



## **AGENDA**

**MEETING:** Regular Meeting (Hybrid)  
**DATE/TIME:** Wednesday, June 7, 2023, 5:00 p.m.  
**LOCATION:** Council Chambers, 1st Floor of the Tacoma Municipal Building  
747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402  
**ZOOM INFO:** Link: <https://www.zoom.us/j/88403846060>  
Dial-in: +1 253 215 8782; ID: 884 0384 6060

### **A. Call to Order**

- Quorum Call
- Land Acknowledgement

### **B. Approval of Agenda**

### **C. Approval of Minutes**

- February 15, 2023
- March 1, 2023
- March 15, 2023
- April 5, 2023 (special meeting)
- April 5, 2023 (regular meeting)

### **D. Public Comments**

This is the time set aside for public comment on Discussion Items on this agenda that have not been the subject of a recent public hearing.

- Written comments must be submitted to [Planning@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:Planning@cityoftacoma.org) by 12:00 noon prior to the meeting. Comments will be compiled, sent to the Commission, and posted on the Commission's webpage at [www.cityoftacoma.org/PlanningCommissionAgendas](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/PlanningCommissionAgendas).
- To comment virtually, join the meeting using Zoom. To comment in person, sign in at the back of the Council Chambers. Where necessary, the Chair may limit the allotted time for comment.

### **E. Disclosure of Contacts and Recusals**

### **F. Discussion Items**

#### **1. Urban Design Review Program**

- Description: Review recent actions of the Washington State Legislature related to the proposed Urban Design Review program and consider adjustments to the public review draft.
- Action: Comment and Direction.
- Staff Contact: Stephen Antupit ([SAntupit@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:SAntupit@cityoftacoma.org));  
Carl Metz ([CMetz@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:CMetz@cityoftacoma.org))



## 2. Pacific Avenue Corridor Subarea Plan & EIS (“Picture Pac Ave”)

- Description: Review the specifics of the schedule and strategies to be employed as part of the outreach and engagement for the visioning/scoping phase of the Picture Pac Ave project. Staff is seeking feedback and direction as it looks to secure and finalize in-person outreach events for this phase of the project.
- Action: Comment and Direction.
- Staff Contact: Wesley Rhodes ([WRhodes@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:WRhodes@cityoftacoma.org))

## G. Upcoming Meetings (Tentative Agendas)

- (1) Agenda for the June 21, 2023, meeting includes:
  - South Tacoma Groundwater Protection District (STGPD) Code Amendment
  - Comprehensive Plan Update – Housing and Employment Targets
  - Home in Tacoma – Phase 2
- (2) July 5, 2023 – cancelled
- (3) Agenda for the July 19, 2023, meeting includes:
  - Urban Design Review Program

## H. Communication Items

- (1) **Status Reports by Commissioners** – Housing Equity Taskforce, Picture Pac Ave, and Facility Advisory Committee.
- (2) **IPS Agenda** – The Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability Committee’s next hybrid meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 14, 2023, at 4:30 p.m.; the agenda (tentatively) includes presentations on EnviroChallengers, the Urban Design Review Program, and a dog barking ordinance. (Held at 747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402, Conference Room 248 or virtually at <http://www.zoom.us/j/87829056704>, passcode 614650)

## I. Adjournment



## **MINUTES (draft)**

**MEETING:** Regular Meeting (hybrid)

**DATE/TIME:** Wednesday, February 15, 2023, 5:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Christopher Karnes (Chair), Andrew Strobel (Vice-Chair), Morgan Dorner, Robb Krehbiel, Brett Marlo, Matthew Martenson, Brett Santhuff, Anthony Steele

**ABSENT:** N/A

### **A. Call to Order**

Chair Karnes called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. A quorum was declared.

Chair Karnes read the Land Acknowledgement.

### **B. Approval of Agenda**

*Vice-Chair Strobel moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **C. Approval of Minutes**

- August 17, 2022
- September 7, 2022
- September 21, 2022

*Vice-Chair Strobel moved to approve the minutes of the August 17, September 7, and September 21, 2022, meetings. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **D. Public Comments**

Stephen Atkinson, Principal Planner, reported that no written comments were received.

Speaking before the Planning Commission:

1. Charlie Brown, speaking on electric fences.

Public Comment ended at 5:08 p.m.

### **E. Disclosure of Contacts and Recusals**

Commissioner Steele disclosed that he spoke with the pastor of the Church of the Living God regarding shipping containers.

### **F. Discussion Items**

#### **1. 2023 Amendment – Electric Fences**

Atkinson provided an overview of the 2023 Annual Amendment process, timeline, and docket.

Jana Magoon, Land Use Manager, presented the staff report and proposed code changes for the “Electric Fences” application, including an overview and background on the application, issues, and an outline of the recommendations and additional considerations.

The Commission provided feedback and requested clarification on zones and locations on the property where the code would apply, variances and how they are applied, fence appearance, height requirements,

the definition of transparency, voltage limits, language in the code related to non-electric fences, prohibited critical areas, visual aids, clarity around barbed and razor wire, types of electrified fences, and a five-foot setback from sidewalks.

*Vice-Chair Strobel moved to include, as part of the public review packet, a change to include a five-foot setback from the sidewalk. Commissioner Steele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

*Vice-Chair Strobel moved to release the “Electric Fence” amendment packet, as amended, for public review and set a public hearing to be determined. Commissioner Krehbiel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

Discussion ensued regarding the distance between the electric fence and property lines.

*Vice-Chair Strobel moved to reconsider the motion to release the “Electric Fences” amendment packet. Commissioner Martenson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:*

*Ayes: 7 – Dorner, Karnes, Marlo, Martenson, Santhuff, Steele, Strobel*

*Abstain: 1 – Krehbiel*

*Vice-Chair Strobel moved to release the “Electric Fence” amendment packet, as amended, for public review and set a public hearing to be determined. Commissioner Krehbiel seconded the motion.*

Discussion ensued regarding electrified fences placed on property lines.

*Commissioner Martenson moved to amend the packet to include language of a five-foot setback from the property line, as well as the sidewalk. Vice-Chair Strobel seconded the motion to amend.*

Discussion ensued concerns of setbacks.

