

From: Le, Anna
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 7:19 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Emery, Nicole (Legal); Sellers, Drena; Chavez, Ramiro; Franco, Joseph; Miguel Martinez; MYC Tacoma; Rowen Higley; Joseph Muller; 'begi.kisembo@gmail.com'; jaycehartman@icloud.com; Haydenleskajan@gmail.com; Clyde Manda; dkcarstonspears@gmail.com; 'gawryczikn@gmail.com'; Caleb R.; aeristrans@gmail.com; Warren, Bucoda
Subject: Mayor's Youth Commission Statement in Support of Resolution 41588 regarding Streets Initiative II
Attachments: Youth Commission Streets Initiative Statement to Council December 2024.pdf

Dear Office of the City Clerk,

Attached is a letter from the Mayor's Youth Commission in support of Resolution 41588, on the 12/17/2024 Council meeting agenda.

Thank you!



Anna Le (she/her)
Management Fellow
City Manager's Office
ale@cityoftacoma.org
(253) 257-5610



Tacoma City Council
747 Market Street
Tacoma, WA 98402

Sent via email to cityclerk@cityoftacoma.org

Mayor's Youth Commission of Tacoma
myctacoma@gmail.com
cityoftacoma.org/youthcommission
Instagram @MYCTacoma

December 16, 2024

Dear Mayor Woodards, Deputy Mayor Hines, and Members of Tacoma's City Council,

We, the Mayor's Youth Commission of Tacoma, ask you to support Resolution 41588, placing Streets Initiative II on the April 22, 2025, Special Election ballot for consideration by the voters. As the City's only body formally charged with advising Council on policies on behalf of Tacoma's youth, we are exercising our responsibility to the City's young people – of today and the future – so our voices and opinions are heard before Council votes on Resolution 41588 on December 17, 2024. While the failure or success of Streets Initiative II in April will affect the lives of all Tacomans, its outcome will have a unique and disproportionate impact on youth.

Streets Initiatives I and II aren't just about roads and sidewalks. The criteria Streets Initiative uses to select projects specifically include equity and accessibility. Streets Initiative embodies and puts Tacoma's commitment to equity and opportunity into action because our values are embedded in its very foundation. Members of the Youth Commission benefit from and bear witness to the ways Streets Initiative I improves each of our lives in a tangible way and on a day-to-day basis. We have seen roadwork and new crosswalk safety beacons outside our schools – including Lincoln and Silas High Schools. These beacons are just a portion of the 48 installed through Streets Initiative I by the end of 2023.

Youth Commission meetings are held at the Graduate Tacoma office at South 9th Street and South J Street. Roadwork was being done just outside on J Street as we held our first meeting of the year in mid-October. Not only is the intersection now in far better condition than before, but the project also installed multiple curb ramps where none previously existed. Streets Initiative I has installed nearly 4,000 curb ramps as of this month, improving accessibility for people with disabilities, stroller users, cyclists, and older Tacomans.

Adopting Resolution 41588 is in the best interest of all Tacomans because it will make for a stronger City government overall. On April 23, 2025 – after April's Special Election has come and gone -- the number of streets needing repair, sidewalks requiring maintenance, and lack of multimodal connectivity will be identical whether voters authorized the Proposition or not. In the event Streets Initiative II fails, the City will not only need to address the same aging transportation infrastructure but also accelerate the pace at which it (does not, currently) meets the demands of an expanding population at the same time. Put another way, the City will need to accomplish more than it currently does, and with fewer resources.

We are high school students, but exhaustive education or subject area expertise isn't necessary to understand that authorization of Streets Initiative II is the fiscally responsible and efficient policy decision. Without renewed, sustainable funding, the City will need to look



Mayor's Youth Commission of Tacoma
mytacoma@gmail.com
cityoftacoma.org/youthcommission
Instagram @MYCTacoma

elsewhere to find the resources required to maintain ground on the progress made by Streets Initiative I. "Elsewhere," means taking funds that would have gone to different Departments to carry out other City functions. All City Departments and services would be adversely affected without Streets Initiative II, not just Public Works and maintenance of Tacoma's transportation infrastructure. Similar to how transportation affects all areas of our lives, the repercussions of unstable and insufficient funding for roadways will be broad and far-reaching.

When Council votes on Resolution 41588, we ask our elected officials to consider the ways youth are especially vulnerable to the consequences of a Public Works Department with inadequate resources. The vast majority of youth attend school in-person, which means we are more exposed to Tacoma's transportation infrastructure than our older neighbors who might have the opportunity for virtual or hybrid work. Young people who aren't old enough to drive must often become pedestrians, without the protection and relative safety of being in a car if involved in a vehicle collision. Smaller bodies are harder for drivers to see, and face a higher risk of serious injury and death when struck by a car. At the same time, young people with less driving experience higher rates of vehicular collisions. Young people are safer when Vision Zero has Streets Initiative support, because Vision Zero decreases the severity of collisions but also reduces the likelihood collisions occur in the first place.

Our peers – young people in 2024, specifically – would continue to bear the burden of Streets Initiative failing in 2025 for the rest of our lives. The cost to reconstruct streets and roads degraded from deferred maintenance is more expensive than ongoing preservation. According to the National Cooperative Highway Research Program, "for every dollar spent on preventative maintenance at the correct time in a pavement's life cycle, \$3-4 in future rehabilitation costs could be saved."¹ Should present-day voters and elected officials underinvest in Tacoma's transportation infrastructure, today's young people will literally pay the price for their actions in the future. Young people will shoulder the cost of every year Tacoma operates without consistent and sufficient funding. However, the opposite is also true: we stand to benefit from every year Tacoma can rely on Streets Initiative II funds. Further, we potentially have the opportunity to benefit from its authorization *for decades to come*.

Unlike older Tacomans, many youth have fewer options to influence local government decisions because they are ineligible to vote. This is yet another reason we depend on you to listen to what we have to say and advocate for us. We urge you to vote to adopt Resolution 41588 and, hopefully, go on to serve as champions for Streets Initiative II's authorization.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mayor's Youth Commission of Tacoma
2024 – 2025

¹Broughton, Ben, et al. "30 Years of Microsurfacing: A Review." ISRN Civil Engineering, vol. 2012, 26 Apr. 2012, pp. 1–7, <https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/279643>.

From: Rebecca Stith <rstithlaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 3:03 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Bushnell, Joe; Hines, John; Walker, Kristina; Rumbaugh, Sarah; Scott, Jamika; Daniels, Kiara; Sadalge, Sandesh; Woodards, Victoria
Subject: 📎Comments re & request to table proposed ordinance 29014, 12/17/24 Agenda Item 41

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

I am a resident of Council District 2 and served on the 2024 Charter Review Committee including as a member of its subcommittee on creating a Climate and Sustainability Commission. A majority of the Charter Review Committee endorsed the subcommittee's recommendation.

At the outset, I want to thank you all, particularly Council Member Walker, for taking that recommendation seriously and recognizing that our City is long overdue for an ordinance codifying a Climate and Sustainability Commission. The public needs, wants, and deserves more climate-action accountability and transparency by the City, especially as profound climate crises continue to escalate and adversely impact us all.

Unfortunately, as detailed below, the proposed Climate and Sustainability Commission ordinance 29014, 12/17/24 Agenda Item 41, has too many substantive issues (and stylistic quirks) to be passed in its present form. It would create a Commission weaker in some ways than the current resolution-created one, which is already too weak. I know that is not the Council's intent.

I therefore respectfully ask that you pass a motion tabling consideration and likely passage of the proposed ordinance at your December 17, 2024, 5:00 pm Council meeting, and send it back to the Council's Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability Committee and/or to a Council Study Session for further study and revision.

It's better to take additional time to get this vital ordinance right.

Here is a list of some specific concerns in no particular order. All are important.

Why is there not an express requirement of enhanced accountability and transparency by the City to the Commission on meeting the goals of its Climate Action Plan and other sustainability initiatives? Given the ongoing public outcry concerning the potential adverse climate impacts of, for example, the LNG facility and the Bridge Industrial Warehouse, neither of which the Council has been able to pause or stop, it would behoove the Council to give this new Commission - which is the Council's designated community advisor on climate and sustainability - the codified authority to require detailed periodic reporting from the City on its decisions to greenlight (or decline to allow) such large-scale projects and the potential and actual environmental impacts of such projects.

