

**From:** Jennifer McCabe <jmccabe809@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 30, 2021 9:53 AM  
**To:** City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Hazard pay for essential grocery workers

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello ,

I am a grocery store worker and through this entire pandemic we have encountered many issues. Stress from being overworked and working long hours, abuse from customers and so many lives have been put at risk. We risk our lives and the lives of our loved ones just to go to work everyday. We need hazard pay right now.

**From:** Steve Allsop <s.allsop.37@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 30, 2021 1:44 PM

**To:** City Clerk's Office

**Subject:** Public Comment - Home in Tacoma

**Attachments:** Home in Tacoma comments.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello. I have attached some comments and would appreciate you distributing them to Council.

Thank you.

Steve Allsop

To: Elliott Barnett  
 Planning Commission  
 City Council

Re: Public Comment—Home in Tacoma

Following are my observations after much study and interaction with planning staff. They are a reaction to the plan, and not intended as a criticism of any individual.

My over-riding position is adamant opposition to such a far-reaching and radical program. It is overkill in the extreme, in my view, and after watching the March 23 Study Session, it appears to me that proponents are focused more on ideology (aka "inclusion") than addressing the issue of supply in a balanced way. Within that context:

- What is "inclusion"? Inclusion for whom, in what? And, if the ultimate "equalizer" is home ownership, how does a plan that actually decreases ownership options help?
- Tacoma's South End has some of the most affordable options in the Puget Sound Area. More affordable than Sumner, Bonney Lake, Puyallup, Fircrest, University Place, Gig Harbor, and certainly all points north. So where is the "emergency"? Certainly there is an issue, but it appears to me that "emergency" is being used as a lever to radically change the city without proper discourse. The average homeowner does NOT know about this plan, much less its implications, and jamming it through as an "emergency" is an immense disservice.
- Several Councilmembers stated that people who are opposed to the plan "just don't get it", as if they don't understand. Interestingly, looking at comments on the interactive map, I see the most negative are from folks who have actually experienced (such as Proctor residents) the type of change this plan advocates. They get it -- very clearly -- as they have been slapped in the face by it.
- The statement that "some of Tacoma's most popular neighborhoods were built before SFR zoning" should also mention that it was precisely the hodge-podge result that led people to demand zoning changes 70 years ago. I have zero interest in living in the Stadium District for exactly that reason and yet, that's where we appear to be headed. A giant step backwards.
- It is literally horrifying to contemplate a four-story apartment house with zero parking 1/2 block from my home. I invested in this *neighborhood*, beyond just buying a house, and it is not equitable that I should bear the brunt of someone else's notion of "equity".
- Speaking of equity, how is it equitable that, due to economic reality, places on the slopes and other high-priced areas will be largely sheltered from this plan's measures? The folks that will suffer the consequences are those of us where less-expensive properties can be snatched up by developers and demoed or converted. A perfect example is N 8th and Oakes: two SFR's screaming for someone to fix them up will instead be demoed for a 4-story, 41-unit apt house with no parking. The ripple effect for blocks in that neighborhood will be huge and negative. Two chances for someone to enjoy home ownership at a bargain price squandered and a neighborhood thrown into turmoil. Not equitable. Not fair. Not community-minded. There is no provision for differentiation amongst neighborhoods with different

characteristics. Ironically, the very people supposedly targeted for "inclusion" will likely be the most negatively impacted since Oakes-type changes will be more prevalent in their neighborhoods.

- The panel selected to address the Council hardly represents a balanced perspective. Perhaps a real estate expert like Mike Lonergan would be a good addition if balanced input is of interest.

I spent most of my 16 years on Sumner's City Council as chair of the Community Development Committee. We grappled with the issues thrust on us by the GMA, PSRC, etc. etc. and came up with some ways to increase density without radically altering the reasons folks chose their respective neighborhoods.

- One tactic was of course mixed-use centers, carefully sighted so as to create as little impact on surrounding properties as possible.
- In the spirit of maintaining scale and encouraging home-ownership, we revised the code to allow for zero lot-line development in some areas, thereby encouraging individual ownership of the units in a townhouse, for instance.
- We also mandated ground-related housing for multiplexes to reduce their scale, and limited the number allowed in any one block.
- Cottage housing was a minimally invasive tool for increasing housing options, as well as relaxed ADU standards.

These are *reasonable* means of addressing the issue, without decimating neighborhoods.

Here's how this proposal could be modified to present a *balanced* approach to the housing issue:

- Limit the "mid-scale" housing to mixed-use centers. Eliminate the wide swaths that engulf people's homes just because a bus happens to go that way.
- Require parking! 1:1 ratio minimum. Councilman Thoms cited data validating what everyone knows intuitively. While some might wish people no longer drive, that notion is at least 20 years in the future. Streets lined with parked cars are not a pleasant, or safe, streetscape and when adequate parking is not available, the whole neighborhood suffers the consequence.
- Limit the number of multiplexes allowed in one area. The original pilot program had a 1000-foot buffer between them. That made sense.
- Incorporate ownership-friendly provisions as I have outlined above. Everyone wins.

