

## Tacoma Billboard Community Working Group

### Meeting 2

**Monday, October 6, 2014, 4:00-6:00 P.M**  
**Center for Urban Waters, 326 East D Street**

### DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

<b>Working Group Members Attending:</b>					
Andy Mordhorst	X	Sharon Winters	X	Evette Mason	X
Doug Schafer	X	Ray Velkers	X	Rusty George	X
Tricia DeOme	X	Steve Wamback	X	Nalani Linder	X
Nick Fedaiy	X	Pam Guinn	X	Eric Jackson	X
Jill Jensen	X	Mike Luinstra	X	Rose Mednick	X
Dale Cope	X	Dale Reed		Tony Powell	
<b>Working Group Member Alternates Attending (audience):</b>					
<i>John Thurlow</i>	X	<i>Jon Ketler</i>	X		
<i>Chris Beale</i>	X	<i>Dalton Gittens</i>	X		
<b>City Representatives, Staff, &amp; Support Team Attending:</b>					
Brian Boudet	X	Michelle Regan	X		X
John Harrington	X	John Griffith	X		X
Karen Reed	X				

The meeting commenced at approximately 4:10 P.M. Karen Reed reviewed the proposed agenda for this meeting and provided an update on Working Group membership. Since the first meeting, Tony Powell is now a member of the Working Group as a City resident and Dale Cope is a member representing Scenic Tacoma; Dalton Gittens is the new alternate for Scenic Tacoma.

The draft summary of Meeting 1 was approved: Moved by \_\_\_\_\_; seconded by \_\_\_\_\_.  
 The motion carried.

The revised Community Working Group charter was reviewed. Motion to approve as revised by Sharon Winters; seconded by Nick Fedaiy. The motion carried.

City staff John Harrington provided a recap of basic information about billboards in Tacoma. His presentation included descriptions of the numbers, types and sizes of inventory, and locations of billboards, as well as a glossary of zoning terms.

There was a request to have a map indicating zoning and arterial road designations. That layer will be added to the online interactive map by the time of the next meeting. Zoning will also be added to the interactive map. Staff will also explore the viability of printing a larger more legible handout map.

**Information request:** Tricia DeOme asked how many billboards would be conforming if one face was removed.

Eric Jackson asked why we are reviewing current code if we are developing something new. Ms. Reed explained that it is important to know where we are starting from in order to thoughtfully develop alternatives.

Mr. Fediay asked if there are any illegal billboards out there. Mr. Harrington spoke of one location he is still reviewing to determine status. It is possible there is one illegal billboard; all of them are nonconforming, but by far most are not illegal.

Amortization was reviewed in depth. The question came up: How many total signs are still in amortization status? The response is: all of them.

Ms. DeOme would like C2 zoning explained. The group was provided with a zoning reference guide.

Ms. Reed reviewed the homework exploring the interests and values of the group. She provided a handout which summarized her analysis of the results. She pointed to several consensus items as well as nonconsensus items. The group is fortunate in that there are strong consensus points to work with.

The group will defer developing a statement of common interests until they know each other a little better.

Doug Schafer asked about why billboards are prohibited in CIX. He would like to understand the thinking of the City's planners in prohibiting billboards in CIX. What are the major policy drivers in code development? What is the vision of the City Planners? These questions were echoed by Mike Luinstra. Brian Boudet said the Planning vision can be covered at the next meeting. Mr. Schafer would like the history to go back to the 1988 ordinance. Harrington will recap to the extent possible. Details of staff work from the 80s is likely not available. Ray Velkers asked what happened to make all the current billboards nonconforming. Harrington explained that the progression of codes will be available at the next meeting.

Ms DeOme asked if the group could get a list that describes when each billboard became nonconforming. Staff is working on this. It is a high degree of analysis. We may never have a complete list.

Steve Wamback would like a description of the City's vision, what other jurisdiction have done. Also he would like some review of the statements made in the homework (interests and values of the members) to determine if some of them are viable/legal or if some are actually illegal. The City Attorney will be at the next meeting and can speak to that issue.

Mr. Fediay asked if, at this point, anyone can obtain a permit to build a billboard in the City? The response is, no. The overall number is higher than the cap currently.

Ms. DeOme asked how many complaints have come in and how much code enforcement has been done since 2012? Pam Guinn said when Clear Channel has gotten complaints, they have fixed the issue. The calls have come from City Council members, clients, etc. But very few requests or complaints have come in.

Jill Jensen asked if the billboards have been nonconforming since 1997, what has the City done to enforce? An amortization period was established in 1997. In 2007, enforcement letters went out to the businesses and landowners to initiate enforcement action. At that point Clear Channel filed suit, and it has been litigious since then. Ms. Jensen asked how many nonconforming billboards have actually been removed? Mr. Harrington reviewed the numbers in the ppt.

Ms. Guinn mentioned that there has been a 21% reduction in the number of faces in the City, some because of the standstill agreement and some as a good faith effort.

Ms. Winters said, given that there will still be billboards in Tacoma, but less of them, she is interested in Clear Channel's view on new billboards, what is the effectiveness of billboards, and what makes them more or less effective than other media. Clear Channel spoke of the effectiveness of billboard advertising for local businesses. There will be more detail in the Clear Channel presentation in meeting 4.

Rusty George spoke of the Humane Society campaign. He said that billboards are an important part of an awareness campaign. He asked if one of the elements of the standstill agreement was that Clear Channel could have more digital billboards. Ms. Guinn said that the digital option has been removed from the discussion at this point given the public response last time.

Dale Cope mentioned that a lot of discussion centers around the investment by the advertisers, billboards companies, and so forth, but we have no metrics for discussing the social cost of incessant advertising, so that doesn't get talked about. Ms. Reed said Paula Rees' presentation will speak to this issue at the next meeting.

Ms. DeOme asked if the standstill agreement been adhered to. Ms. Guinn said Clear Channel did fulfill the terms—30+ billboards were removed per the standstill agreement and another 40 (approximately) for good will. There was an **information request** for locations of those that were removed in good faith. Ms. Guinn will provide that information.

**Information request:** Steve Wambach asked when offsite signs are permitted. Harrington will provide that information.

Mr. Schafer would like to know what the fees are paid to the property owners—how much would the landowner lose when the billboard is removed? Ms. Guinn responded that there are many factors, some proprietary. For publicly owned land leased by billboard companies, the fees could be discovered via public disclosure request.

Mr. Schafer asked that Ms. Reed suggest candidates for co-chairs for the group. There as a suggestion from Ms. Guinn that this be delayed until after the historical presentations. There were no objections, so that discussion was delayed to meeting 5.

The meeting ended at 5:51pm.