maximize its usage and minimize costs.

Our Board of Directors represents twenty downtown businesses, organizations, and agencies, and the approximately 35,000 employees and more than 4,000 students that commute to downtown Tacoma on a daily basis. Our goal is 4,000 more people choosing non-drive alone commute options by 2015, with 805 of those commuters choosing bicycling. With forward-thinking policies like this one, we will realize this goal and see the economic and community benefits that come with it.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to working with you to promote cycling as a viable option for transportation in Tacoma!

Sincerely,

Kristina Walker
Downtown On the Go Manager

~ 520 ~
April 16, 2014

Planning Department
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

Planning Commission and City Planners:

This letter is in reference to the proposed Sustainability Code Amendments for 13.06.510(F) regarding Electric vehicle parking requirements. On behalf of the Master Builders Association of Pierce County (MBA Pierce), thank you for your consideration of these comments.

MBA Pierce and its members would first like to thank city staff for concurring to make the change to include a statement which specifies that the electric vehicle requirements under this section do not apply to single family housing. MBA Pierce would like to respond to the city staff’s comments on the following provision:

1. **Ch. 13.06.510(F)(2)** “Multifamily uses shall provide electric vehicle infrastructure for 10% of the parking spaces provided, such that a future level 2 charging station can be accommodated.”

City staff stated that the proposal does not specifically require that these spaces be designated upfront, but rather that capacity and infrastructure be provided for potential use in the future. A suggestion listed in the city staff’s response was to run a conduit to multiple levels of a parking garage so that wiring could be put in place at a future date for specific parking spaces. This impacts things such as the meter box being used, how the electricity will be properly billed to the correct tenant and the logistics of piping in the conduit. Additionally, city staff failed to explain how this approach would work for parking in areas that do not contain covered parking.

Another issue that this regulation fails to consider is that the electric vehicle parking requirements will result in additional cost without any guarantee that the infrastructure would be utilized. The building industry is still attempting to recover from an economic downturn and requiring additional cost to a builder to install infrastructure that has no guaranteed use or demand is wasteful and only diminishes the profitability of a project.

MBA Pierce would request that city staff provide information on whether there have been studies as to how many electric vehicles being used in Tacoma and whether there is demand in the market. There was discussion based on the national market trends, but nothing that specifically addresses Tacoma. The Planning Commission requested that City Staff research three comparable cities to find out requirements they may have in place for electric vehicle parking, however this may still not address the difference in the consumer market between the cities.
Additionally, there is no proof that providing this infrastructure would actually encourage residents to go purchase electric vehicles, thus leaving builders with the expense of providing a convenience to a consumer that may not want or use the infrastructure.

MBA Pierce already addressed in its initial letter to the Planning Commission the logistical issues involved with placing infrastructure due to assigned spaces for condos, townhomes and other multi-family housing. This regulation would only result in adding complications to multi-family housing management groups in terms of managing the electric bills for electric vehicle parking, assigning parking spots and requesting builders to come back later, at an additional expense, to finish the infrastructure which was only partially completed. The same problems will result in terms of the electric vehicle owner having to pay to complete the infrastructure.

MBA Pierce would request that this ordinance be rejected by the Planning Commission before moving it forward to the City Council with the understanding that if a consumer owns an electric vehicle, they will bear the cost of having the infrastructure built at a time where it is actually appropriate and needed.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeremiah J. Lafranca, Government Affairs Manager

Cc: Sean Gaffney, Chair
    Donald Erickson
    Stephen Wamback
    Erle Thompson
    Tina Lee

    Scott Winship, Vice-Chair
    Benjamin Fields
    Chris Beale
    Alexandria Teague
April 16, 2014

Planning Department
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

Planning Commission and City Planners:

This letter is in reference to the proposed Annual Amendment to the Land Use Regulatory Code Amendment to 13.04.095 regarding pipestem lots. On behalf of the Master Builders Association of Pierce County (MBA Pierce), thank you for your consideration of these comments.

MBA Pierce and its members would like to express concern over the proposed code changes and the resulting problems they would cause. The following provisions within the proposed amendment have been identified specifically as being areas of concern for the building industry:

1. **Ch. 13.04.095(D)(3)(a)** “Pipestem lots shall have the same setback along all lot lines. In the R-1 District the setback shall be 15 feet. For all other districts the setback shall be 10 feet.”

The proposed language will limit the potential development of pipestem lots. Tacoma City Staff did present their response to the MBA’s previous comment letter in which they presented illustrations of how the proposed regulations would work and did argue that the setback requirements in the R-1 District would not, in most cases, result in a reduction of building area and would often result in a larger building footprint. The problem is that these illustrations failed to take into consideration several problems. First, if a pipe stem lot home had a garage, how would the car enter that garage or park in front of it? Second, how would the illustrated layouts for the pipe stem lots in the city staff’s response work with hammerhead parking radius? Third, for larger lots which are turned into multiple pipe stem lots, how would the parking and turning radius for parking work in that scenario and would the setbacks result in potentially eliminating a pipe stem lot in that scenario due to sizing of the lots?

Another issue with this proposal is that for each zone there should be one set of standards for homeowners in terms of setbacks, height restrictions and other regulations. By creating a new set of standards for pipe stem lots, these new homeowners will be unfairly and unjustly treated by a different standard than their neighbors simply because there were some complaints in neighborhoods about new homes being built. This creates a discriminatory practice in terms of regulations within a zoning district between homeowners that should be treated equally by the government in terms of how they build on their property. Additionally, this becomes a drain on staff time as they would have to do additional analysis beyond what is normally required for building in a particular zone to make sure that a different standard is being met.
MBA Pierce requests that the Planning Commission reject this provision and seek to treat all homeowners within each zoning district equally and without discrimination based on lot location. Furthermore, the MBA Pierce would request that city staff provide information on the number of pipe stem lots in Tacoma and the percentage of neighbors which have complained about the development of these pipe stem lots.