My hope is that you will take a step back and give greater credence to the immense negative impacts this plan harbors. Have some respect for the average homeowner who has invested in this city and will suffer the brunt of your plan. As everyone said, it is a BIG deal with immense implications – many unknown and unintended. If you proceed with Phase I, the dye will be cast regardless of subsequent zoning or design standard tweaks. You should scale back the revised Infill Pilot Program (add buffers, parking requirements) which has been in place only a few months and let it run its course.

Respectfully submitted,  
Steve (and Susan) Allsop  
2201 N Lawrence St.

**From:** Michelle Wissing <michellewissing@hotmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, April 5, 2021 10:54 AM

**To:** City Clerk's Office

**Subject:** Hazard Pay

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello

My name is Michelle Wissing and I work for Safeway on proctor in Tacoma. I feel that we should be entitled to hazard pay as we have been open for business and working the entire pandemic. At the same time I'm also grateful that I didn't have to endure the hardship others have had by not being able to work. However most were give a substantial unemployment stipend during the initial pandemic, while most grocery workers had to work and put there selves and their family members at risk everyday up to now. We don't know how long this will go on or even if the vaccine is going to keep us safe six months from now. So I am asking that the council please consider those of us that are keeping the company afloat this entire time. They have surpassed business projections thus far.

Thank you

Sent from myMail for iOS

**From:** Edna Dyke <ednadorothy@comcast.net>

**Sent:** Monday, April 5, 2021 2:42 PM

**To:** City Clerk's Office

**Subject:** hazardous pay

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Flagged

We as essential workers we should not have to worry about money at the same time that we have to make sure we are safe during this pandemic. I have been going to work ever since before the pandemic started.

We should be able to receive hazardous pay. The Kroger company has been making billions of dollars in profit during this pandemic. We should be granted hazardous pay since we have to go to work and restock shelves if groceries for our customers to buy.

I get a feeling that Kroger does not appreciate the work that we do on a daily basis. Most of the customers that I talk to say that support the hazardous pay for all grocery workers. Because without us the stores would not have the shelves stocked. I work at the James Center Fred Meyer store.

Thank you,

Edna Dyke

**From:** Heidi <batlmaidn3@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 7, 2021 8:07 PM  
**To:** Planning; City Clerk's Office; Wung, Lihuang; Beale, Chris; McCarthy, Conor; Ushka, Catherine; Blocker, Keith; Walker, Kristina; Hunter, Lillian; Thoms, Robert; vadergan@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Home in Tacoma Project

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

To whom it may concern:

This is in regards to the Home in Tacoma Project proposals. I am appalled by the changes in this proposal and the outreach to the citizens of Tacoma. Not one of my neighbors has even heard of the changes the planning dept. are proposing let alone the confusing survey that was put out that was biased anyway toward making you choose taller and more housing. There were 870 responses on the survey out of the over 200,000 people that live in Tacoma. The 870 responses do not represent the majority of the residents of Tacoma. I would hope that if the City wants growth then they would add more Fire and Police and have a standard of how many Fire and Police are needed to the ratio of people because as of now we do not have enough and the crime has skyrocketed in Tacoma.

### Home In Tacoma Project proposals

- Allow more housing types (such as duplexes, triplexes, cottages and small multifamily) throughout Tacoma's neighborhoods – *What about the people that bought their homes on single dwelling lots that want a quality of life and single dwelling living. They are being left out of this equation. I think that areas that already have single dwelling should stay that way.*
- Allow mid-scale multifamily housing in areas close to shopping and transit – *If you allow this then there needs to be adequate parking(15 parking stalls with 50 units are not adequate parking) and enforcement of parking over sidewalks and on planting strips because this is already happening in the West Mall area and in So Tacoma where there is multi-family housing and it is not a walkable area.*
- Update design standards so new housing complements the neighborhood – *bottom line is that whatever someone proposes will get an okay from the City because they want be able to pack people in like sardines and take away a quality of life.*
- Strengthen policies and programs to make housing more affordable – *I would like to know what the City thinks is affordable because I know that \$1,100 a month for a very small studio is not affordable for someone that makes \$16.00 per hour and just picking up the utilities is still not affordable. As long as Tacoma remains a hot spot to live no housing will be affordable unless the City builds and maintains it. As far as I know the City cannot tell a person how much they can charge for rent, so affordability is out the window.*
- Strengthen anti-racism and anti-displacement policies and programs – *No person that wants to buy or rent should ever be turned away as long as they meet the criteria of the purchase or rental. I do not know how you will deal with this. I live in a very diverse part of Tacoma and love it.*

I am a lifelong resident who owns a home in a single dwelling neighborhood. I am involved in my community love my neighborhood and do not want to see anyone without a place to live, but the reality is Tacoma will not be affordable for people that make \$16.00 or less. I wish the city will stop saying housing will be affordable because you have no control over how much people ask for the sale of a house or the rent that is to be paid. Developers and all the people that have a vested interest in building in Tacoma should not have a say in how Tacoma grows and should not get the 8 or 12 year tax breaks to build. We need to be smart about how we grow and West Mall/Proctor district areas are not the way we should grow.

