Dear Tacoma City Council,

I am making public comment concerning item #5, 23-0362. I mostly agree with your letter.

I feel compelled to mention that the interactions on my block were changed drastically between September of 2019 and November 2019 when my two door down neighbor had their building searched and seized concerning the growing of cannabis at 3420 E McKinley, 98404. They were Chinese.

I worked with my neighbor in 2019 on the plots that were flush with the 723 e 35th side of the building. I worked on the plots until I was struck in January 2022.

Theresa Evans, Owen's mom
Pethau bychain
From: OTTO MATSCH <omatsch@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2023 2:58 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: Changes to the City Council meeting | April 11, 2023

As usual the council announces changes to the agenda at the last second. Why bother having an agenda?

Otto Matsch
915 North Park Drive
Tacoma, WA 98403
ph: 253.307.2765
fx: 253.404.0817

On 04/11/2023 2:14 PM City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@cityoftacoma.org> wrote:

Good afternoon,

There may be changes to the City Council meeting of Tuesday, April 11, 2023.

**A motion may be made to add a Resolution, Resolution No. 41175:**
A resolution setting Tuesday, April 25, 2023, upon completion of Regular Agenda Items, no earlier than 5:15 p.m., as the date for a public hearing by the City Council on the 2023 Annual Action Plan for Housing, Community and Economic development, and public services.

**A motion may be made to add a letter to Governor Inslee:**
A letter from the City Council to Governor Inslee, supporting Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5080.

**A motion may be made to amend Item No. 5:**
To amend Item No. 5, the letter supporting Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5080, to include the current status of the Bill, express appreciation to the legislators for their hard work, and other minor edits.

Thank you,

Jessica Jenkins
City of Tacoma | City Clerk’s Office
Phone: 253.591.5167 | Fax: 253.591.5300
Hearing Examiner Judge to City Council: YOU HAVE THE POWER
City Council Refusing to Grasp Decision-Making Power regarding Warehouse Street Vacations

In the process of permitting the South Tacoma 2.5 million square foot warehouse for Chicago-based Bridge Industrial, old city right of ways need to be “vacated” so the construction can go forward. The Hearing Examiner Judge Jeff H. Capell wrote an unprecedented 20 page ruling engaging the detailed concerns from citizens related to this construction and assessing the legal issues relative to this street vacation. In particular, he noted:

RCW 35.79.010 gives the legislative authority [of a municipality] -- the city council – sole discretion as to whether a petition to vacate shall be granted or denied." Long-standing case law in Washington has held that the vacation of right-of-way is a legislative/political function that belongs to municipal authorities.

Additionally, he determined:

The Hearing Examiner’s role in street vacation proceedings is somewhat quasi-judicial in nature, making findings and conclusions based on evidence presented, but without a final decision. The Examiner’s recommendation leads to a legislative determination by the City Council that is enacted by ordinance.

In noting that many residents’ written and verbal comments were connected to the planned construction that the street vacations enable, he added:

Whether the City Council has the authority and discretion, in its vacation decision, to consider development and permitting considerations, along with all the reasons offered in public testimony as grounds for delaying or denying these vacations, is for the Council to decide.

And yet, at the March 21 meeting, did the elected city representatives take the time to follow the Hearing Examiner Judge’s recommendations to make these decision and take their responsibility to use their “sole discretion,” taking into account all 20 pages of information and assessment from the Judge? No. The street vacations were skillfully buried as non-issues toward the very beginning of the meeting; the two ordinances were simply lumped into the consent agenda (along with numerous other items and even other Hearing Examiner responses). Council Member Walker made a motion to approve the entire consent agenda as well as moving to accept all of the Hearing Examiner’s recommendations without any discussion.

What are the city council members there for but to take seriously the residents’ concerns? The unelected Hearing Examiner took much more time to consider residents’ concerns than did the council! The City Council has one more chance to review and discuss the situation before making a decision – will they seize and use their power?!

Dr. Michelle S. Mood (she, her, hers)
(c) 740-233-6333
3719 South Gunnison St
Tacoma WA 98409

A boomer, not a zoomer.
City Council Members:
I am deeply concerned with the types of business and housing development in The Central and South Tacoma areas. It feels like City officials and planners are using an "immediate and reactive" approach to pushing through approval of housing and business projects to be located in South Tacoma. These efforts to push these projects through are not using a careful, thought out, coordinated process. I would describe it as feeling "scattered, lacking focus on previously established goals and desired outcomes."

Nobody seems to be thinking of the impacts (health, environmental and economic) of these various projects on the people that live and work in Tacoma!

Greater use of Public transit has been encouraged. However, how will public transportation be able to provide acceptable and consistent service in South Tacoma if the roads are clogged from the vehicle/diesel truck trips (10,000-12,000 daily) generated by this Bridge Industrial distribution/warehouse project to be located in South Tacoma? In the West Mall development area, we now have the start of demolishing older, smaller homes and replacing that housing with crowded apartment buildings. So more people living in South Tacoma that will be stuck in stagnant traffic...making the traffic and air quality situation even worse.

Has any City Official thought these development plans through...from the perspective of a resident living in the middle of South Tacoma? The City Council needs to consider what is the best plan for the residents that are already living in South Tacoma!

Cathie Urwin
TO MARY WOODARD, CITY MANAGER PAUL, CECILITY ATTORNEY FOSBRE AND MEMBERS OF TACOMA CITY COUNCIL

SUBJECT: NEW YORK CITY'S MENTAL HEALTH OBSERVATION LAW FOR DANGEROUS UNSHELTERED INDIVIDUALS

FROM: MICHELE REICH
PO BOX 110433, TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98411

I came across an article piece about the Mayor of New York City and New City's City Council passed a new law to address dangerous homeless individuals that pose a safety risk to citizens in public.

In essence, the law allows police to involuntarily detain an individual exhibiting erratic mental behavior and escort that individual to a mental health facility for treatment and to follow up with suitable housing.

While it may seem extreme, the law—passed by a progressive administration for its merit—provides a means to address public safety concerns. Similar incidents have occurred in Seattle and Tacoma by individuals experiencing a "mental health crisis." It is a matter of public health and safety.

The law is designed to allow the detention of individuals who may pose a danger to themselves or others. It is a balance between safety and personal freedom.

In essence, the law is an attempt to provide a second chance for those in need of mental health care. It is a step towards ensuring that individuals who may pose a danger to themselves or others can receive the care they need, while also protecting the safety of the broader community.

While it may seem extreme, the law—passed by a progressive administration for its merit—provides a means to address public safety concerns. Similar incidents have occurred in Seattle and Tacoma by individuals experiencing a "mental health crisis." It is a matter of public health and safety.

The law is designed to allow the detention of individuals who may pose a danger to themselves or others. It is a balance between safety and personal freedom.

In essence, the law is an attempt to provide a second chance for those in need of mental health care. It is a step towards ensuring that individuals who may pose a danger to themselves or others can receive the care they need, while also protecting the safety of the broader community.

I, Michelle Reich.
Homeless encampment sweeps ‘decrease life expectancy,’ a new study suggests

The Journal of the American Medical Association
Published April 10, 2023
Population-Level Health Effects of Involuntary Displacement of People Experiencing Unsheltered Homelessness Who Inject Drugs in US Cities
Authors: Joshua A. Barocas, MD1; Samantha K. Nall, MPH1; Sarah Axelrath, MD2; et al
https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2803839

From the study abstract:

Importance: At least 500,000 people in the US experience homelessness nightly. More than 30% of people experiencing homelessness also have a substance use disorder. Involuntary displacement is a common practice in responding to unsheltered people experiencing homelessness. Understanding the health implications of displacement (e.g., “sweeps,” “clearings,” “cleanups”) is important, especially as they relate to key substance use disorder outcomes.

Here’s a quote from the principal investigator of the study, Josh Barocas, MD
“Our study found that encampment clearance/sweeps could increase deaths among people experiencing homelessness by 25% by 2028. ‘Sweeping’ people is not a solution to homelessness, but is rather a form of (costly) state-sponsored violence.”

Coverage by Denver newspaper of the study published in JAMA (quick summary)
https://denverite.com/2023/04/10/homeless-encampment-sweep-study-cu-anschutz/

A photo from today – just a few months after the sweep in my neighborhood (G street). The NIMBY boulders have little effect. Trauma and drama to what end?

Theresa Power-Drutis tpdruitis@nctacom.org
I am challenging you, once again, to draw from your integrity, authority, and respect for other agencies whom have weighed in on the S Tacoma Warehouse proposal, and DELAY the vacating of any streets for Bridge Industrial until an EIS and Health Impact Statement have been conducted.

This isn’t a time to ignore the relevant feedback from the Tacoma Pierce County Health Dept, the WA State Dept of Ecology, the Puget Sound Clean Air agency and numerous community members, including our previous Mayor.

This is a time to take full responsibility for thoughtfully and thoroughly evaluating the impact of this enormous Industrial complex on public health, air quality, water quality, traffic congestion, loss of more precious land and, finally, the impact on environmental and social Justice.

Please do the right thing for this community.

Janee Provazek