2. Ch. 13.04.095(D)(3)(b) “The height of the main building on a pipe stem lot shall be no taller than 25 feet or no more than the average of the height of the dwellings on each abutting property line and shall not exceed the height of the zoning district.”

MBA Pierce and its members would reiterate the comments from the MBA’s previous letter regarding the height restriction listed above. The proposed language interferes with a property owner’s rights to have the same height restrictions on their homes as other property owners have within their zoning district. This creates a discriminatory standard that would prevent a homeowner on a pipestem lot from being able to maximize the potential of their property due to the home designs of neighbors which moved in prior to them. Additionally, when this subsection is combined with subsection (a) listed above, the ordinance will result in limiting development of pipestem lots in general.

The response provided by city staff was to preserve the neighborhood cohesiveness and character. This response does not address the concerns listed above nor scenarios in which it creates discrimination against a homeowner. This creates a scenario where a homeowner could decide to remodel their home, put in a second floor or raise their roof, while the pipe stem lot that is abutting that homeowner is not entitled to do the same simply because they are being held to a higher standard on the basis that it does not correlate with preserving neighborhood cohesiveness and character. The market for the building industry is constantly evolving as will neighborhood characters in terms of homes as they are remodeled over time. MBA Pierce would ask that city staff to provide feedback on how these planned regulations supports the stated goal of the City of Tacoma to increase density and affordability.

MBA Pierce requests that the Planning Commission reject the various provisions of this ordinance and maintain a level of equality for homeowners within each zoning district.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Jeremiah J. Lafranca, Government Affairs Manager
Cc:  Sean Gaffney, Chair
     Donald Erickson
     Stephen Wambach
     Erle Thompson
     Tina Lee

     Scott Winship, Vice-Chair
     Benjamin Fields
     Chris Beale
     Alexandria Teague
Hello Steve,
Please see my responses to your questions below. I hope my info helps.

---

From: Atkinson, Stephen  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 2:56 PM  
To: Hellman, James  
Subject: RE: Electrical load questions  
Importance: High

James – As a follow up to our conversation last week, I was hoping you could respond to the following questions and let me know if there are any code citations that address these issues. I hope the questions are clear – these have come up in conversation with the Planning Commission and other stakeholders concerning the proposed electric vehicle infrastructure requirements. Would you be willing to provide responses that I could give to the Planning Commission? Thanks,

Steve

If a new multifamily structure was required to run an empty conduit from an electrical panel or electrical room to a junction box in a parking structure, would that requirement trigger any other electrical capacity upgrades? **No.** Effectively, would the use be required to have the electrical capacity for the conduit? **If the conduit were to be used, the service capacity would need to be adequate for the additional load served.** Or could the capacity be added later when the conduit is proposed for use? **Capacity could be added later.**

It seems prudent for a new development to include some extra electrical capacity for future additions or upgrades. Is there a general requirement for excess electrical capacity? If so, is this a TPU requirement or national electrical code? **Prudent is an accurate statement; there is no NEC or TPU code language mandating an allowance for future load.** The NEC references future planning and convenience as good design practice. **Future conduits for service conductors and branch circuits are always a good idea, but in some cases, the service equipment and transformer may need to be upgraded if they are to be used.**

Lastly, if a new structure is planned to accommodate future electrical appliances but without a definite timeframe for when those additional loads would be added, would the transformer sizing be based on the existing load or the planned future load? Or is this a choice the developer could make at the time of construction? **Per our New Service Engineer Supervisor, John Martinson, transformer sizing for the scenario you describe would be handled on a case-by-case basis due to many factors. New Service Engineers would discuss design issues with the customer/engineer to determine what their plans are regarding the future load.**
May 7, 2014

Planning Department
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street, Room 345
Tacoma, WA 98402

Planning Commission and City Planners:

This letter is in reference to the proposed 2014 Annual Amendment package regarding the Mixed-Use Centers Code Review and Affordable Housing provisions. On behalf of the Master Builders Association of Pierce County (MBA Pierce), thank you for your consideration of these comments voicing further support for these two provisions of the Annual Amendment.

MBA Pierce and its members support the proposed Mixed-Use Centers Code Revision adoption. MBA Pierce believes that the Mixed-Use Centers Code Review provision should promote and increase the rate of development of mixed-use centers and help to eliminate some of the current unintended barriers that exist for this type of project. Passage of this provision will show Tacoma’s dedication to finding ways to promote unique development to accomplish efficient infill while seeking to create a more vibrant city lifestyle.

MBA Pierce and its members also support the passage of the Affordable Housing provision of the Annual Amendment. The Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group has been creating an Affordable Housing package that will make the development of affordable housing in Tacoma more attractive to for-profit and non-profit builders. Passing this provision forward to City Council will demonstrate the Planning Commission’s commitment to creating an affordable housing option to the residents of Tacoma which will help promote economic diversity within the city limits.

Please contact MBA Pierce regarding issues that would affect the housing industry in Tacoma. Thank you for your efforts in supporting these two provisions of the Annual Amendment which will help to diversify the building industry’s approach to building in Tacoma.
Sincerely,

Jeremiah J. Lafranca, Government Affairs Manager

Cc: Sean Gaffney, Chair
    Donald Erickson
    Stephen Wambback
    Erle Thompson
    Tina Lee

    Scott Winship, Vice-Chair
    Benjamin Fields
    Chris Beale
    Alexandria Teague