Sincerely,

Heidi White, S Tacoma



**From:** Sorum, Doris  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 8:36 AM  
**To:** Jenkins, Jessica; Emery, Michelle  
**Subject:** FW: Tacoma Planning Commission (Home in Tacoma Project)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Doris Sorum  
City Clerk  
253-591-5361  
[dsorum@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:dsorum@cityoftacoma.org)

**From:** ElderJusticeAdvocacy <ElderJusticeAdvocacy@protonmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 7, 2021 7:16 PM  
**To:** City Manager <CityManager@cityoftacoma.org>; Sorum, Doris <DSORUM@cityoftacoma.org>  
**Subject:** Tacoma Planning Commission (Home in Tacoma Project)

Dear the Honorable Mayor and Tacoma City Council

Unbeknownst to numerous residents, the Tacoma Planning Commission is taking comments on the proposed re-zoning of single-family neighborhoods. The two re-zoning options available to the public, excludes non-disclosed concerns and options specified by a majority of residents. The disclosed public viewing options specifically excludes the failing business districts. Numerous box stores, store fronts are vacant, boarded up, fenced off and filled with debris on major thoroughfares. The same business districts that were specifically ignored by Tacoma Planning Commission. Full disclosure of all discussed options including that of the failed business districts and disclosing of all conflicts of interests by governing bodies must be disclosed to the public, before any re-zoning proposals are introduced.

Furthermore, it has been reported by residents, that stakeholders, planning commissioners and/or via their businesses, associates, affiliations have targeted senior residents specifically to sell, grant easements, access and right of ways through unethical business tactics, unlawful means, including but not limited to false impersonation. These same unlawful business tactics are found within Endicott v. Saul 142 Wn. App 897, 176 P.3rd 560, involving predatory real estate practices by Windermere broker. In recent open-sourced publications, April 2021, Windermere's Chief Economist, Matthew Gardner has stated, "Over the last year, housing prices in Seattle and the greater Puget Sound area have skyrocketed. What can be done to manage that? The solution may lie in ending single-family zoning once and for all." Simultaneously, there are reports of seniors, widows and residents being targeted by predatory developers to grant easements, access, sell and even change their deed under guise of social statement. Given the overt nature of the targeting of seniors and residents by developers and those with direct and/or indirect benefit thereof, we are referring and requesting a criminal investigation by the United States Department of Justice, Elder Exploitation Division.

Angela Strege

cc: United States Department of Justice Elder Exploitation Task Force

Kayla Stahman, Assistant United States Attorney



**From:** Jill & Rob Jensen <jillandrob@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 3:40 PM  
**To:** City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Tacoma City Council & Tacoma Planning Commission  
**Attachments:** Planning Commission.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear City Clerk,

Please forward on my comments regarding the proposed changes to our zoning regulations to the members of the City Council and Planning Commission.

Thank you,

Robert Jensen

April 8, 2021

Tacoma Planning Commission & Tacoma City Council Members

I am writing to say I do NOT support the proposed mid-level housing the Planning Commission has proposed.

This change to our city's zoning is too much, too fast and I do not feel it has been thought through carefully enough regarding the impacts it will have on the citizens of Tacoma and our existing infrastructure.

Before beginning yet another change, I feel we should pay close attention and fine tune the changes we already have in place.

As an owner of a licensed rental property within city limits, I wonder how many properties are currently rented without meeting the city's codes and guidelines? I personally know of several home owners who rent out their property but do so without being licensed. Why don't we focus on getting revenue from people who are not following the letter of the law and use those funds to help provide truly AFFORDABLE housing.

Many people make changes/additions to their property without the necessary permits. The city should be enforcing our existing codes before bringing on even more options when we cannot keep up with the work load which currently exists. For instance, I have seen homes for sale which list ADUs or basement conversions in the realtor listings. The city should follow up on these to determine if they were permitted or not – before an unsuspecting buyer purchases a home where the changes made potentially do not meet code.

I have just heard of this new proposed zoning change and in my opinion, it is being implemented much too fast. The city should make certain the tax paying citizens are fully informed of what's being proposed and the neighbors I have spoken with are in the dark.