Regarding the proposed ordinance as currently drafted, I respectfully note the following concerns, questions, and recommendations:

Remove the prohibition on compensation for Commission members. With one exception of which I'm aware, the City's other ordinances and resolutions creating commissions, boards, and committees don't include a compensation prohibition, and none of their members are compensated. Removing the prohibition will give future Councils the flexibility to offer stipends to members of commissions, boards, and committees without having to amend ordinances to remove compensation prohibitions. Council Member Walker also stated at a study session earlier this fall that she would work with staff to remove this prohibition after Council Member Scott brought it to the Council's attention. (The exception is the charter section (and enabling ordinance) creating the Planning Commission, which has a prohibition on member compensation. But this is only because it tracks similar language in the WA statute covering planning commissions; it is not necessary or required.)

The proposed ordinance expands membership to thirteen from eleven, and adds district and residency criteria, but no longer requires "balanced representation," which the 2008 resolution 37631 does, so the new Commission could theoretically be filled with, eg, all developers or all climate activists. Why does the proposed ordinance get rid of the requirement of balancing membership representation? (The CRC proposal similarly required that there not be over-representation in any one professional/experiential category.)

The proposed ordinance requires that members have just “basic” familiarity with climate and sustainability issues. Why is that word in there? What does “basic” even mean? Please remove this confusing adjective.

The proposed ordinance requires the new Commission, similarly to the current Commission, to bring “community accountability, transparency, and vigilance” to the City’s longterm implementation of its Climate Action Plan, yet it also requires the Commission to “identify” its own “implementation plan.” What exactly is this Commission implementing? What is the basis of its purported authority to implement a plan? Upshot: Why is this wording in there and what does it mean?

The 2008 resolution requires the current Sustainable Tacoma Commission to “coordinate with the City’s Office of Sustainability to obtain greenhouse gas emissions reduction reports.” The proposed ordinance deletes any reference to GHG reports from the City, let alone obtaining them. Why does the Council want to omit the Commission’s authority to obtain such reports from the City? Please don’t take away that authority and the express expectation of the response required of City staff.

The 2008 resolution also gives the current Sustainable Tacoma Commission authority to “obtain” updates on the City’s CAP implementation efforts and results reports. The proposed ordinance merely allows the Commission to “request” updates on the implementation and results of the City’s “sustainability policies and programs” from “staff.” Why is the Council diluting the current authority of the Commission? What happens if City staff members ignore those requests? Quite likely nothing because the proposed ordinance doesn’t expressly authorize the Commission to “obtain” such reports. And the Council can’t make City staff members provide requested updates to the Commission because, per WA law applicable to council/city-manager FOG and under our current City charter, the Council can’t “interfere” with the City Manager’s administration of the City including personnel matters.

A few stylistic things of note:

Consider changing “his and her” under the “Rules and officers” heading to the more inclusive “their.”

It would be helpful if the various headings were numbered, eg, I, II, III, etc. Otherwise, the proposed ordinance just has multiple subsections A, B, C, etc., which can only be referenced by first listing the entire heading above each one. (In other words, it is much easier to refer to, eg, Section II.B. than to “Climate and Sustainability Commission-Declaration of purpose,” Subsection B.)

For clarity, the generic “staff” could be replaced with “Office of Environmental Policy and Sustainability (OEPS),” which is already designated to provide support to the current Commission.

Thank you for considering my comments, questions, and suggestions including the request to table proposed ordinance 29014 and return it for further Council review and revision in light of the above detailed concerns and others being brought to your attention by community members.

Rebecca Stith

From: Aaron Hallenberg <ahallenberg@masterbuilderspierce.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 3:04 PM
To: Woodards, Victoria; Hines, John; Sadalge, Sandesh; Scott, Jamika; Rumbaugh, Sarah; Diaz, Olgy; Daniels, Kiara; Walker, Kristina; Bushnell, Joe
Cc: City Clerk's Office
Subject: MBAPC Comments for Ordinance 29006
Attachments: MBAPC O29006.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Tacoma City Council Members,

On behalf of the Master Builders Associations of Pierce County, please see the attached letter from our Legislative Strategy Committee Chair concerning Ordinance 29006. If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

All the best,

Aaron Hallenberg
Government Affairs Director
Direct (253) 686-3968
Office (253) 272-2112, Ext 103
www.masterbuilderspierce.com

Membership Drive is in Full Swing! [Learn More Here.](#)



 www.masterbuilderspierce.com
 253-272-2112
 1211 South Pearl St. Tacoma, WA



1211 South Pearl St. | Tacoma, WA 98465
253.272.2112 | www.masterbuilderspierce.com

December 16, 2024

Tacoma City Council
747 Market Street
Tacoma, WA 98402

RE: Ordinance 29006

Dear Tacoma City Council,

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to submit comments on Ordinance 29006 regarding the Gross Earnings Tax and the removal of deductions for Contributions in Aid of Construction (CIAC). As the leading voice for the building industry in the South Sound, Master Builders Association Pierce County (MBAPC) represents more than 800 builders, remodelers and industry professionals employing over 10,000 people in Pierce County.

We are writing today to express our concern about the removal of the CIAC deductions and the implications it has for development in Tacoma. The MBAPC remains committed to being a part of the solution to bring more attainable housing to Tacoma, especially after the passage of Home In Tacoma, but worry this may only introduce more barriers for developers to deliver projects in a timely and cost-effective manner. It is our understanding that the utilities may pass the cost on to the developer, adding an additional expense to home building. It remains to be seen exactly how this will be implemented, but we look forward to working with the City and Utility to find creative solutions to mitigate and not contribute to rising development costs and housing prices.

We look forward to hearing from you and learning more about how we can move forward reducing barriers and costs to housing in Tacoma.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott Kaul". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Scott Kaul
Legislative Strategy Committee Chair
Master Builders Association of Pierce County

From: Barbara Church <jbchurch2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 4:19 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Barbara Church
Subject: Please read my comments on Ordinance 290114

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

We do need a Climate and Sustainability Commission ordinance in Tacoma, however the current proposal needs to be TABLED until there is full transparency and accountability. As it stands, the ordinance does not include any new measurable outcomes to insure we are meeting our climate commitment goals.

Here is the LEGISLATIVE INTENT from Ordinance 290114 as stated by the Infrastructure Planning & Sustainability (IPS) committee: *"This ordinance is a result of the City's 2024 Charter review process, discussions with the STC"* and also a resolution for the IPS committee to review this proposed ordinance. **Despite the stated purpose by the IPS committee, there is very little difference between this proposal and what already exists with the Sustainable Tacoma Commission (STC) which has not resulted in measurable progress. In addition, key language in the Charter Review Committee's amendment are not mentioned in this proposed ordinance.**

Below is key language that was studied and drafted by the Charter Review Committee. This language lays out measurable actions and outcomes that are critical for keeping the city accountable to its commitment: CRC's Brief Summary of Amendment requires the Climate Accountability and Sustainability Commission to track and report on the City's progress on its climate action plan, including monitoring the carbon budget and other sustainability measures.

- Adding a new Section to Article III to require the City to establish a carbon budget designed to reach net zero emissions by 2050.
- Requires the Climate Accountability and Sustainability Commission to track and report on the City's progress on its climate action plan, including monitoring the carbon budget and other sustainability measures.

As I have highlighted, when the IPS committee says they used the *"City's 24 Charter review process"*, they left out accountability measures. The action steps and accountability are why the community supported the CRC's recommendations in the first place.

Some of the duties of the Climate and Sustainability Commission in addition to the City's proposed ordinance should include advising, providing oversight, and reporting to the Council on the City's progress in meeting the goals of its climate action plan and sustainability measures, including, but not limited to:
(i)

monitoring the carbon budget

(ii)

reporting on climate goals, including impediments to such goals

(iii)

monitoring Council's existing and future resolutions and ordinances and advising on their operational alignment with the climate action plan

(iv)

monitoring the City's department budgets and advising on their alignment with the climate action plan

(v) monitoring and advising on sustainability measures

with broad public interest and long-term impact

In the City's own words, "Our region faces unprecedented heat, extreme downpours, wildfire smoke, and other impacts from climate change." The measures listed above need to be part of the City's proposed Climate and Sustainability ordinance if Tacoma is to make any progress on their CAP's 2050 net zero emission goals. Please TABLE Climate & Sustainability Commission Ordinance No. 29014's until the ordinance includes the critical measures listed above.

Best

Regards, Barbara Church,

NE Tacoma resident

From: Julie and Jay TURNER . . . <juliejayturner@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2024 4:01 PM
To: City Clerk's Office; McKnight, Reuben; Johnson, Susan; Deborah Cade
Subject: Support for 411 S. M
Attachments: Letterhead 3623 2 2.pages.pdf

Attached is the North Slope Historic District's letter of support for the nomination of 411 South M St as an individual property on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

Julie S. Turner, Sec.
North Slope Historic District



North Slope Historic District

908 North M St.
Tacoma, WA

December 11, 2024

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

DEBORAH CADE, CHAIR
HIST. PRESERVATION
JULIE TURNER, SECRETARY
GEOFF CORSO, TREASURER
JUDITH MARTIN, PROGRAMS
TOM GISKE, BEAUTIFICATION
JOHN BUTLER, OUTREACH
MARSHALL MCCLINTOCK
LYNDA BEST
ROGER JOHNSON
HEATHER STRAUB

City Clerk at City of Tacoma. org
Reuben McKnight, HP Officer
Susan Johnson, HP Coordinator

Dear Commissioners,

The house at 411 North M Street is applying to be listed individually on the Tacoma Historic Register.

This letter is to inform you that the North Slope Historic District, Inc. Board of Directors and our representative on the LPC, Deborah Cade, wish to support this application and thank the sponsors and others who worked to make it happen. The homes in the Wedge Historic District represent a cross-section of homes built in Tacoma's early days, and they still remain as homes for families and as examples of how livable historic homes can be in a modern world.

We in the North Slope Historic District wish to thank Julie and Ross Buffington for their letter of support for the property at 411 North M St. and for their long-time work in the Wedge Historic District.

Sincerely,

Julie S. Turner, Secretary
North Slope Historic District, Inc.
Tacoma, Washington

From: Maria Remick <remick253@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2024 2:26 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: Attn city Council meeting Current Tacoma pet abuse and care laws need revisions

Hello I did not receive any receipt that this was received by the city council read by the city council etc If not I will resend it If there's another way that's supposed to be sent I will do that I just need to get some verification Thank you

On Fri, Nov 29, 2024, 12:13 PM Maria Remick <remick253@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello my name is Maria Remick I am a animal rescuer, I'm very distressed that Tacoma has their own set of laws and guidelines outside even of the Pierce county guidelines , and that comes straight from the director of Animal control. I was told as long as the dog has a dog house, or a shelter of some kind for shade that they can be left outside 24/7 They can even be on a chain. As long as you change allows him to move around. As long as they have food and water. So technically medically all dogs are susceptible to heat stroke whether in the shade or not So 100° is not okay. And not all dogs are okay and 25 30° weather such as little dogs. But even big dogs that might not Have problems you can't see. They shouldn't be outside in the cold, no person or animal should be left outside. I'm speaking specifically of a dog that I know lives outside day and night , no blanket, no food in the dish and you can't see if there is water in the dish and zero toys or anything for mental stimulation. After speaking to the animal control officer he knew the dog, he went by and looked at it and the owner had taken it inside because she knew they were coming. He said she used to own lots of them? and so that made it okay. Dogs are pack animals This poor dogs by itself day and night in the cold in the heat and I am just so beside myself that animal control feels like there's nothing they can do about it because it doesn't have any outward illness or lameness. Which he said is how the laws are written. I go there twice a day and I've gone there late at night and that dogs never inside. This dog doesn't know the blanket is I threw a blanket over the fence when it was freezing rain and it left it there and the owner even left it there and it's still sitting there. Pierce county laws say that the animal has to be in a good dog house that has no drafts and has a smooth floor so they can't get their feet cut up etc which is at least a step above what I've seen in Tacoma where they just have a lean to and they call it good But like I said animal control officers have been known to bring dog houses so people are in compliance That is not okay compliance shouldn't mean the dog lives in a dog house in the snow or heat. He told me she wouldn't let him in the yard . And he went away with his report in hand because he felt the dog looked okay. .I was told the same thing A year or two ago when a unhoused deeply schizophrenic woman was dragging a pitbull around town by its collar , no leash the dog was emaciated and people were reporting it to everyone under the sun even bus driver, three bus drivers reported she was abusive and kicking the dog . She put the dog in a rain suit when it was 95° so people couldn't see its body People were offering money food and she refuses and spitting people's face So the police were called to Starbucks and Fircrest where she was throwing a fit and holding dog up by its collar in the air there were photos AC were given . They reported that the dog was in good condition . animal control person in charge specifically told me my officer saw this dog , and the dog's fine, it's not in pain. Shortly after I was able meet this woman with another person that set this in motion , at the Sumner vet to evaluate the dog. While there I spoke to her explained to her this is the best thing for her and the dog is to relinquish the dog. Now remember few days earlier officers claim the dog was fine. PACK rescue pay for complete workout When we got there the vet said he wasn't sure if dog was going to make it. He was so emaciated so dehydrated so spent for me and drag up and down streets everyday by this woman. He spent over a week in the hospital being attended to trying to save him He had broken hips from a car accident and back injury that she did not have properly tended to when he got hit .. So all this walk he was bad for him She wasn't feeding him because she didn't want him to put weight on because of his injuries. So when I get that answer from officers that the dogs not suffering I've had enough of that answer !! That dog would have died if we had not intervned and taking the time to get to know the whole story and get that dog properly treated by a vet and that would have never happened without pack paying for it He was just been put down somewhere else. He has a good life now. But literally I have had enough of that answer. Last week a woman had four little dogs in a dark colored minivan with the windows rolled up for 4 days straight and I kept calling and the neighbors kept calling and they said Oh she was out there when we showed up , dogs seemed fine I said it was 65 outside yesterday so that meant inside it would be 75 to 80 No windows cracked What is your idea of okay. Anywhere else in the world dogs would have been pulled out of there the windows would have been bashed in He said well we just can't take this dog because they're homeless!! they live in the van . I said yes you really can ,, Yes you can , They deserve a better life than to live in a van with no person in it , why the person is staying an apartment with their friends. Even if she was staying in the van with them it's still not a good life. Tacoma needs to change the laws! We need to be representing the state of Washington for the

supposed toughest animal abuse laws but we don't! The man that was charged with pit bull fighting and killing dogs has dogs again . And nobody's doing anything about it. he's not supposed to ever own dogs. We need to do better Tacoma . I have so many stories just like this of dogs are abused Little dogs elderly left out on a 4x4 balcony of someone's house that has a little bit of a roof overhang and when I call Animal control and say it's snowing they've been out there day and night for years and he goes over there and the people tell him well they went the bathroom in the house, so we didn't want him inside and they just leave these old elderly dogs out there to wither away and Animal control's answer was to go get them a dog house because that's the way with Tacoma's laws written the way they are as long as they have a dog house or a lean-to for shelter they're okay!! This is shameful you know to say as long as they have food water which most of these that we call about don't and a little bit of shelter that they're good Are you kidding me It's snowing they are tiny 12 13-year-old dogs in now a hard plastic dog loo which is not warm and a day where you can't even keep the water from freezing ! So we thought finally Hamilton's going to go over there cuz enough of us is called and they'll bring the dogs in or put in the garage with a bed no no animal control facilitated and keeping those dogs suffering because now they were compliant. Are you kidding me How is this our legacy in Tacoma

This is worse than 1950 , This is backwards thinking , If you have a pet it should be cared for inside when it's hot inside when it's cold Fed properly food and water available not just empty dishes and if you don't want that animal relinquish it . You should give one or two warnings and that should be it . Because we have one person on staff at Animal control and you guys rewrote the laws last year so that three or more neighbors have to complain when a dog's causing an issue it's doing less for the animals in our community not more. So if a dog is barking incessantly and people are calling it might be because a dog is injured or is hurt or is starving and can't get out and wants to help itself. One person is not enough I'm not even sure the police should be the ones running Animal control they are helpful but they are not trained animal experts as evidenced by them saying things like the dogs fine when the dog was almost dead They are very concerned about getting involved in any cases with homeless people because of the unhoused advocates. And as you know we have a huge problem with a certain part of the unhoused community stealing dogs and then using them as trading commodities or getting money from people from pan handling.. everyday there's a post about someone unhoused with dogs that doesn't look quite right, meeting it might be a \$3,000 Frenchie or a \$4,000 Weimaraner That doesn't add up If you're homeless and you have a rope around a dog's neck then it's a \$4,000 dog we're pretty sure it's stolen. That particular dog got away from the homeless encampment sat in front of a store in the rain at night while 6:00 or 7 people showed up trying to catch it ended up running the street getting hit by a car. The owners ended up living like Woodinville Okay these dogs are being transported and traded and sold. Yet people get very upset but when someone's saying there's a guy in front of the movie theater in Lakewood he has four doodle dogs and are fighting each other, we as rescuers have to respond . Animal control has told me personally they would love it if the laws were changed because their hands are tied. Veterinarians are behind this and literally I can go to senators and start from there if need be but I thought I would come to City council first. Our police and animal control should be able to respond to a call like that and ask the person for proof of ownership! As a pet owner you should have a vet of record at the very least and have registration of your dogs at the Tacoma licensing If you don't have that you should at least be able to say this is my vet or This is the breeder I got this dog from or this is the rescue I got this dog from. there's nothing wrong with making that a law so people prove that these are their dogs. But again these are two separate issues and they both are very important, dogs should not be allowed to be chained outside 24/7 dogs should not have to live outside 24/7 and all temperatures and be left alone because they have a dog house. I'm literally so disappointed ,Tacoma prides themselves on their forward thinking and making laws and moves ahead of The rest of the country when it comes to certain issues but apparently not this one .. I think it's time to do a deep dive on what we as humans want to have represented as our community for abuse and care of animals. It's beyond sad and sickening and if you had to go out there and see the pictures and deal with it you would understand what I'm saying.. I go by and feed that German Shepherd every night if that German Shepherd had food it wouldn't be gobbling up the food I'm putting through the gate for her. The owner does not do a thing with this dog She just sits there night after night and the officer said his hands are tied We need better laws Thank you, Maria Remick

From: Linda Redman <lincredman@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2024 12:34 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: Beautifying Tacoma & Helping the Homeless

Dear Tacoma mayor, city council members, and city's liaison to help the homeless (Javon Carlisle):

Since it can cost hospitals and taxpayers \$1-7 million a year to treat homeless residents, perhaps area hospitals & residents would consider to donate to a "Keep Homeless Residents Healthy Fund."

Churches and other non-profits could assist with safe, uplifting villages.

Here is one example of what one church in Portland has been doing:

<https://reasonstobecheerful.org>

I hope we can also get lots of large flower pots made - as well as lots of caring, health-encouraging villages to help improve the city's public health, beauty, and favor of God!

Thanks for listening.

Sincerely,

Linda C. Redman

From: Jessica Schneider <1spanishrose5@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 8:37 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Trump tarrifs

Hello, I know the city is concerned about trumps tarries I was wondering why can't Tacoma organize manufacturing training camps for homeless or low income highschool seniors and have them build or manufacture what the tariffs will be on thus potentially decreasing the homeless and working around the tarrifs two birds one stone. I don't pretend to know the logistics of it but I figured it couldn't hurt to throw it out there. Best of luck jessica k schneider

From: Thomas Sauvageau <tom@sauvageauandco.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 12:01 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Written Comment

Hello, I'm writing as a fellow city council member for the city of Enumclaw. Recently I expanded my wine bar, Bordeaux Wine Bar, into its second location in old town which is inside the city limits of Tacoma. On September 3rd, 2024 I paid the business licensing fee of \$1,500 so that I could be compliant with City of Tacoma licensing requirements. Earlier today I received a renewal notice stating I needed to renew my city license for the calendar year of 2025 and pay another \$1,500. I called the city and verified that it is part of their fee schedule to charge this fee on a calendar basis, and not pro rate this fee if you are a new business opening towards the end of a calendar year.

Because this is an acquisition of a current business we have previous data showing that we expect to make between \$15-20k annually in net profits. Therefore, we expect to pay roughly 10% of our net profits for this fee.

I do understand the city of Tacoma has one of the highest licensing fees in the state, and that's not including the city's B&O tax. As an elected official I understand the need for cities to be cautious about reducing their fees, which is not something I'm suggesting. However, as you can see this fee will consume roughly 1 month worth of my net profit. To have to pay it twice in a 3 month period is exorbitant and seems like a barrier to small business owners. I'm suggesting the way this fee is calculated be adjusted.

Therefore, I'm requesting that the city council amend their business licensing fee schedule to pro-rate initial applications that won't be in use for the entire year. In our case, because we opened in September of 2024 our fee should only be 33.33% of the annual \$1,500 fee(4 months of the 12 month calendar year). I think this makes considerably more sense as a way to calculate this fee and would help eliminate this as a barrier to entry for small businesses.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Thank you,

Thomas M. Sauvageau, MBA

Managing Member

425.681.0885

From: Cathie Raine <cjrird@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 4:56 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: 12/17/24 City Council Meeting (Community Forum)

These comments are for the 'Community Forum' part of the 12/17/24 City Council Meeting

Dear Mayor Woodards, Deputy Mayor Hines and Council Members:

Here we are at the end of 2024...and I wanted to share the following thoughts, perspectives and observations with all of you:

(1) This City Council and City Staff (especially the PDS Dept) continue on a path of dismissing and ignoring the residents' most critical concerns regarding the environment, the residents' health, the residents concerns for lack of personal safety that comes with living in Tacoma.

(2) The housing development plans (AKA..'Home in Tacoma-Phase 2') that guarantee over-parked streets, decreased access for residents to easily shop in smaller neighborhoods (esp if vehicle use is predictably needed), more street safety concerns related to increased street parking/obstructed views.

Providing public transit options, in addition, will not be met as the population increases. Residents are expected to just "live with the 'growing pains' of inadequate transit services". Justb what people hate..parking far away from residences and stores when these same residents are faced with personal (justifiable) safety issues.

(3) The City of Tacoma's officials' insistence on rapid..almost overnight..housing development without the assurances of the City's ability to provide adequate infrastructure and services to accompany population increases.

(4) The continued (and, unbelievable) lengths that City officials will go to in order to meet business, housing developers and industrial companies 'wish lists' (seen with the Bridge Industrial Company's warehouse", LNG facility. 'Home in Tacoma' plan to start with..)

(5) The City of Tacoma's unwillingness to be 'transparent' with the residents..concerning the issues that most affect the residents' lives.

But..please understand that City officials (including City Council members) have a 'tell'. The more dangerous a project is for a community.. .such as the Bridge Industrial (BI) warehouse project, the harder these officials work to conceal the very existence of a project or problems (City employees continue to be told to NOT discuss this BI warehouse situation..or address future infrastructure needed once this warehouse is operational....

Also..note the PDS Dept does not list this 'mega-warehouse' project on their list of 'highlighted' projects

There is a good..and, predictable...reason why residents don't trust the City Council to represent their needs ...look at how much effort the Council members put into catering to the business community at the expense of the residents..your constituents.

Cathie (Raine) Urwin

From: Tacoma Business Council <info@tacomabusinesscouncil.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 4:55 PM
To: City Clerk's Office; Woodards, Victoria; Walker, Kristina; Rumbaugh, Sarah; Hines, John; Bushnell, Joe; Scott, Jamika; Diaz, Olgy; Sadalge, Sandesh; Daniels, Kiara; Pauli, Elizabeth
Cc: Mark Bardwil; Kris Zachary; Steve Jones; Lisa Hunt; Dena Jones; Jim Henderson; Kirsten Carlson; Christina Dobler; jjohnston@pwrprop.com; Courtney Wimer; Sheila Irish; Valentine Smith; Kristen Wynne; marshall .
Subject: Thank you for your hard work on the budget



December 16, 2024

Dear Mayor Woodards and Councilmembers,

Thank you for your hard work on the budget. We know that making the decision to cut spending by many millions was a difficult one. We applaud your leadership in taking that step. We also congratulate you on finding a way to provide the Fire Department with an additional \$2.5 million to support their staff and address issues around burnout and brownouts.

We understand that in January you will need to determine where the actual cuts will be made. We ask that you prioritize spending for the government's core function (public safety, public works including well maintained streets, and the removal of trash and graffiti). While these are not sexy, they are fundamental to creating a climate where all feel safe, where citizens receive reliable, high quality public services and where businesses are likely to invest and grow.

Following the vote on the budget, several council members mentioned the need to identify "new revenue sources". We encourage you to focus on increasing revenue by growing Tacoma's economy (not through more taxes). We know from speaking with residents and businesses that increased taxes (whether a higher property tax approved by the State legislature, levy lid lifts, or other local tax increases) are not what the citizens want. We believe this is why the levy lid lift failed. Rather than new taxes, let's continue to invest in a well run city that is safe for all. We should work strategically with our current business community to ensure they wish to stay and grow and to identify and attract new businesses to Tacoma.

Again, thank you for your leadership. We appreciate your work for the citizens of Tacoma,

Respectfully,

The Tacoma Business Council