*The motion to amend passed unanimously.*

*The motion to release the packet for public review, as amended, passed unanimously.*

The Planning Commission recessed at 5:58 p.m. and reconvened at 6:06 p.m.

## **2. 2023 Amendment – Shipping Containers**

Magoon presented the staff report and exhibit for the “Shipping Containers” application, including background, issues, and an outline of the recommendations and additional considerations.

The commission requested clarification and provided feedback regarding setbacks, types of screening allowed, limiting the number of shipping containers on individual sites, allowing shipping containers as an accessory use, Conditional Use versus Temporary Use, design standards for accessory structures, building standards, and minor versus major conditional use thresholds.

*Commissioner Santhuff moved to release the “Shipping Containers” staff report and exhibit package for public review and to incorporate the following elements: a five-foot setback from rear and side property lines, a screening option of a vegetative buffer to include existing or new landscaping, and a prohibition on stacking shipping containers. Vice-Chair Strobel seconded the motion.*

Discussion ensued regarding existing containers in R-2.

*The motion passed with the following votes:*

*Ayes: 7 – Dorner, Karnes, Krehbiel, Marlo, Martenson, Santhuff, Strobel*

*Abstain: 1 – Steele*

## **3. 2023 Amendment – Delivery-Only Businesses**

Adam Nolan, Associate Planner, provided an update on the status of the analysis of the “Delivery-Only Business” application for the 2023 Annual Amendment, including background; characteristics, potential impacts, and opportunities; responses to previous comments from the Commission; examples; staff options; Commission considerations; and next steps.

The Commission requested clarification and provided feedback on the definition of “delivery-only businesses” and how to categorize it, retail versus food establishment consideration, minimum standards in the code, trip generation and how to reduce impacts from delivery drivers, provision for a direct-to-

customer component on pedestrian streets, consideration for drive-throughs and how they apply to commissary kitchens, and pedestrian safety.

The Planning Commission recessed at 7:21 p.m. and reconvened at 7:27 p.m.

#### **4. 2023 Amendment – Commercial Zoning Update**

Wesley Rhodes, Senior Planner, presented the proposed code updates as part of Phase I of the “City-wide Commercial Zoning Code Update” application for the 2023 Annual Amendment, including the phased approach, background, key issues studied that do not require code updates, major themes found, recommended code updates, and next steps.

The Commission discussed maximum setback standards on designated streets, applying design standards by use, the basis of determining that code updates were not required on certain issues, the Multi-Family Property Tax Exemption Program (MFTE), and landscape standards for tree canopy goals.

*Commissioner Steele moved to release the “Commercial Zoning Update” application for public review and set a public hearing to be determined. Commissioner Krehbiel seconded the motion.*

Discussion ensued regarding the clarification of exhibits.

*The motion passed unanimously.*

#### **G. Upcoming Meetings (Tentative Agendas)**

- (1) Agenda for the March 1, 2023, meeting includes:
  - 2023 Amendment – Delivery-Only Businesses
  - 2023 Amendment – Minor Amendments
  - 2023 Amendment Package
- (2) Agenda for the March 15, 2023, meeting includes:
  - Urban Design Review Program
  - Home In Tacoma Project Phase 2

#### **H. Communication Items**

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

Chair Karnes reported that he attended the first Picture Pac Ave Advisory Group meeting, and the group discussed the timeline and process.

Commissioner Steele reported that the Facility Advisory Committee will start touring city-owned properties on February 18, 2023.

#### **I. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

*\*These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit:  
[http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees\\_boards\\_commissions/planning\\_commission/agendas\\_and\\_minutes/](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/planning_commission/agendas_and_minutes/)*





## **MINUTES (draft)**

**MEETING:** Regular Meeting (hybrid)

**DATE/TIME:** Wednesday, March 1, 2023, 5:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Christopher Karnes (Chair), Robb Krehbiel, Brett Marlo, Matthew Martenson, Brett Santhuff, Anthony Steele

**ABSENT:** Andrew Strobel (Vice-Chair), Morgan Dörner

### **A. Call to Order**

Chair Karnes called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. A quorum was declared.

Chair Karnes read the Land Acknowledgement.

### **B. Approval of Agenda**

*Commissioner Krehbiel moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Commissioner Santhuff seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **D. Public Comments**

Stephen Atkinson, Principal Planner, reported that no written comments were received.

No individuals addressed the Planning Commission.

Public Comment ended at 5:03 p.m.

### **C. Approval of Minutes**

- October 5, 2022

*Commissioner Krehbiel moved to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2022, meeting. Commissioner Santhuff seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **E. Disclosure of Contacts and Recusals**

There were no disclosures of contacts or recusals.

### **F. Discussion Items**

#### **1. 2023 Amendment – “Delivery-Only Businesses”**

Atkinson presented the staff analysis and preliminary recommendations for the “Regulating Delivery-Only Businesses of Food and Other Consumables” (“Delivery-only” businesses) application, including an outline of the proposed code changes relating to definitions, standards, size considerations, and retail on pedestrian streets and next steps.

The Commission requested clarification regarding the in-person customer component definition, a front façade benchmark, the language used for the pedestrian street clause, classifying delivery-only businesses as commissary kitchens, potentially retitling the amendment, and the Gourmet Niche facility.

*Commissioner Krehbiel moved to amend Section 3 of Exhibit A to state “retail uses are required to primarily conduct direct, in-person customer sales at the storefront when located on designated pedestrian streets”. Commissioner Martenson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:*

Ayes: 5 – Karnes, Krehbiel, Marlo, Martenson, Santhuff  
Abstain: 1 – Steele

Commissioner Krehbiel moved to release the “Delivery-Only Businesses” Staff Report and exhibit, as amended, for public review and comments. Commissioner Marlo seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

Ayes: 5 – Karnes, Krehbiel, Marlo, Martenson, Santhuff  
Abstain: 1 – Steele

## **2. 2023 Amendment – “Minor Plan and Code Amendments”**

Atkinson presented the staff analysis and preliminary recommendations for the “Minor Plan and Code Amendments” application, including background, an outline of the issues and proposed amendments, and next steps.

Commissioners requested clarification on the home address signage amendment.

Commissioner Steele moved to release the “Minor Plan and Code Amendments” Staff Report and exhibits for public review. Commissioner Krehbiel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **3. 2023 Amendment Package**

Atkinson outlined the 2023 Amendment docket and next steps.

Commissioner Krehbiel moved that the commission set April 5, 2023, as the date for a public hearing on the 2023 Amendment package and set April 7, 2023, at 5:00 p.m. as the deadline for written comments. Commissioner Santhuff seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **4. 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update**

Atkinson reviewed the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update, including the regional planning framework; Vision 2050 aspects, noting regional collaboration, environment, climate, development patterns, housing, public services, transportation, and economy; opportunities through the update; other priorities; other projects; and milestones. Atkinson facilitated a discussion on partnership opportunities that would be critical, key issues to address, and desired priority outcomes.

The Commission provided feedback regarding 20-minute neighborhoods, addressing equity in the placement of retail, community engagement and brainstorming, defining centers, parks and open space designations, impact fees, hazards due to climate change, road diets, coordination with regional tribes, and transportation planning.

## **G. Upcoming Meetings (Tentative Agendas)**

(1) Agenda for the March 15, 2023, meeting includes:

- Urban Design Review Program
- Home In Tacoma Project Phase 2

(2) Agenda for the April 5, 2023, meeting includes:

- Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan Update
- 2023 Annual Amendment Package – Public Hearing

Atkinson noted that the tentative agenda items for the March 15, 2023, meeting were incorrect on the agenda and outlined the correct upcoming agenda items.

## **H. Communication Items**

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

Brian Boudet, Planning Manager, informed the Commission of the following:

- The Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability Committee recommended and forwarded the McKinley Hill Neighborhood Plan to the full City Council.
- Ordinance No. 28872, relating to the South Tacoma Groundwater Protection District moratorium, was set over for final reading on March 7, 2023.



- Sound Transit's Tacoma Dome Link Extension faced challenges in their design process and is looking at alternatives in Fife and south Federal Way, and the projected service date has shifted to 2035.

Commissioner Steele reported that the Facility Advisory Committee toured the Tacoma Dome, the Greater Tacoma Convention Center, and theaters.

Commissioner Marlo reported that she attended the Housing Equity Champions training on February 25, 2023.

## **I. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

*\*These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit:*  
[http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees\\_boards\\_commissions/planning\\_commission/agendas\\_and\\_minutes/](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/planning_commission/agendas_and_minutes/)





## **MINUTES (draft)**

**MEETING:** Regular Meeting (hybrid)

**DATE/TIME:** Wednesday, March 15, 2023, 5:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Christopher Karnes (Chair), Andrew Strobel (Vice-Chair), Brett Marlo, Matthew Martenson, Brett Santhuff, Anthony Steele

**ABSENT:** Robb Krehbiel, Morgan Dorner

### **A. Call to Order**

Chair Karnes called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. A quorum was declared.

Chair Karnes read the Land Acknowledgement.

### **B. Approval of Agenda**

*Commissioner Martenson moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Vice-Chair Strobel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **C. Approval of Minutes**

There were no meeting minutes to approve.

### **D. Public Comments**

Stephen Atkinson, Principal Planner, reported that one written comment was received regarding the Urban Design Review Program.

No individuals addressed the Planning Commission.

Public Comment ended at 5:02 p.m.

### **E. Disclosure of Contacts and Recusals**

There were no disclosures of contacts or recusals.

### **F. Discussion Items**

#### **1. Urban Design Review Program**

Stephen Antupit, Senior Planner, provided an overview of the Urban Design Review Program, including the three major components, the four amendment characterizations, and future work items.

Carl Metz, Senior Planner, reviewed the proposed re-organization for Mixed Use district building standards, noting ground level standards and form and expression.

Shirley Schultz, Principal Planner, outlined the proposed re-organization for the Downtown district building standards, noting ground level standards and form and expression.

Metz presented the maximum setback standards within Mixed Use and Downtown districts; street level building transition standards within Residential and Commercial districts; and the residential yard space exemption.

Antupit outlined the upcoming schedule and approach for the public review draft.

The Commission provided feedback and requested clarification on the reorganization of the building standards, code applicability, maximum setbacks, the titles “ground level” and “form and expression”, addressing utilities in projects, the strikethrough language, mass reduction standards in Downtown districts, intent of the maximum setback, residential transitions, and the residential yard space exemption.

The Planning Commission recessed at 6:14 p.m. and reconvened at 6:23 p.m.

## **2. Home In Tacoma Phase 2**

Elliott Barnett, Senior Planner, introduced Heidi Oien, Mithun, and provided an overview of the Home In Tacoma Phase 2 update, including objectives and round one engagement.

Oien presented the initial direction on the zoning framework and standards.

The Commission provided feedback on the zoning framework, including the hybrid format, setbacks, initial standards, building width and depth, a floor area ratio (FAR) approach, the bonusing option, attached and detached accessory dwelling units, parcel assembly configuration, and housing types.

Barnett reviewed the initial zoning map options.

Discussion ensued regarding walkable services, features, buffering from mid-scale residential, buffer distance, and four-story buildings.

## **G. Upcoming Meetings (Tentative Agendas)**

- (1) Agenda for the April 5, 2023, special meeting includes:
  - Safety Training for Commissioners
- (2) Agenda for the April 5, 2023, regular meeting includes:
  - Picture Pac Ave Update
  - 2023 Annual Amendment Package – Public Hearing
- (3) Agenda for the April 19, 2023, regular meeting includes:
  - 2023 Annual Amendment Package – Debrief
  - Urban Design Review Program

## **H. Communication Items**

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

Commissioner Steele provided a report on the Facility Advisory Committee.

## **I. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

*\*These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit:*  
[http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees\\_boards\\_commissions/planning\\_commission/agendas\\_and\\_minutes/](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/planning_commission/agendas_and_minutes/)



## **MINUTES (draft)**

**MEETING:** Special Meeting (In Person)

**DATE/TIME:** Wednesday, April 5, 2023, 3:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Christopher Karnes (Chair), Andrew Strobel (Vice-Chair), Robb Krehbiel, Brett Marlo, Brett Santhuff, Anthony Steele

**ABSENT:** Morgan Dorner, Matthew Martenson

### **A. Call to Order**

Chair Karnes called the special meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. A quorum was declared.

### **B. Public Comments**

Mary Crabtree, Administrative Assistant, reported that no comments were received.

### **C. Safety Training**

Laurie Hardie, Office of Health and Safety Director, introduced Trent Hill, Enterprise Safety Manager, and Judd Johnson, Fleet and Facilities Operations Manager, and provided opening remarks regarding emergency response training for the Planning Commission.

Johnson reviewed the emergency response training, including the shared responsibility model, steps for contacting emergency services, fire extinguishers, first aid kits and emergency defibrillators, fire drills, evacuation procedures, evacuation points for the Tacoma Municipal Building (TMB), earthquake procedures, and active threat information and procedures.

Johnson led Commissioners on a physical tour of the evacuation routes in the TMB and reviewed visual aids of exits throughout the building.

Hill and Hardie concluded by providing information to the Commission on other safety trainings that are available.

### **D. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

***\*These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit:***

[http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees\\_boards\\_commissions/planning\\_commission/agendas\\_and\\_minutes/](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/planning_commission/agendas_and_minutes/)





## **MINUTES (draft)**

**MEETING:** Regular Meeting (hybrid)

**DATE/TIME:** Wednesday, April 5, 2023, 5:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Christopher Karnes (Chair), Andrew Strobel (Vice-Chair), Morgan Dörner, Robb Krehbiel, Brett Marlo, Brett Santhuff, Anthony Steele

**ABSENT:** Matthew Martenson

### **A. Call to Order**

Chair Karnes called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. A quorum was declared.

Chair Karnes read the Land Acknowledgement.

### **B. Approval of Agenda**

*Commissioner Krehbiel moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Vice-Chair Strobel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **C. Approval of Minutes**

- October 19, 2022
- November 2, 2022

*Commissioner Krehbiel moved to approve the October 19, and November 2, 2022, meeting minutes as submitted. Vice-Chair Strobel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **D. Public Comments**

Adam Nolan, Associate Planner, reported that one written comment was received regarding the Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan.

No individuals addressed the Planning Commission.

Public Comment ended at 5:02 p.m.

### **E. Disclosure of Contacts and Recusals**

Commissioner Krehbiel disclosed that he spoke with Communities for Healthy Bay and neighbors regarding the “Mor Furniture Land Use Designation Change” application of the 2023 Annual Amendment package.

### **F. Discussion Item – Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan “Picture Pac Ave”**

Wesley Rhodes, Senior Planner, provided an update on Picture Pac Ave, including a timeline and milestones, an overview of the “soft launch”, the Project Advisory Committee (PAC), major themes of feedback, six key engagement goals, demographics of the Picture Pac Ave area, engagement phases, engagement tools, audiences, and tools.

Discussion ensued regarding the demographics, affordability metrics, concentration of retail, onboard vehicles, outreach to transit users, Pierce Transit’s Bus Rapid Transit proposal and tree retention, next steps, the existing conditions survey, and themes from the previous workshop on January 18, 2023.

*Commissioner Steele moved to postpone the “Picture Pac Ave” discussion item until after the public hearing tonight. Commissioner Krehbiel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

## G. Public Hearing - 2023 Annual Amendment Package

Chair Karnes called the public hearing to order at 5:31 p.m. and outlined the procedures of the public hearing, noting that testimony will be taken separately for each application.

Commissioners introduced themselves.

Nolan presented an overview of the amendment process and schedule; the six applications - (1) "Mor Furniture", (2) "Electric Fences", (3) "Shipping Containers", (4) "Delivery-Only Retail Businesses", (5) "Commercial Zoning Update Phase I: Neighborhood Commercial Design Standards", and (6) "Minor Plan and Code Amendments"; and the public hearing process.

Chair Karnes called for testimony. Twelve people testified, as follows:

### (3) Application: Mor Furniture Land Use Designation Change

121. Kirk Kirkland – I'm with the Audubon Society in Pierce County. We have some problems with this particular proposal. It's in violation of several policies that are part of the comp plan. One of the policies pertains to putting commercial growth like this in centers with corridors and transit stations. This is an isolated project at the end of a dead-end road in a challenging neighborhood. Another policy the city has is about the negative impacts of putting a project, this would have negative health impacts in a sensitive area. This is an environmental justice issue where we have a lot of pollution coming off I-5, and we don't need to add more traffic to the neighborhood. I've included a lot more information in a letter than I can't possibly say in a two-minute speech. So, I can only give you a brief outline. This is a particularly underserved, underrepresented community. There wasn't an analysis done like that. The staff report didn't look into the fact that 55% of the people are people of color, there's low-income people here - 81% - and there's 20% that are over 64. The unemployment rate here is 21%. This is not a neighborhood that needs to be having a commercial district created. It's not part of a regular part of the city that has arterials and transit and other things. So, to be really brief, it's compatible with residential land use. This isn't a commercial zone. It's not supported by transportation and other needs. It disproportionately affects low-income people and people of color, and it's an environmental justice issue in this zip code. We should look into those details and decide to deny this permit.

122. Eric Seibel – I'm co-chairman of the Conservation Committee of Oddball Society in Pierce County. Thank you for the opportunity to speak about the Mor Furniture amendment to the comp plan. We would like to ask you to deny this amendment. We believe the site would be better served to help the community if the land was set aside as a forest buffer. We hope that in denying this amendment, you will ask the City Council to explore purchasing the land with the county's Conservation Futures funding. Such a buffer was once created on I-5 at the 84th Street intersection, for example, so the city could make application again. The project, as proposed, is in violation of several city planning policies which would justify you in denying this amendment. First of all, Mor Furniture Outlet proposed opening a store next to a school and on a dead-end neighborhood street. This amendment is incompatible with city policies that require commercial outlets to locate in centers, corridors, and transit station areas. The staff report failed to determine if the proposal was in violation of concerns about environmentally sensitive areas and about community health and safety. The I-5 corridor, for example, from Everett to Tacoma, experiences the worst diesel particulate matter pollution in the state due to heavy truck traffic. The regional health disparities map shows that diesel emissions are concentrated in communities with a higher percentage of low-income people and people of color. Secondly, underserved communities is a factor here. The zip code for this project is comprised largely of low-income families that are disproportionately exposed to environmental harms and health disparities, according to the Tacoma Pierce County Health Department. City Policy UF-1.11 requires evaluating the impacts of land use decisions on current residents of particularly under-served and under-represented communities. The planning staff report skipped this step. This is an environmental injustice. This land use decision affects communities of people of color who live in close proximity to pollution that creates a health disparity. Therefore, we would ask that you deny the Mor Furniture land use rezone.



123. April Smith – I'm here to ask that you deny this application. Because of the location right next to this middle school, these children and the families that live in this area are impacted so much already from the pollution from I-5, that they don't need additional pollution from the trucks and all the additional traffic that will come from this being right up against the school. It would be much better served to use as a green space and fill it with trees to help with counteracting the pollution that's coming from I-5.
124. Stacey Oaks – I oppose the Mor Furniture rezone. As people have pointed out, this is an area right behind the school. This is an area behind a school that is already rated by the Health Equity Index to have a 10 out of 10 score, which is negative, for environmental pollution. That pollution affects school performance, brain development, life expectancy, incidences of cancer, asthma, and other illnesses. Several agencies have already submitted comments concerned about this. That should be part of any presentation going forward. So, let's just be clear. What we're talking about right now is voting to poison children - children that are already being poisoned. The traffic impact analysis is incomplete, and that matters. Bernice A. King wrote, "Truth is only a threat to those who benefit from lies." So, let's think about that. Why would an incomplete traffic analysis be used? Why wouldn't we be digging into this health equity index prior to it even being brought up by public comments? Because we're benefiting from the lies to try to put this in. Why are we not already addressing that this is an already overburdened community. The Heal Act was passed to try to keep things like this from happening. This is not a proposal where the city can hide behind the excuse of "if it fits in the current land use, we have to say yes" - which is, frankly, from a dirty playbook; but nevertheless, not available to use in this case. This zoning change can and should be denied.
125. Laura Svancarek – I'm speaking personally today as a Tacoma resident. I live about three blocks away from the parcel in question. I'm really concerned about traffic impacts, particularly increased freight traffic. I'm not speaking as a driver, but from my experience as a cyclist, pedestrian, and transit user in this neighborhood. South 48th Street, to be really blunt, is scary. I can't tell you how many times that I've almost been hit by drivers while crossing 48th. At the same time, 48th is also the safest way to cross I-5 in south Tacoma if you're walking or biking. While it's safer than other options, I need to be clear that it's still not actually safe, especially if you are on a bike. Those are the current conditions. I understand that staff determines the zoning change will generate less traffic than if the parcel was developed into housing as currently zoned. I think we all know that development into housing was very unlikely anyway, so this is an increase in traffic over the current levels, and it worries me a lot based on my lived experiences on this street. I'm also a member of the Pierce Transit BRT System Expansion Study Technical Advisory Group, and 48th is under serious consideration for the next BRT route in Tacoma. I think that's very important to mention. We should be planning for the success of that route rather than creating more points of roadway conflict for those that have to navigate and slow the system. I really encourage the commission to look at alternatives here, as has been mentioned, the loss of trees, while we already don't have enough in South Tacoma just for another furniture warehouse, which we already have quite a few of within like three blocks, or three miles, an increase in current and truck exhaust - that's really challenging to me. At the very least, I've heard interest from others in my neighborhood around this site, that there should be a plan to mitigate tree loss should this project move forward. So, thank you for your time. I am not supportive of this change.
126. Esther Day – This project, while it may sound wonderful to have more commercial business here, it's really not a good idea. It can find another place. We have to think about our children. Put yourself as a parent next to that Mor place and have all that traffic pollution petering into your home where you can't open your windows or air out anything, or even enjoy the outdoors because the pollution is so bad. If you've never sensed that type of pollution, you need to try it, walk in their shoes. Mor Furniture can find another location. Keep it for trees to clean the air - which we need desperately in the city, as we are constantly trying to cut down trees, but also continue to do something better for housing. This is a low-income community, and you're adding to the low-income communities' problems. The children should be our first priority in this regard. In this particular regard, please deny this application.

127. Sean Arent – I live in the neighborhood where this project is being proposed, and I oppose it. Let's look at the facts. There's a partnership underway between the Trust for Public Land and Jenny Reed Middle School. The purpose is to plant trees between a school unfortunately sited next to I-5 as a buffer. My question is shouldn't we do this with all the schools located along I-5? Air pollution kills. I worked for the Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility we've effectively drawn that link, particularly when we advocated to ban natural gas hookups in new homes. Air pollution causes life-altering conditions, such as asthma, cardiovascular disease. I-5 is a huge source of air pollution. Kids running on the track at Giadrone are just breathing that right in. My neighborhood has worse air quality and less trees as much of the rest of Tacoma. These things are interlinked. The science behind trees reducing air pollution is clear, and they are a living filter. So, on one hand, we have a clear recognition that tree buffers are needed for schools and communities next to I-5. We have a public recognition that lower-income neighborhoods in the south and east side need trees and investment. We have a climate action plan and a comprehensive plan that speaks to that. On the other hand, we can change the code and lose the best opportunity to do that in my neighborhood. We can increase truck traffic next to a school and push forward a project to expand the concrete desert of the Tacoma Mall, and build another absolutely unnecessary furniture store in an area that has at least five furniture stores in a 10-minute radius. It isn't your fault what Tacoma Public Schools did in 2018 with selling this. They gifted this public property without looking at the big picture, but you have a choice to make. We can reject this code change and subsequent rezone rendering the property worthless to the developer. Take it back and create a vibrant green space akin to McKinley Park that actively absorbs air pollution in an underserved neighborhood, or you can give us Mor Furniture for less.

#### (4) Application: Electric Fences

8. Doug Konop – I am speaking today as a business owner in the Port of Tacoma. I've been a resident of Tacoma for the last 27 years and in January of this past year, I moved my company from King County to Tacoma to the port. So, since January 2022, I've operated my business there and one of the first things I did was install a chain link fence on the property to protect semi-truck equipment and propane tanks. Since I've had that fence in place, I've had over six break-ins in the past six months. Break-ins cost me \$2,500 to have repaired, and I have losses in the \$1000s for stolen equipment and vandalized equipment. I've made multiple police reports. I've worked with the City of Tacoma and the police department who have tried to help but I still have break-ins on a regular basis. I'm trying to support this measure to allow electric fences in Tacoma. I've applied for a permit through AMAROK back in November, and now we find ourselves here discussing this tonight. My biggest issue on this is - I know I've read through some of the notes from this meeting - I know it's an aesthetic issue, but I'm pleading for public safety both for my employees and people that are living on the streets in front of my property. I do not want my employees to get involved in any altercations with people there, and until we improve the security of our property, these types of issues are going to continue. We currently have a fence, the Amarak fence that we'll put in place, where it'll be behind our fence - it's medically safe, and I think it will keep my employees safe and those people that are around the property safe as well. I really ask that people do this. I'm a small business owner, and I am regretting moving my business here without change.
9. Michael Pate – I am with Amarak. We basically are the folks who install many of these devices across the state. We actually have dozens of these devices installed at this time in the city of Tacoma. During the COVID pandemic, for some reason, the city staff initiated an amendment to ban the use of these devices. So, we literally have dozens of these devices now in the city that protect properties, and literally dozens of folks who would like to install these devices that are unable to do so. There are a couple of things with the draft that is proposed right now that really will not work. One is the setback issue. These are not fences, these are alarms and security systems. They go behind the existing fence line. So there really shouldn't be a setback issue at all, they actually go behind the existing fence line as it exists. The other issue that we're looking to right here is the front yards and not allowing them in front yards. This is akin to locking your back door and closing your windows and opening all the windows and doors in

the front of your house and leaving. I don't think any of you would do that on your own personal residences, and we don't think anyone should have to do that on their business. It just doesn't make any sense at all. I'd like to also address aesthetics that Doug just brought up. These devices are almost impossible to see the only reason you can really see them as you know where they are and what you're looking for. They are industrial commercial areas that are used for outdoor storage or for businesses that actually store large amounts of property outdoors. I thank you for your time we will be submitting written response to this.

10. Randy Ehli – I'm CEO of Ehli Auctions. The Ehli family has been serving the Tacoma market since 1948. We are located on 94th and Pacific. We leased three acres there and 20,000 square feet. So, I guess we're part of your Picture Pac Ave. It's been about 12 months since the city made the decision about businesses utilizing fences. In that time, our business has faced significant losses over \$45,000 in theft and damages. They steal trucks. They run through our gates and steal forklifts and inventory. Our inventory is consigned by the public and government agencies. We didn't have a fence when he started leasing there in 2008, not even a cyclone, and we hardly had any issues. However, since the city's lack of focus on tackling property theft, we have no choice but to request the use of commercially available electric fences. While electric fence services is not cheap, it offers a safe, reliable, and cost effective solution for protecting business and keeping intruders out. In summary, we urge the city to allow businesses to use electric fence services, and so that each of us don't have to go through a variant process. It just needs to be done. Also, I have an objection to the rule that they want to make a setback for the fence; however, my building sits 100 feet from the road, I paid for commercial property and commercial taxes, and we would like to have a fence put inside, closer to the road.
11. Charlie Brown – I'm here today on behalf of AMAROK as well. We appreciate the proposed amendment and the willingness of your staff and you all to work with us to put this amendment into place. We do request the modification of view as you've heard of the five-foot setback issue. The fence actually sits about eight to 18 inches behind a perimeter fence, and that's what provides really the safety as you heard from some other speakers. People will simply cut through the chain link fence if that's what they have, and just go and steal stuff. So, this just sits right behind it, and provides that kind of security protection. When somebody tries to break into the property and the electric fence has cut, then an alarm is triggered, the property owner is notified, we will know exactly when that's happening, and we can try and get that change. So, we would request that five-foot setback to be eliminated. We'd also request that the allowance for fencing in front of our business be modified. As you heard just previously with Mr. Ehli, there are businesses where the building itself sits back from the front and you want to protect the perimeter, that's what the fence does. It simply protects the perimeter of the property from people breaking into people's properties. We would request a modification, which would be similar to what was adopted in Olympia, where you may have some auto dealerships that don't sit in exactly the kind of commercial zones that are stated in this draft, but we do allow in Olympia - at least they just adopted codes - that allow for vehicle dealerships to have these fences, for rental businesses to have these fences, and your auto body and other places that might not be exactly in these areas. I would submit to you that the Titus-Will facility, which is very interested in this, sits in just that kind of a conundrum where it's not exactly in that commercial zone. So, to that degree, I'd ask you to look at the Olympia language and consider that in your draft that you might move forward to the City Council.

(5) Application: Shipping Containers

12. Esther Day – I watched your presentation regarding the shipping containers. My only request is that we make sure that we do not allow this to get out of hand, and we make sure that somehow those containers are behind some sort of protection so that they're not an eyesore and don't become a storage center in our communities in our neighborhoods.

(6) Delivery-Only Retail Businesses:

No community members testified on this application.

(7) Commercial Zoning Update Phase I: Neighborhood Commercial Design Standards:

No community members testified on this application.

(8) Minor Plan and Code Amendments:

No community members testified on this application.

Commissioners requested that staff provide clarification at the next meeting regarding electric fences, a forest bumper on 84<sup>th</sup> Street, background and history of the Mor Furniture site, the language of Olympia's electric fence code, the Healthy Environment for All (HEAL) Act, modifying the City Charter, and communication with the Tacoma School District regarding Mor Furniture application.

Chair Karnes closed the public hearing at 6:25 p.m., reiterated that written comments are accepted until 5:00 p.m. on Friday, April 7, 2023, and thanked those who testified.

The Planning Commission recessed at 16:25 p.m. and reconvened at 6:33 p.m.

### **F. Discussion Item – Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan “Picture Pac Ave”**

Rhodes facilitated an interactive workshop with an activity designed to elicit feedback and direction on key outreach and engagement strategies and priorities.

The commission provided brainstorming and input on the following three questions:

- (1) What do you think would be the most successful way(s) to engage people along Pac Ave?
- (2) Are there specific groups, organizations, or people who should be involved in this project? Are there any that we are missing? Any people or groups you would recommend adding to the PAC?
- (3) Are there any specific events we should be aware about as engagement opportunities?

### **G. Upcoming Meetings (Tentative Agendas)**

- (1) Agenda for the April 19, 2023, regular meeting includes:
  - 2023 Annual Amendment Package – Debrief
  - Home In Tacoma Project Phase 2
- (2) Agenda for the May 3, 2023, meeting includes:
  - 2023 Amendment Package - Recommendation

### **H. Communication Items**

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

### **I. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

*\*These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit:*  
[http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees\\_boards\\_commissions/planning\\_commission/agendas\\_and\\_minutes/](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/planning_commission/agendas_and_minutes/)



**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Stephen Antupit & Carl Metz, Planning Services Division  
**Subject:** **Urban Design Review Program –Response to State Legislation**  
**Memo Date:** May 24, 2023  
**Meeting Date:** June 7, 2023

**Action Requested:**  
Comment and Direction.

**Discussion:**

At the Planning Commission’s meeting on June 7, 2023, Urban Design Studio staff will provide a briefing on the implications and options presented by recent actions of the Washington State Legislature for the proposed Urban Design Review program. At this briefing, staff will describe adjustments staff expect to make and seek feedback and direction from the Commission on certain items in response to the legislation.

The recent actions of the Washington State Legislature relate to two aspects of the proposed Urban Design Review Program. They are contained in the following pieces of Legislation:

1. [EHB1293](#): Specific parameters for public Design Review regulations and processes, and
2. [2SSB 5290](#): Permit review processes and timelines.

(Links to the Bills, as passed, are provided above, [here](#), and [here](#))

This briefing will outline relevant provisions of the two pieces of Legislation, how the draft proposal has anticipated these provisions, and present staff’s approach to complying with the new provisions as part of a Public Review Draft. This includes some elements of the program design where additional Commission direction is requested.

Background:

**ESB 1293** specifies that design guidelines must be clear and objective, and further, guidance cannot result in reductions in height, density, bulk or scale of development proposals. It also specifies that only one public meeting may be conducted as part of a public Design Review permit process.

**2SB 5290** defines “Public Meeting” and specifies timeframes for permitting procedures such as Application Completeness review, Public Notice, and the maximum number of days a city may take to render Final Decisions after Completeness review.

Issue:

Taken together, the legislation generally supports the priorities and much of the guidance provided by the Commission and Council to staff developing a Tacoma Urban Design Review program proposal. Now, these legislative actions further emphasize timely and predictable processing of Design Review permits. Perhaps most significantly, they place clear limits on the role of public input in the design review process.



Staff will present options to the Commission related to how and when Tacoma's public Design Review process (i.e., projects over the thresholds that would be reviewed by a Design Review Board) might conduct the one allowed Public Meeting.

It should be noted staff assumes a two-stage Urban Design Review process consisting of early, "concept"-level and later, "final design" reviews. This feature of the program design is intended to align with several priorities and guidance previously articulated by the Commission:

- 1) **Concept Design Review:** Early concept-level guidance is appropriate to the "big moves" of site planning, pedestrian orientation, connectivity, contextual response, and the like. Our program priorities and guidance documents are focused on those urban design concerns.
- 2) **Final Design Review:** The purpose of this review is to confirm consistency with the earlier guidance. As long as the applicant's proposal is responsive to this guidance, any required modifications should be relatively modest.

Per the Legislature's actions, options generally consist of conducting the public meeting at the early or later stage, as described below. Additionally, variations of these choices are also described below.

- **Early Public Meeting:** The Board conducts a public meeting, which includes public notice and opportunities for public comment, considering an early Concept Design application package. The Board would then provide a Concept Review Guidance Report to the applicant. The Board would approve or deny a subsequent Final Design application, but a public meeting would not be held.
- **Early Public Meeting Variation - Administrative "fast track" Final Design Review:** An option where the Board could waive the Board-level Final Design review and instead authorize a "fast track" to Administrative Final Design review. Types of developments where this could be viable would be where the applicant's Concept Design application is exceptional and/or where the site's development is relatively uncomplicated, and no significant concerns are identified by the Board, staff, and/or from any public input.
- **Later Public Meeting:** The Board reviews the early Concept Design application package and provides a Guidance Report without consideration of public comment. Instead, the Board only conducts a public meeting when it reviews and approves or denies the Final Design application.
- **Later Public Meeting Variation - Early Guidance Consultation:** Instead of having a formal application-level early Concept Design review, the Board provides "early guidance" where the levels of detail and information provided by the applicant would be less than Concept Design requirements. The applicant would then submit a single, application akin to the Final Design requirements. This would operate similar to how the Landmarks Commission provides early guidance except this would be mandatory whereas theirs is voluntary.

### Staff Assessment

As we have discussed at previous meetings, and consistent with feedback and concerns from the Commission and the Project Advisory Group, staff finds significant benefits to conducting a public meeting at the Concept Review stage rather than *only* at the Final Design review. The primary benefit is that public input solicited early --before development teams commit major investments of time and resources in developing detailed site engineering and architectural design-- can be

more impactful and meaningful. In the interest of mitigating unnecessary delays and encouraging higher quality Concept Review application submittals, staff thinks the “fast track” option merits consideration.

**Next Steps:**

After the June 7, 2023 briefing, staff will return to the Commission to present the full proposed program package, expecting then to release a public review draft and setting a Public Hearing on the consolidated proposal will be presented to the Commission.

**Project Summary:**

Information on the work of the Urban Design Studio can be found on the program website at <https://www.cityoftacoma.org/UrbanDesign>.

**Prior Actions:**

Staff have briefed the Commission in numerous presentations between September 2019 and Spring 2023. Most recently, notable topics on which the Commission provided direction and input are:

- Outlining various specific Land Use Code modifications and clarifications;
- Establishing thresholds at which development proposals would be exempt or subject to Urban Design Review;
- Limiting the geographic scope of the Urban Design Review Program’s applicability;
- Reviewing relevant permit activity/volumes and regional precedents/best practices;
- Participating in a project-level review simulation workshop with PAG members and consultants to test and give feedback on the draft Urban Design Guidelines; and
- Reviewing community priority input collected through the online open house survey.

**Staff Contacts:**

- Stephen Antupit [santupit@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:santupit@cityoftacoma.org)
  - Carl Metz [cmetz@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:cmetz@cityoftacoma.org)
- c. Peter Huffman, Director







**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Wesley Rhodes, Planning Services Division  
**Subject:** Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan and EIS – “Picture Pac Ave”  
**Memo Date:** May 31, 2023  
**Meeting Date:** June 07, 2023

**Action Requested:**

Comment and direction on engagement schedule and strategy for the visioning/scoping period.

**Discussion:**

Picture Pac Ave is a Subarea Plan and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a 4.5-mile-long portion of Pacific Avenue/State Route 7 (SR 7) (approximately, I-5 to south 96<sup>th</sup> Street) along a proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor.

Staff has met with the Commission four previous times for this project:

- June 15, 2022 - Staff presented an overview of the Picture Pac Ave project background, major project elements, and a general timeline.
- November 16, 2022 - Staff presented updates on the feedback received to date as part of the “soft launch” engagement process, formation of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC), and project timeline. The Commission also took an action to appoint Commissioner Torrez to represent the Commission of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC). (Note: Subsequent to Commissioner Torrez’s resignation, upon accepting employment with the City of Tacoma, she was replaced on the PAC by Chair Karnes).
- January 18, 2023 – Staff provided a project update and engaged the Planning Commission on questions regarding key assets, challenges and opportunities, for various key Project Goals for the Picture Pac Ave process.
- April 04, 2023 - Staff engaged the Commission in an interactive workshop with an activity designed to elicit feedback and direction on key outreach and engagement strategies and priorities.

At the June 07, 2023, meeting staff will inform the Commission of how input received to date (including from the Commission) has been incorporated into the visioning/scoping outreach schedule and strategies. Staff will be presenting the specific visioning/scoping engagement plan, including the schedule and strategies, to be conducted during the summer of 2023.

**Project Summary:**

The “Picture Pac Ave” subarea planning process is intended to create a shared long-term vision and more coordinated approach to development, environmental review, and strategic capital investments along Pacific Avenue. Completion of the subarea plan will help leverage the benefits of planned transit improvements and support the ongoing eligibility for, and prioritization of, funding for capital investments.

In recognition of the significance of Pacific Avenue as Pierce County’s first Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) line, the City of Tacoma, Pierce Transit, and the State Department of Commerce have partnered to fund and develop a Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan for adoption by the City of Tacoma as part of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.



**Staff Contact:**

- Wesley Rhodes, Senior Planner, [wrhodes@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:wrhodes@cityoftacoma.org), (253) 208-0083
- Project webpage: [www.cityoftacoma.org/PicturePacAve](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/PicturePacAve)

**Attachments:**

- Attachment 1: Visioning/Scoping Engagement Brief
- c. Peter Huffman, Director



## Visioning/Scoping Engagement Brief

At the June 07, 2023, meeting staff will inform the Commission of how input received to date (including from the Commission) has been incorporated into the visioning/scoping outreach schedule and strategies. Staff will be presenting the specific visioning/scoping engagement plan, including the schedule and strategies, to be conducted during the summer of 2023.

### Project Engagement Goals

Through conversations with key stakeholders, the Project Advisory Committee, various commissions, and City Council, staff has identified the following major themes in regards to outreach and engagement strategies for the Picture Pac Ave project:

- No large in-person workshops
- Partner with community events
- Be creative
- Prioritize equitable engagement
- Make participation easy

These key themes were then used to formulate the projects overall engagement goals, which include:

1. Conduct equitable engagement that includes content that is accessible to all and relatable to those living and working along the corridor.
2. Communicate the purpose, benefits, and timeline of the Picture Pac Ave Plan.
3. Make it easy to collaborate, provide input, and stay informed of the plan development.
4. Build consensus, excitement, and buy-in for the outcomes and recommendations of the plan.
5. Report out how input received has helped shape the plan.
6. Highlight other concurrent or related projects near the project area, led by the City, Pierce Transit, or other agencies.

To achieve these goals staff has created an overall public involvement plan (PIP) which includes specific engagement tools and the identification of key audiences as well as a language access plan and a specific schedule for the visioning/scoping engagement period.

Through demographic analysis, community conversations, and ground-truthing, staff has created a language access plan that will help guide outreach to specific structurally excluded groups throughout the project area. The plan identifies that key project materials such as the project fact sheet, online open house, and visioning/scoping survey need to be translated and also identifies that partnerships with cultural ambassadors should be formed to help provide additional outreach, translation, and language targeted events. Languages identified for translation include Spanish, Vietnamese, and Korean. Additionally, staff will attempt to work with cultural ambassadors to conduct additional engagement with populations that prefer Khmer and Tagalog.



**Schedule for Visioning/Scoping Engagement Phase:**

Week 1 – Visioning/Scoping begins (~June 22)

- Send Mailer
- Launch Online Open House and Survey

Week 3 – Kick-off Meeting (virtual - July 13)

Week 4/5 – Issue DS/Scoping notice

Weeks 1-10 – In-person events (esp. 5-10)

- 5/5 Project Lit – Stewart Middle School
- 5/6 Bike Rodeo - Mary Lyons Elementary
- 5/22 HIT Workshop – Stewart Middle School
- 6/8 HIT Workshop – Fern Hill Library
- 6/10 Bike Rodeo – Whitman Elementary
- 6/24 72nd & D Block Party
- 8/1 National Night Out – Safe Streets
- Blueberries & Blues – Blueberry Park
- Walking Tours (7/8 SENCo) / Farmers Market / Intercept tabling and micro events / Door-to-door

Week 10 – Close survey and end scoping (~August 31)