I question what is the hurry in pushing through for mid-level changes? Before branching out, Tacoma should see what the demand is for more multi-family style housing once the current projects down the pipeline are completed.

Our biggest problem is these new projects – where developers are given multiple year tax breaks and no infrastructure fees charged – are NOT addressing our need for AFFORDABLE housing. Let's not lose sight of the people our council and commissions say we are needing to help. Let the developers pay their fair share for improvements before our citizens get taxed out of their homes.

Let's ensure Tacoma is a livable community for EVERYONE who calls her home.

Robert Jensen  
3002 N 13<sup>th</sup> St  
Tacoma, WA 98406

**From:** Sorum, Doris  
**Sent:** Friday, April 9, 2021 4:38 PM  
**To:** Wung, Lihuang; Jenkins, Jessica  
**Cc:** Pauli, Elizabeth  
**Subject:** FW: Home in Tacoma response letter to Council and Planning Commission  
**Attachments:** April 9 Home in Tacoma letter 2.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Doris Sorum  
City Clerk  
253-591-5361  
[dsorum@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:dsorum@cityoftacoma.org)

---

**From:** J Quilici <jquil@harbornet.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 9, 2021 4:13 PM  
**To:** Sorum, Doris <DSORUM@cityoftacoma.org>  
**Subject:** Home in Tacoma response letter to Council and Planning Commission

Dear Doris,

Home in Tacoma response letter:

Attached is a letter to the Planning Commission members and the City Council members and a cc to the City Manager.

Will you please see that they each get a copy.

Thank you,  
Judi Quilici  
1530 Fernside Dr. S.  
Tacoma, Wa 98465  
253-564-0847  
[jquil@harbornet.com](mailto:jquil@harbornet.com)

April 9, 2021

Tacoma City Council Members  
Tacoma Planning Commission Members  
747 St. Helens  
Tacoma, WA 98407

Re: Home in Tacoma Project

Dear Council Members and Planning Commission Members:

Affordable housing is a market driven issue, not a land use and zoning issue. Programs and incentives can be developed concerning affordable housing assistance.

If there is a housing problem in Tacoma, we need a clear definition of what it may be. This has not been done. The Home in Tacoma project appears to be very complex and goes well beyond just housing. It involves land use, zoning and neighborhood disruption. It will detrimentally affect existing neighborhoods.. The proposed action is unclear and the impacts are not identifiable.

We need face to face meetings through each designated Neighborhood Council when the Pandemic situation allows. No attempt has been made in this regard. Many people did not receive the City's mail out card about this matter, and if they did, they did not have the normal contacts with neighbors to ask questions because of the Pandemic.

We currently see degradation of neighborhoods; demolition of existing houses; and absolutely no design standards whatsoever. (i.e., No. 7<sup>th</sup> and Prospect area and other areas).

Rezoning the entire city at once would be 'a race to the bottom' and bring unintended consequences. I urge you to look at transit corridors and hubs before erasing all city single family zoning.

I strongly urge more meaningful and factual examination of these issues before they are voted on. A slow roll out is also strongly urged.

Thank you in advance for any consideration of these matters.

Yours Truly,

Judi Quilici

1530 Fernside Dr. S.  
Tacoma, WA 98465  
jquil@harbornet.com

cc. Tacoma City Manager



**From:** Ray Bennett <raylbennett@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 13, 2021 9:46 AM  
**To:** City Clerk's Office  
**Cc:** Ray Bennett  
**Subject:** Hazard Pay

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Good Afternoon Mayor Woodard and City Council Members,

Hazard pay should be given to all Grocery workers since we have been on the front line since the beginning of the pandemic. We have had team members die, hospitalized and effected by this terrible pandemic. We have put up with extra hours without the needed help, customers hitting, spitting, yelling and at least one case stabbed a fellow coworker just because of being asked to wear a mask or out of product. Kroger has given out bonuses to upper management in excess of five times their highest bonuses due to the double and sometimes triple the sales during the pandemic. This pandemic isn't even close to being over South Hill Fred Meyer meat department had everyone out for covid19 for the last couple of weeks and a few in other departments there.

The stores that Kroger is saying they are closing because of the hazard pay isn't due to hazard pay at all since they were slatted for closer since 2017. If anything they would be to the billions of bonuses they paid out to upper management for the profits that we as the underlying grunt workers.

We as grocery workers classified as essential workers should have hazard pay!

Thank you Kindly for Your Time,

Ray L Bennett

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



**From:** oakschiller2 <oakschiller2@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 13, 2021 3:21 PM

**To:** City Clerk's Office

**Subject:** City Council Comment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Flagged

I want to express my support for a ordinance to make large grocery stores pay their employees hazard pay.

Jay Oak-Schiller, the South End

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone