

City Council Chambers, 7:00 P. M.

Tuesday, September 6, 1960.

Council met in regular session. Present on roll call: 8, Bott, Cvitanich, Easterday, Olson, Price, Steele, Murtland, and Porter. Absent 1, Mayor Hanson. In the absence of Mayor Hanson, Mr. Porter, Deputy Mayor, presided.

Mr. Porter requested that the minutes of August 23, 1960 be corrected on Page 6, third paragraph from the bottom of the page, in reference to the spelling of Mr. Roy Wager's name. Mr. Murtland moved that Mr. Weiger's name be corrected to read Mr. Wager. Seconded by Mr. Steele. Voice vote on the motion resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Mr. Cvitanich said he would like to have an addition made to the minutes of August 23, 1960, on Page 2. A question was asked of Mr. Riconosciuto during the discussion of the Post Office rezoning at South 38th and A Streets, in reference to the departure from the Master Plan that was drawn within the City in 1953, and he answered that it was approximately 8 to 10 times a month that the City Planning Commission did depart from this Master Planning.

Mr. Cvitanich moved that the Clerk check the tape recording and that Mr. Riconosciuto's remark be inserted. Seconded by Mr. Easterday. Voice vote resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Mr. Murtland then moved that the minutes of August 23, 1960 be postponed for one week to allow the Clerk to make the requested insertions. Seconded by Mr. Easterday. Voice vote resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Mr. Cvitanich asked that there be an addition made to the minutes of August 30, 1960, in reference to the discussion on the American Manufacturing Co. petition. He said a specific question was asked of Mr. Ramsdell as to the type of traffic count taken and at what hour taken, and he moved that this material, in reference to the traffic count, the time of day and what type of count, be inserted in the minutes of August 30, 1960. Mr. Steele said this traffic count is a matter of record in the City Clerk's office and he could see no reason for requiring the Clerk to re-run the tape for this information.

Mr. Cvitanich said this was in response to a direct question to Mr. Ramsdell and Mr. Buehler in the Council meeting.

Mr. Porter, Deputy Mayor, then called for roll call on the motion, which resulted as follows: Ayes 3; Nays 5, Murtland, Olson, Price, Steele and Porter. Absent 1, Mayor Hanson. Motion LOST.

Mr. Bott said it was his feeling that if something is left out of the minutes which a Council member deems important, his desire should be respected and the material incorporated into the minutes. He could not see why there would be objections to doing this.

Mr. Cvitanich said the most important argument the American Manufacturing Co. presented was perhaps the amount of vehicles going through the alley. The type of count taken and the time, have a great deal of bearing on the result of this vacation, he added.

Mr. Steele asked that a correction be made on page 2 of the August 30, 1960 minutes. Under Resolution No. 16257 the minutes stated that "Mr. Steele moved that the Resolution be adopted. Seconded by Mr. Cvitanich." Mr. Steele said it should read that "Mr. Cvitanich moved that the Resolution be adopted. Seconded by Mr. Steele." Voice vote on the motion to correct the minutes resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Mrs. Olson moved that the minutes of August 30, 1960 be approved as amended. Seconded by Mrs. Price. Voice vote resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent: Mayor Hanson.

This is the date set for hearing pursuant to the provisions of R. C. W. 35.86.050 for the establishment of off-street parking space and facilities.

Mr. Rowlands, City Manager, then stated that this hearing has been properly advertised according to State Law. Mr. Barton, who compiled the original Ferguson Study on the off-street parking, flew in from Cleveland today to be at this hearing. He said that Mr. Barton has conducted 75 parking studies in 60 separate cities and has also qualified as a garage designer, having designed 60 parking garages.

Mr. Rowlands added that a number of individuals will be presenting information to the Council this evening, therefore he would like to have Mr. Marshall McCormick, City Attorney, begin the discussion and then in turn introduce the various individuals who will be presenting this information.

Mr. Marshall McCormick, City Attorney, explained that the Council member some months ago, held a hearing on the off-street parking facilities; but prior to the final decision on the matter some members of the City Council were changed, consequently the majority of the members of the City Council as now constituted did not have an opportunity to hear the material presented. Therefore, a new hearing date was set for tonight on the same matter.

Mr. McCormick explained that this hearing was set up according to State Law which was passed by the last Legislature in 1959. This State Act specifically provides that in the establishment of off-street parking space and facilities, a City shall proceed with the development of the plans, therefore, by making such economic and physical surveys that are necessary, shall prepare comprehensive plans and shall hold a public hearing thereon prior to the adoption of any Ordinances relating to the leasing or the acquisition of property and providing for the financing thereof for this purpose.

Mr. McCormick said the members of the staff in gathering this evidence have prepared it in documented form. Copies have been received by all of the members of the Council. A copy of these documents and statements which will be made tonight have been filed with the City Clerk and is available as they are a part of these proceedings and public records.

Furthermore, it will constitute with the other facts presented here tonight, the official record insofar as this hearing is concerned for later Court proceedings if they are taken.

Mr. McCormick said he will introduce each person who will speak and give a summary of the material each is to present.

Mr. McCormick introduced Mr. Eugene A. Barton who was a member of the H. K. Ferguson firm at the time the Ferguson Report was made in 1959. He said he now has his own engineering and traffic survey firm and has updated the Ferguson Report to the present date.

Mr. Charles T. Pearson, a member of the architectural firm of Lea, Pearson and Richards of Tacoma, will explain and comment on the plans for the garages and the cost estimates of site preparation, construction, etc.

Mr. Yoshio Kosai, Traffic Engineer, of the Public Works Department, will explain and comment on the need for additional off-street parking facilities from the viewpoint of proper and adequate traffic control.

Mr. Russell Buehler, Planning Director, will explain the Planning Department's own report on the need for the off-street parking facilities, the

Tacoma Shopper Attitude Survey by the Washington Department of Commerce and Economic Development (May 1960), the Central Business District, the Broadway Mall; the Central Core and Downtown Tacoma Renewal by Tacoma Urban Renewal Department.

Mr. Frank Young, a member of the Downtown Parking Corporation, will give estimates on cost of acquisition of sites and site preparation for garages and other pertinent facts showing the need for downtown off-street parking facilities.

Mr. John C. Newland, Attorney representing the Downtown Parking Corporation interested in these garages, will explain the gift proposal in connection with the financing of the off-street parking and also the various needs for downtown off-street parking from the viewpoint of the businessmen he represents.

Mr. Eugene A. Barton will then go into the financing - the feasibility and his computation and survey on the estimated revenues and the estimated expenses.

Finally, one of the most important presentations will be by McLean and Co. who are investment bankers and financial advisers. Mr. McLean will explain the various methods of financing the construction and operation of said off-street parking facilities.

Mr. McCormick said this is a brief summary of the facts that will be presented by the staff, and further stated that a written summary of this outline is on file and a part of the record.

He then called upon Mr. Barton to make his presentation.

Mr. Barton explained that he is no longer a member of the firm which made the survey in 1958. The work he has performed in assisting the City of Tacoma to maintain this program in updating any necessary data which may be involved has been done voluntarily and entirely without compensation. He said he was here tonight on the same basis and is not retained by the City to make any survey. He said he is here entirely as a specialist in this field who has originally worked on the survey and has continually maintained his interest in Tacoma and to provide what assistance he could.

Mr. Barton said he would now like to outline how they made this survey. He said they were asked to make a downtown survey and were given a perimeter from 8th Street to 15th, from Market to A Street, to determine the parking needs and what might be required for additional parking facilities in that area.

He said they expanded a little by going beyond the perimeter approximately a block in each direction which is the Firm's normal practice, so as to provide additional information. They then proceeded to separate the downtown area into two districts - the Downtown Core Area, which is the very core area or the 80% to 100% retail district; and the Secondary Area, which is everything beyond the perimeter of the Downtown Core Area.

Mr. Barton said the purpose of this study and report is to conduct a comprehensive detailed parking need survey of the business district; (2) to appraise and evaluate both of the much discussed 10th and 12th Street sides on Pacific Avenue; (3) to determine the economic feasibility of each site's project potential; (4) to evaluate the proposed sidewalk escalation plan; (5) to determine the parking needs, if any, of the balance of area under study and (6) to advise on method or methods by which recommended projects can or should be financed.

He said the growth trend of the area was studied; that is population, the vehicle registration, etc. Before moving ahead to determine what is needed it must be found what facilities are available and to what extent they are being used. The procedure was then to determine the public's views about the parking facilities that it now has. Therefore, an interview was conducted. All drivers who parked at the curb and all

of those who parked at off-street facilities were stopped to obtain their opinions. They also checked the vehicle volume going in and out of the City to see if that supported, and substantiated the estimated increase in motor vehicles.

Then a very careful analysis was made of space utilization by checking hourly what the various facilities were doing. He further stated they also found whether each curb space was being used 4 times a day or 10 times a day and for what periods the vehicles were parked at each space. From all of these findings the parking space demand was determined.

He said they checked even further into the affect and impact the sidewalk escalators might have on both projects and vice-versa. They even went further and studied some data turned over to them by other firms that have conducted their own independent studies and tried to appraise that from whatever neutral standpoint they might have as consultants coming into the City. Then from the entire structure they were to determine what would be the economic analysis or the economic structure of such potential facilities; if they would be self-sufficient or would they have to be subsidized and if so to what extent. From that, he added, they determined their complete recommendation. This procedure was followed step by step and a very thorough analysis and preliminary study was made - a 10 day survey was conducted until late evenings till midnight and through Saturday and Sunday.

Mr. Barton said a summary of his remarks and findings have been prepared and filed as part of this record.

Mr. McCormick then introduced Mr. Pearson of Lea, Pearson and Richards Architects.

Mr. Pearson said they were requested to make studies of garage buildings in these two locations taking into consideration the report that had been made and attempting to furnish the rates for the number of off-street parking spaces that were required. In working with the Downtown Parking group, he added, they were asked to provide one garage opposite 10th on Pacific and one opposite 12th on Pacific. The one opposite 10th, in view of the property available was to be 200 feet long. The other was to be 175 feet long. These two buildings were laid out on the general basis of an entrance from Commerce Street into the parking spaces either directly opposite Commerce Street overlooking Pacific Avenue, which provided part of the space and also an exit out of the garage to another exit so as not to allow any cross traffic.

In so doing they had to take into consideration the fact that this block is only 100 feet deep which is a very bad dimension for a parking garage because space is needed for modern cars and also aisle space in order to park them at right angles to the walls which in this case seems to be the best method of approach.

In following through with that method they came up with these two buildings. The one on 10th and Pacific will house 324 cars and the other on 12th and Pacific will house 267 cars. In each case the entrance ramps are narrower because they do not extend out to the curb line as they do above but stop at the Commerce Street property line, he added. So there is an arcade on the Pacific Avenue level, an arcade on the Commerce Street level and the space above them being occupied by parking space and ramps.

The type of construction presented in this preliminary plan is one of prestressed columns and prestressed beams to get these long spans without going into great depth of beam and great size of columns, and will have a concrete floor slab cast over these beams to support the cars. The beams would have 7 feet minimum clearance, and the beams would drop down about 2-1/2 feet below the slab.

In this Plan there would be no parking on the Pacific Avenue level of either building. First of all, it was felt this would not be economically sound because of the space being too shallow. The space from Pacific to Commerce is 100 feet, part of which would be occupied by the space of the sidewalks. Therefore, this level will be available for rental space except for the space occupied by the Speed ramp housings which will probably take 16 feet. He said there would probably have to be some form of small elevator lobby, for an elevator going from Pacific Avenue level to the top of the garage building in each case.

In Unit "A" at 10th and Pacific they planned three levels of parking with 70 cars on each level. One level had 68 spaces, 2 spaces lost for clearance of the speedramp housings. One level with 36 cars and the entrance level with car spaced for 10 cars. The total spaces in Unit "A" is 324.

Unit "B" at 12th and Pacific is 25 feet shorter than Unit "A" and has 3 levels of 58 cars each, one of 56, one of 30 and the entrance ramp with 7 making a total of 267 spaces.

In each case the entrance ramps are narrower because they do not extend out to the curb line, as they do above, but stop at the Commerce Street property line.

Mr. Pearson said, "Our estimates of the cost of these buildings are based on present unit prices for the various materials and elements composing the buildings. We know how much various mixes of Ready-Mix concrete are per cubic yard, delivered to the sites in the quantities required."

"The same is true of form-work and reinforcing steel in place. We have also checked these costs with some of our contractors to see how they average out.

Every possible part was put on a unit price basis and carefully checked before being used. However, because the estimates are made from preliminary studies it is necessary to cover some parts by a percentage for contingencies.

As a result of careful study of each part and each area, it was found that our estimates agree quite closely with the rough calculations made earlier by men whose business it is to build buildings on which they have made competitive bids.

Mr. Pearson in conclusion stated that he had been discussing the Parking Plans for the City of Tacoma composed of 6 sheets signed by his firm, Lea, Pearson and Richards, revised August 30, 1960; also the information which he had given in regard to the matter and the estimate of the cost had been documented and the Council furnished with a copy thereof.

Mr. McCormick said the next speaker, Mr. Kosai, Traffic Engineer, would explain and comment on the need for additional off-street parking facilities from the viewpoint of proper and adequate traffic control and furnish facts to update the Ferguson Report.

Mr. Kosai said the elements of motor transportation are vehicles, roads and a place to park at the end of the trip. The growth of the suburbs and vehicle ownership have resulted in increased usage of the automobile to travel to the downtown area as well as growth of shopping centers, usually with generous provisions of off-street parking spaces. The increased usage of the automobile has created the need to utilize existing streets for safe and free movement of traffic. Full utilization of streets for safe and free movement cannot be realized unless there are adequate, conveniently located, and easily accessible parking spaces for traffic.

With our increased activity and mobility, people go largely when and where they want, but most frequently where travel facilities best meet their requirements and convenience.

Curb parked cars, as well as cars in the process of parking and unparking, create accident hazards. Cars slowing to park, double-parked, and backing into curb spaces on high volume streets create accident hazards. Curb parking near intersections and crosswalks create traffic accidents. Turning vehicles are involved in accidents with cars leaving parking stalls near intersections. Pedestrians entering crosswalks from behind parked cars have been involved in fatal or injury accidents. Curb parked cars also reduce the traffic-carrying capacity of streets.

To improve safety and free flow of traffic, additional parking prohibitions at 238 parking spaces are needed as follows:

|                        |                  |                                  |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Hill Streets (9AM-6PM) | 43 spaces        | 312 Cars Presently Parked        |
| Hill Streets (4PM-6PM) | 20 Spaces        | 43 Cars Presently Parked         |
| Pacific Ave. (4PM-6PM) | 130 Spaces       | 345 Cars Presently Parked        |
| Meter Respacing        | <u>45 Spaces</u> | <u>472 Cars Presently Parked</u> |

Totals                    238                    1172

The above areas are located in the core area (South 9th Street to South 13th Street, "A" Street to Broadway.) These 238 spaces are some of the more desirable spaces for parkers.

During a survey of curb parking in the core area on an average day in November, 1959, 113 passenger cars and 87 trucks double-parked where observed. In addition, 142 passenger cars and 11 trucks were observed in illegal spaces. Since it is not possible to provide off-street spaces for trucks in the downtown area, additional truck loading zones are needed.

Before curb parking prohibitions for better utilization of streets for safe and free movement can be utilized, adequate, conveniently located, and easily accessible parking spaces must be provided. Curb parking spaces within acceptable distances of parker's destination are highly in demand. In fact, the motorist will cruise the streets seeking curb spaces near their destinations. Cruising also increased the volume of traffic a street must carry. Off-street parking spaces must be within acceptable walking distance which is about 500 feet in Tacoma. If the development of a parking facility is to help stabilize or improve business in a given area, it must have sufficient size for efficient operation and be close to traffic generators. Not only do parkers dislike to walk far, but they also dislike to climb hills. They want a minimum of inconvenience; they want their cars to be safe against damage; they want speedy service--all with reasonable time limitations and fees.

Off-street parking spaces should be of the self-parking type to meet the demand of the parkers. Non-uniform arrival rate of parkers, faster movement, parkers handling own cars, parkers locking own cars, and parkers depositing packages in cars and continuing shopping are considerations which have resulted in practically all new off-street parking facilities in this area as well as in Tacoma to be self-parking facilities.

Since the Ferguson Report, the supply of public off-street parking has been increased by 75 spaces in or adjacent to the core area. The changes were as follows:

- Tacoma Hotel Garage, a loss of 76 spaces
- Greyhound Parking Garage and Lot, a gain of 140 spaces
- National Bank of Washington, a gain of 11 spaces

This means an overall gain of 75 spaces. 105 of the Greyhound Parking Garage are used mostly by all-day parkers.

In addition, there are 120 spaces cleared by 13th Street and "A" Street owned by the General Services Administration, now restricted to use by the Post Office

Department. Also, Rhodes Store is constructing on Market Street, between 9th and 11th Street, a self-parking garage of 600 spaces which will be a net increase of 400 parking spaces. This new facility will help to meet the high demand for parking by Rhodes customers but will not alleviate the need for the additional off-street parking facilities proposed.

The proposed garages with ingress and egress from Commerce Street are designed properly from traffic consideration. Driveways on Pacific Avenue to these garages should not be allowed for the following reasons:

1. Relatively high volume of parkers.
2. The conflict between pedestrians and vehicles will be greater on Pacific Avenue and will result in creating additional injury hazard.
3. Traffic congestion on Pacific Avenue will be increased because of the delay caused by vehicle-pedestrian conflict.
4. Vehicles entering and leaving parking facilities with driveways in or near intersections would result in increased traffic congestion and hazard. The proposed parking garages are in the intersections on Pacific Avenue.
5. It is desirable to minimize the number of exits in order to minimize the number of attendants required.

In addition to the need for 781 parking spaces determined by the Parking and Economic Study of Downtown Business District, Tacoma, Washington by H. K. Ferguson Company, at least 238 off-street spaces conveniently located at the present time are needed to meet minimum standards of traffic safety and movement.

In the foreseeable future, as traffic demand increases continually, curb parking prohibitions will be required. To facilitate turning movements, spaces now used for curb parking for a minimum 100 feet from the intersection would be needed to facilitate bus transit operation, construction of exclusive bus lanes for faster operation of busses as well as automobiles must be made. These additional traffic controls will all require additional off-street parking spaces.

The fact that it may appear that downtown business section has a large number of parking facilities does not mean there is no further need for additional, modern off-street parking facilities, properly located. This is well illustrated by the report, "Parking" by the Eno Foundation for Highway Traffic Control, Saugatuck, Connecticut, 1957 where, on pages 43-45, it is stated----In every population group there is an apparent excess of parking space in the central business district as a whole. The actual excess or surplus, however, is not as large as it appears to be. Because of the time used by vehicles entering and leaving spaces, the time spaces are empty until parkers find them, and because the arrival rate is not uniform throughout the day, it is not possible to get 100 percent use of the space-hours theoretically available.....

Studies in many cities indicate that rarely, even in the presence of heavy demand, have any curb spaces, lots or garages achieved better than 85 percent usage of their theoretical capacity. It is necessary, accordingly, to discount the apparently available supply...As cities grow, the central business district spreads out... Ground space in the core is almost entirely preempted by department stores, retail shops, banks, office buildings, and other uses normally found where land values are highest. Rarely are many parking facilities available in the center of the core and, equally logically, and ironically, the further one goes from the core, the more easily is the parking space found. Near the outer edges of the central business district there is

more space than is needed. But this surplus, unfortunately is much too far from the center of demand to attract drivers bound for destinations many blocks away. Most business districts have enough parking space, but not where it is needed.

Mr. Kosai said he would also like to make a few comments on updating the Downtown Parking Garage Report. The physical conditions have today not changed appreciably to affect the Report since May, 1958. He said he has brought out the increase in the off-street parking spaces, the supply of curb parking has not changed, it fluctuates depending on requests for various types of restrictions. The Downtown Garages are being designed for short time parkers and the curb parking usage study indicates no appreciable change. Parking demands have not decreased and the Pierce County Vehicle Registrations are steadily increasing. In 1957 there were 104,142 passenger vehicles registered; 108,282 in 1958 and 112,990 for 1959.

Mr. McCormick said Mr. Kosai's remarks were documented and are a part of the record of this proceeding.

He then introduced Mr. Buehler, Planning Director, who will present the Planning Department's own report on this off-street parking facilities and also briefly summarize several other articles and surveys, to wit: "Tacoma Shopper Attitude Survey", Central Business District articles, -Broadway Mall - Central Core and Downtown Tacoma Renewal by Tacoma Urban Renewal Department; copies of which also were given to the Council as a part of the record of this hearing.

Mr. Buehler said the Broadway Mall Report, the Central Core Report, the Urban Renewal Report and the Shoppers Attitude Report have all been submitted to the Council, and that a brief statement proceeds these reports in the brochure, from which he will make a few points.

First is the "Pedestrian Mall" development taken from the Planning Department's Report on Pedestrian malls in the draft form that has been authorized by the Commission to go into final printing for general circulation.

The provision of additional downtown parking facilities is a prerequisite for pedestrian mall development. Since the amount of convenient parking space now available near the CBD Core is generally considered inadequate during periods of peak demand, any development involving the removal of existing curb parking spaces in the area of greatest demand will be dependent upon a program to replace this loss. Some 98 metered curb spaces would be lost with conversion of Broadway to a pedestrian mall in the location described above. In addition, bus loading zones would have to be transferred to another street, probably Commerce, which would mean loss of an additional number of curb parking spaces. Since the creation of a mall would undoubtedly increase the "pulling power" of the CBD Core and attract more shoppers with their autos, any such plan should be integrated with the provision of off-street parking spaces over and above the actual number eliminated by mall development.

In the areas of peak parking demand in Tacoma's C. B. D. Core, the existing facilities are unable to meet even present needs. In contrast, a number of parking lots located only a block from the core are seldom used to full capacity. This may be attributed to the steep topography and long blocks characteristic of the CBD west of Pacific Avenue. Shoppers do not like the up and downhill walking east and west, nor do they like the extra walking distance strung out along the long blocks north and south. Additional parking facilities near the center of each of the two long blocks in the CBD Core and adjacent to the moving ramp locations, should do much to alleviate these problems.



The proposed two garages will provide close-in, short-time parking directly tied in with the existing retail shopping development on Broadway, and with the office and financial buildings on Pacific Avenue and on "A" Street. With entrances and exits restricted to Commerce Street, which is used increasingly for primarily distributive and service purposes, the garages will give a minimum of interference to pedestrian movement. The garages can make a substantial contribution to CBD Core improvement, particularly if amenity values are taken into consideration in their design.

The following is taken from the report "Downtown Tacoma Renewal" recently published by the city's Office of Urban Renewal. Although Downtown makes up only a small fraction of Tacoma's total land, it is one of its major assets. A large share of Tacoma and Pierce County employment is located here. About one third of all of the retail dollars spent in the city are spent within the Downtown area. The city's largest investment in land and buildings is concentrated here.

Downtown more than pays its own way. It accounts for about 20% of all of the property and business taxes collected within the city. Schools, police, fire and other city services throughout Tacoma are helped substantially by taxes collected Downtown. A healthy Downtown is everyone's concern.

Downtown has weathered the mistakes of the past, thus far, only because it performs a vital function in the life of the city and because the advantages of a central location for some types of business have yet to be surpassed. However, this may not always be the case. Realistic but imaginative planning will be required to revitalize and redevelop the Downtown area. This planning must include the following objective, among others: Off-street parking for both long and short time use which is tied in with the arterial network and within easy walking distance of Downtown destinations.

He said he will comment briefly on the Shopper preference section which is taken from the "Tacoma Shopper Attitude Survey" done by the Retail Trade Bureau in cooperation with the Washington Department of Commerce and Economic Development Business and Economic Research Division. This report was contained in the brochure sent to the Council and covers the percentages of the various opinions of the people interviewed.

Two examples are given. In one, the shopper's opinion was that downtown traffic conditions can best be improved by the addition of more central parking lots and the carrying through of the plans for the Broadway Mall.

Another shopper's pet peeve is the limited parking available downtown - the difficulty of being blocks away in the middle of a purchase when the one-hour meter is up, when one must walk back, up and down steep hills, to move a car. A person would like to be able to drive in and park close to the stores, to their shopping etc. without worrying about their car.

Mr. Buehler said this covers some of the points listed in the various reports from the Planning Department.

Mr. McCormick then introduced Frank N. Young, as a well known business man of Tacoma, a member of the Downtown Parking Corporation who has been active in this project since its inception. Mr. McCormick stated that he was thoroughly familiar with property values. Mr. McCormick then called upon Mr. Young to give the estimates on the cost for the garages.

Mr. Young said he has been working on this project with Mr. Syford and Mr.

Mueller for several years and is very familiar with it. The Report on Acquisition Cost of Existing Land and Buildings in Connection with Sites for Proposed Parking Garages at 10th and Pacific Avenue and at 12th and Pacific Avenue is as follows:

Site No. 1- 10th Street and Pacific Avenue: Considerable discussion and several meetings have been held with the various property owners who would be affected by the purchase of the 200-foot site at 10th and Pacific Avenue, being located in Block 904, Map of New Tacoma. As of this date the City has acquired Lots 12 and 13. Lots 14 and 15 adjoin to the south and are owned by the Brown brothers. At a meeting held by the Brown brothers and two adjoining property owners to the south, it was agreed that they would accept a figure of \$2,750 per front foot. This represented a total of 100 feet of frontage.

The adjoining 50 feet to the south is owned by Joseph Gallucci and family and in a recent discussion we were unable to secure a more or less firm asking price. He is aware of the price being asked by adjoining property owners to the north and for the purpose of this report we are using the same rate per front foot.

Based on the rate of \$2,750 for 150 feet, this would develop a present day asking price of \$412,500. This 150 feet, added to the 50 feet acquired by the City makes up the total of 200 feet as required for the 10th Street garage.

Site No. 2- 12th and Pacific Avenue: In reference to the 12th Street site, it is our understanding the city has not entered into a firm purchase agreement for Lots 13 and 14, Block 1104, New Tacoma. It is the intent to acquire the adjoining 125 feet to the south.

Lot 15 is owned by Mr. Meyer, who operates a jewelry and loan office and who has heretofore withheld any comment as to price and has indicated he would prefer not to sell. Based, however, on commitments received on Lots 16, 17 and 18, the owners here have heretofore in writing agreed to accept a figure at the rate of \$1, per front foot. Lot 19 again is owned by Brown brothers and the location and buildings are more or less similar to the adjoining properties to the north, and therefore we are placing a similar valuation on this 25 feet, thereby making a total present day appraisal of the 125 feet of \$187,500.

From the above the figures summarize as follows:

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Acquisition cost of 150 feet of frontage at<br>South 10th Street location                              | \$412,500      |
| Acquisition cost of 125 feet of frontage at<br>South 12th Street location                              | <u>187,500</u> |
| Total acquisition cost of two sites at either<br>asking or preliminary appraised present<br>day values | \$600,000      |

With the exception of a firm asking price from the Gallucci property, being Lots 18 and 19, Block 904 and Lot 15 in Block 1104, the above mentioned per foot costs have been verbally confirmed as of this date.

It can be assumed that there will be some difficulty in acquiring the two exceptions at these rates and where condemnation action may be necessary.

It should also be understood that these figures do not include any portion of the two parcels of property purchased by the city for use of the escalators, it

being understood that the escalators will use a maximum frontage on Pacific Avenue and Commerce Street of 16 feet in each location, and that the parking garages would occupy the remaining portion of the ground area, plus air rights over the escalation above Commerce Street at each location." Signed: Herbert F. Syford, President.

Mr. McCormick stated that the Council has heard the estimates of the cost of construction and site preparation by Mr. Pearson, the architect, and the cost of the acquisition of the land by Mr. Young. Also given to the Council in their brochure is "The Estimate Valuation of Portions of Land Purchased for Escalator Purposes and Used for Garages." Mr. McCormick stated that Mr. Blangy, the appraiser was consulted on this question and he had said that the property to be used for the garages at 10th and "A" Street determined to be \$81,600 and the properties for Project "B" at 12th and Pacific, \$42,840.00. Those are in addition to the site cost reported by Mr. Young and are reflected in the total estimated cost of the Parking Garages. This information has been documented and given to the Council. From those figures, Mr. McCormick stated, the total estimated cost of the project was determined. The question now is how it is to be financed.

Mr. McCormick then introduced Mr. Newlands, Attorney representing the Downtown Parking Corporation, who was to explain the gift proposal of the Downtown group of not less than \$700,000 and other pertinent facts relating to the project.

Mr. Newlands pointed out that most everyone is familiar with the efforts of the Downtown Businessmen and property owners in securing additional off-street parking facilities in Downtown Tacoma. He said his clients feel there is a separate need in the Central Business District for parking facilities of modern design to permit self-parking which are close to stores, banks and other facilities in Downtown Tacoma, and which will have a low rate of charge for certain short time parking.

He further stated that these parking facilities will not only reduce present traffic congestion, making it more attractive to shop downtown, but also in the long run aid in the revitalization and renovation of the downtown area. The Downtown Parking Corporation arose from findings of the Parking Subcommittee of the Citizens Committee for Tacoma's Future Development, that the traffic condition in the Central Business District require additional off-street parking. He added there are only 10 shareholders in this Corporation. The capitalization is the minimum required by Law which is \$500.00. Each shareholder has signed an agreement that the valuation of his stock is \$1.00. Each has agreed that he cannot transfer his stock in any way except to a nominee of the other shareholders. The group is representative of the Downtown property owners and businessmen and there is no possible way in which a shareholder may personally gain from the operation of the Downtown Parking Corporation.

In the beginning the Corporation thought they, themselves, would be able to raise enough equity capital to self-finance these garages which would then be placed under a long term mortgage loan to finance the balance of the cost to operate the garages until they were paid off at which time they would be turned over to the City. The group however, could not raise the amount necessary for private financing as it was greatly in excess of \$700,000 and so since then has been working with the City on the present plan to build them.

Mr. Newlands further added that they appreciated the interest that the representatives of the City and the members of the City Council has had in proceeding with these projects. He said the Downtown Parking Corporation still feels that not less than \$700,000 can be made available in the form of a gift to the City if the City will undertake this project. Mr. Newlands further added that the gift proposal is set forth in the brochure received by the Council members, but would summarize some

of the highlights.

The City would receive not less than \$700,000 towards the project. The Corporation, out of funds already on hand, has agreed to advance \$3500 to the City to take care of fees for special Counsel and costs which may be needed for test litigation upon the adoption of this plan. This \$3500 will be paid regardless of the outcome of the Court decisions. If the decision is favorable the \$3500 will be a part of the gift.

As soon as a favorable Attorney's opinion is furnished, which will be after a favorable Court decision, the Corporation will proceed to raise not less than \$700,000 - \$20,000 thereof will immediately be made available to the City to pay the cost of architect fees. The architect will prepare plans substantially in accordance with his plans present here, adequate for the obtaining of preliminary bids sufficient for bond financing.

In addition, at this stage, it will probably be necessary for the City to proceed with the Bond financing which will require bond counsel and perhaps a current traffic survey, etc. The Downtown Parking Corporation further has agreed to allocate \$15,000 for these costs. If this project should be upset by an unfavorable Court decision or by an inability to get proper financing, the Downtown Parking Corporation will be bearing the costs. If everything works out favorably, the City will proceed with the bond financing and the balance of the funds will be placed in escrow and will be made available to the City. A provision is contained in the proposal that if the proceedings are required to be halted at any stage, the City shall deliver and transfer to the corporation any monies contributed which have not been expended or committed hereunder and any properties purchased therewith.

Mr. Newlands said several pages of the gift proposal described generally the commitments the City would undertake in the project. The City obligates itself to go forward with any necessary test litigation to get an Attorney's opinion of which the Corporation is underwriting the cost to go ahead with the financing of the balance of the project to acquire the land and if necessary to pledge all of the on-street parking meter revenues received by the City. He called the Council's attention to a provision in the proposal which permits an amendment to the proposal in the event the parties are not foresighted enough to see all of the problems that might arise.

Certain proposals provide also that the gift proposal shall be cancelled under certain eventualities. These being an unfavorable court decision; the inability to get a favorable attorney's opinion; the inavailability of bond financing at interest rates at 5% or lower, or if the Corporation is unable to raise the \$700,000. The Corporation believes that through these provision which are the result of discussions with the City, that in any event the City will not have lost any money.

He further added the Downtown Parking Corporation appreciates the interest and cooperation of the City in this matter. They have looked over the brochure which has been so carefully prepared by the City and are in favor of the plan set forth. The businessmen whom he represents are confident that Downtown Tacoma has a future but money must be spent on it from time to time. They believe that Parking Garages of modern design are essential; the mall is generally being favored but this cannot be had without the parking garages. The escalators will not reach anywhere near their full usefulness unless the parking garages are built.

Mr. McCormick said as Mr. Newlands has pointed out the complete proposal is in the brochure presented to the City Council Members.

Mr. McCormick asked Mr. Barton to speak again this time on the estimated revenues and expenditures which are projected in the operation of the garages in order that a basis can be formed upon which the financial consultant can base his conclusions.

Mr. Barton said first of all he would like to say that no where, regardless of the size or type of City has a group of merchants ever banded together to provide the City with such a sizeable gift toward a project of this nature. This \$700,000 represents 30 to 35% of the equity dependent on the extent of the project that will be collected and tendered to the City.

Mr. Barton further continued that there is no question, should we or should we not do this. We must do it because that is the only way we are going to survive. There are too many facilities that are outmoded and progress is such that we must not stand in its way. We must provide these facilities.

In listening to Mr. Kosai, he added, and also according to the studies made it is quite evident that there is considerable amount of double parking, particularly on the part of trucks. More parking and loading zones are needed at the curbs which cannot be done unless the space is there. Most of this is now taken up by long term parkers. Facilities must be provided for these people using the curb spaces, if we are going to provide loading zones.

Mr. Barton further added that his appraisal of Mr. Pearson's preliminary estimate indicates he has substantial amount of additional contingencies added to his figure to be sure that the estimate is not exceeded by the cost of construction, etc. He said he was quite confident that the final analysis of the cost of the two structures will be substantially less than is indicated by Mr. Pearson's report.

Mr. Barton spoke on the estimates and figures arrived at through the 1959 report made by the Ferguson Company. He said recently he was asked to update this report and the figures they have come up with are as follows: for Project "A" the income based on two different rates - 15 cent rate for the first several hours as recommended in 1958 and a 20 cent per hour rate which is closer in keeping with the current rates. Using a 15 cent per hour rate on Project "A" at 330 spaces, the income is \$129,000 gross. That is determined by using a 3.0 turnover instead of 3.5 for the day and a 1.0 turnover for shopping evenings of 200 spaces and a 1.0 turnover for shopping other evenings at 100 spaces. There has been a continued observation that evening parking late at night along the parking meters are still very much occupied. The total cars parked, 319,000 estimate for a year of 330,000 spaces; \$129,000 gross income; operating expenses totaling \$37,120.00 deducted from that would leave the net parking income before taxes and amortization \$91,880.00 for Project "A" on the 15 cent rate.

Compared with the 20 cent per hour rate the gross income would be \$160,000: The net revenue after operating expenses and before amortization and taxes would be \$122,880. That is exclusive of any other income that might be derived from the property such as the area that we consider unusable for parking and recommended that stores be provided in those area.

Mr. Barton said Project "B" based on 240 cars - the gross income at 15 cents per hour was \$82,500; at 20 cents per hour \$102,500. Operating expenses estimate at \$28,920.00 leaving a net parking income before amortization and taxes of \$53,580.00 on the 15 cent per hour basis and \$73,580 on the 20 cents per hour basis.

Mr. Barton said we definitely recommend the 20 cents per hour rate if it would be acceptable to the merchants. It is very little more than 10 cents per hour

meters and provides undercover parking for indefinite periods, thus eliminating the worry of the parker having to put more coins in a meter.

Mr. McCormick thanked Mr. Barton. He said Mr. Barton mentioned that would recommend the 20 cent per hour rate if the merchants were agreeable. So far as the record is concerned, if it is necessary to charge 20 cents per hour to finance the garages, the downtown merchants will be in favor of that rate. He asked Mr. Newlands for confirmation of this statement.

Mr. Newlands said that was correct.

Mr. McCormick said the last gentlemen to present the final link in this presentation is Mr. Archie McLean, President of the McLean & Co. For the record, Mr. McCormick added, the Council has retained this firm in connection with the financing of the sanitary sewer project; He also thought he has been the Cowlitz consultant. He has been retained on other projects where financial consultants were necessary to determine the feasibility of financing a project based on the estimated revenue and income. Mr. McCormick said he is mentioning this fact as he wants it as a matter of record that Mr. McLean and his company are experts in this particular field.

Mr. McLean said as long as Mr. McCormick wants this established in the record he will say that they are not only financial consultants and underwriters in the City of Tacoma both in your sewer revenue project and the City's present light and power Cowlitz project, but to the Port of Tacoma and to literally dozens of municipalities, States, Counties, Cities, Water Districts, Sewer Districts, on revenue bond problems throughout the Northwest.

Mr. McLean said Mr. Barton has touched on quite a few of the details which he might have commented on. The plan to finance this proposed project is based on Revenue bonds. He said each Council member has received data on the annual revenue and expenses anticipated. He said the first page covers the gross revenue and expense. The second page recaps Project "A" and Project "B". The main purpose of a financial consultant is to find out what the estimated net annual income might be. The development of the net annual income has a relationship to the annual debt service costs, that is the annual costs of paying off the interest and principal on these revenue bonds. Based on the estimated cost, we feel a bond issue of \$2,450,000 is necessary. The debt service based on a \$2,450,000 revenue bond issue would be an average of about \$161,813.00 annually.

On the last page of the financial report is a "Summary of Financing." The estimated project cost of both Project "A" and "B" results in a figure of \$2,733,274. To that must be added interest during construction, which has been estimated at 1 year at 5% on \$2,450,000 to be \$122,500. Also added to this must be the bond discount, legal, bond printing, etc., estimated to be about \$94,226.00 resulting in a total project cost of \$2,950,000.

Mr. McLean continued that the Downtown merchants and property owners have pledged a \$700,000 gift toward the project. The plan is that \$500,000 of the gift is to go toward the cost and the remaining \$200,000 of the gift would be placed in a contingency fund as first guarantee money for bond buyers, in the event the use of the garages fall short of expectation. Therefore the net deduction from the project cost would be \$500,000 leaving a total of \$2,450,000 to be financed by Revenue Bonds.

He said the figures developed by Mr. Barton, the earnings and the estimates of maintenance and operation costs show that this project will maintain itself. However, in following projects financed by parking revenue as well as projects financed by other revenues throughout the County, it will be found that almost without

exception every project of this kind has the on-street pledged parking revenues in order to make the bonds appear attractive enough from a security standpoint for a buyer to underwrite them and to obtain a lower rate of interest.

Mr McLean said it might be interesting to note that based upon the figures developed heretofore, net earnings of the project will cover annual debt service as follows: At a 15 cent rate, net earnings of \$184,361 are equal to 1.14 times the average annual debt service of \$161,813. Including the on-street parking revenue guaranty in the amount of \$119,404 (revenue from on-street parking last year,) the net available is equal to 1.88 times average annual debt service. At a 20 cent rate net earnings of \$235,361 are equal to 1.45 times the average annual debt service of \$161,813. Including the on-street parking revenue guaranty in the amount of \$119,404 (1959) the net available is equal to 2.19 times the average annual debt service.

Mr. McLean said the on-street parking revenue guarantee is what makes this revenue bond issue look "gold plated."

Mr McCormick said that this is all the facts and data that has been prepared for presentation tonight and the brochure which was given to the Council contained, substantially, the information and material presented; also he stated that a copy of such brochure would be incorporated as part of the minutes of the meeting and kept on file in the City Clerk's Office as part of the official records of this hearing.

A question and answer period took place at this time, the Council asking for clarification on several points.

Mr Cvitanich asked Mr. McLean if this would involve a 30 year issuance of revenue bonds and also what the total interest would be on the amount of \$2,450,000 over this 30 year period.

Mr McLean answered that it would be a 30 year issuance and that he did not have the total interest figure.

It was brought out that the total principal and interest cost of the project assuming a 5% interest rate, would be about \$5,000,000.

Mr. McLean explained that debt service included price and interest.

Mr. Cvitanich then asked Mr. Gaisford if he could give an estimate from one of his manuals on a revenue bond issue \$2,450,000, assuming it would go 30 years. Mr.

Mr Gaisford said using the figure of 4% the total interest cost would be approximately \$1,905,000.

Several questions having been asked about the on-street parking meter money being pledged as an additional guarantee to the revenue bond issue, Mr Robert Thorgrimson, a bond attorney, explained this point further. He said there seems to be some confusion on the part of the Council as to the use of the on-street parking meter money. What has been recommended was that the on-street parking meter revenue would only be a guarantee, not a subsidy. That means that the Ordinance authorizing these bonds provides in the event the revenues derived from the off-street parking facilities are insufficient to pay principal and interest, the parking meter money is pledged as an additional guarantee would be used only if and when the \$200,000 already placed in a contingency fund as first guarantee money is exhausted. Then the on-street revenue can be used only for such as is necessary to make up the deficiency. It has nothing to do with the right of the City to use the balance of the on-street parking meter revenue at any time. It is just there as a fund which ultimately might have to be looked to, to make up any deficiency in principal and interest. He said it is to the City's advantage to pledge on-street parking meter revenues which may never be used to insure the lowest possible interest rate on the bonds.

Mr. Porter, Deputy Mayor, then called upon the opponents of the Parking Garage proposal to speak.

Mr Harold Tollefson, Attorney for the private garage operators, said up until now, the Council has only received information that has already been documented for them in a thick notebook, and has not heard from those who are engaged in the business at the present time. He said he could understand why downtown retailers

and property owners would be interested in this facility especially when a group could get together and pledge \$700,000 for a \$3,000,000 structure.

He said the merchants and property owners are anxious to get this project across; by the same token the small and large parking lot operators, who are in many cases bound by long term leases, are certain this will be damaging to them.

Mr Tollefson added that a few points should be considered by the Council, The voters of the City of Tacoma were told during the 1958 bond campaign, when escalators were approved that the garages would be privately financed. This present plan as contemplated will not be keeping faith with the voters of the City, he added.

Also, when the legislation was approved allowing Cities to construct garages, it was the intent of the Legislature to give the City the right to go ahead in a matter such as this on the basis that there would be a need to alleviate traffic and not on the basis that it was a real estate venture for the purpose of improving marketing and shopping conditions in the downtown area.

He said the Council is not trying to alleviate traffic congestion but rather to create it by bringing additional cars downtown.

The Council is to determine whether or not it is good business to go into a large expensive \$3,000,000 parking garage facility and further to increase the amount of business that is downtown with the ultimate hope that it will increase the evaluation of downtown and increase the amount of B & O Tax which will be received by the City and to rejuvenate the business of the City of Tacoma, He said this is a private venture and should not be taken away from private sources unless there is an actual need, which in his opinion has not been shown.

Mr. Tollefson mentioned the new Rhodes Parking Lot and said the Council before making their decision of Parking garages should take this into consideration and determine what effect this new parking lot will have on the overall parking picture in the City of Tacoma.

Mr. Tollefson said there has been no mention in the report to the Council of any change in the demand for parking spaces in the City since the move was made from the old City Hall.

Statistics downtown will show the availability of parking spaces on every day of the week, he added.

Mr Tollefson called upon Mr. Medved, President of the Private Parking Garages Association, to speak at this time.

Mr Medved said the private operators are opposed to this proposition. They feel that city subsidized garages would constitute "unfair competition." He said many of the private operators will be forced out of business if this comes to pass. He said they do not feel that it is the City's responsibility to provide these garages. They do not oppose the merchants building the garages as this is free enterprise, but feel it unfair for the City to venture into this business.

Mr Medved explained that a survey had been taken of private garages in the downtown area two weeks ago to find out the true parking picture. An average for six days showed that at 11:00 A.M. out of 2,001 there were 866 vacancies; at 12:00 P.M. there were 744 vacant stalls; at 1:00 P.M., 724 vacant stalls and at 2:00 P.M. there were 722 vacant stalls, He said the report made by the Ferguson Firm does not add up with the business the private garages are doing.

He said he thought this a poor business for the City to enter into. If this were feasible there would be plenty of private capital available, as 94% of the parking in the United States is privately financed. The Bond firms do not think this feasible as they have asked the City to pledge meter revenues up to the amount of \$120,000.

Mr. Medved said the cure for the situation would be for the retailers to advertise the parking space which is available rather than bemoan a parking shortage which, he claimed does not exist. He urged a well promoted validation program,



whereby merchants would subsidize existing garages. He said parking has been the whipping boy for all the ills of downtown. He said he felt the parking business is down in proportion with other businesses.

Mr. Lewis C. Hatfield, Secretary-Treasurer of the Garage Employees' Local Union spoke briefly. One point he emphasized was that the City claims to be in financial straits. Therefore, he said, all available funds should be put into police and fire protection and street maintenance, instead of garages, which is a special interest project that will cost the City money in the long run.

Mr Easterday said inasmuch as this matter had been discussed for 4 hours he moved that the matter be tabled. Seconded by Mr. Cvitanich.

Roll call on the motion resulted as follows: Ayes 4; Nays 4; Murtland, Price, Steele and Porter. Motion LOST.

Mr. Steele said the hearing has been held, the testimony has been presented. According to the procedure the Attorney should be requested to bring in a Resolution for Tuesday, September 13th on this matter. He asked that this date be changed to the 20th and at that time the City Attorney bring in a Resolution relating to the findings made by the Council with reference to the necessity and advisability of off-street parking facilities and the requisite order to the Legal Department to draft the necessary Ordinance.

During a short rebuttal, Mr. Barton said that the existing garages are not operating to capacity because they are outmoded, parking facilities that no one wants to use.

He said there are more than 2100 municipally operated garages and more are being built all the time because private enterprise will not put them where the City needs them.

Mr. Barton said any figures they have they can substantiate. Mr. Kosai has very carefully studied these, and the profession recognizes him as a Traffic expert, and he has concurred with most of the studies. Where he has found any questionable material, they have reconsidered or discussed them with him.

Also he said he did not think the City should be considered as entering into competition with private enterprise. There are more than 2100 municipally operated garages and more are being built all the time because private enterprise will not put them where the City needs them.

Mr. Bott said the City has a responsibility to the merchants and businessmen in other areas of the City also. Originally when this bond issue was voted upon, the approval of the escalators with privately built garages was the issue. Now its a matter of obligating the City to a 4½ million project without the people having any say in it and he did not feel this was right. The people as a whole should have a right to vote on this if we change it from a no cost deal to a 4½ million deal.

Mr. Steele again requested that a Resolution be brought in on the 20th of September with reference to the findings by the Council as to the necessity and the proper governmental function of such proposal and also as to the drafting of an Ordinance with reference to the providing for the acquisition, etc.

Mr. McCormick said he thought, what Mr. Steele had in mind was that the Council will have the next two weeks to go over the material and make up their minds one way or the other. Mr. Steele is requesting that the Legal Department draft a Resolution making proper findings to acquire and establish the off-street

parking garages. Then the Council can either vote for or against this Resolution and make the final determination at that time. The Resolution will be the first step.

If the Council does not wish to proceed with the garages, the members will undoubtedly vote the Resolution down. If the Resolution passes, we will then proceed further, and the Resolution will contain findings which we feel necessary to present the issues to the Court in a test case. The Resolution will also instruct the attorney to draft the proper Ordinance, etc. When that Ordinance is passed by the Council, the Legal Department can proceed with the test suit.

Mr. Cvitanich asked that this hearing be postponed until September 27th in order that the private garage owner's consultant will be able to attend the hearing. He thought that the Council should allow him 10 or 15 minutes on the 27th to explain his findings.

Mr. Steele said if this gentleman wishes to make a record and file it with the Clerk it will be included as part of this record.

Mr. Medved said that was not the same as appearing in person, however. He felt his group should be given the same opportunity as the proponents of having an expert present to give his presentation.

Mr. McCormick said there is no objection if the opponents want to file objections to this report or against the opinion of the experts, etc., as it can be made a record of these proceedings. But if the hearing is continued, this could go on indefinitely, he added.

Mr. Porter explained this is the hearing which was set up according to State Law and unless the Council wishes to continue the hearing it remains as such.

Mr. Easterday said he could see no point in continuing the hearing as all the material has been presented. He agreed with Mr. Steele that the Resolution should be brought in and no further hearing held on this matter.

Mr. Tollefson said we were asked to rebut this voluminous report and said he did not think they were asked too much if on the date the Resolution is brought in and prior to its passing, they be given 15 minutes to present their expert on the question, or if he is unable to attend, to present his report to be included in the record.

Mr. Cvitanich moved to reconsider and entertain a motion to guarantee that they will have an opportunity to present their information. Motion failed for want of a second.

Mr. Porter then asked that the next order of business be taken up at this time.

This is the date to which the petition of the Northwestern Homes, Inc., requesting to vacate the alley from 6th Avenue to So. 7th Street between Cushman and Ainsworth Avenue and also the Ordinance No. 16612 for the rezoning of that area, is to be reconsidered by the Council.

Mr. Porter asked Mr. McCormick to give his opinion as to the position the Council is in on this matter.

Mr. McCormick said as he recalls, the original petition submitted to the Planning Commission was for the rezoning of the entire block and at the hearing before the Planning Commission some of the area was deleted. Therefore the remaining portion included only part of the block. At the public hearing held before the City Council the Council overruled the Planning Commission's recommendation and denied the rezoning along with the vacation. Now the matter before the Council tonight is to reconsider the Council action. The decision to me made is whether the Planning Commission's recommendation will be approved as to the partial rezoning of the block,

whether the entire block should be rezoned, or whether the rezoning should be again denied.

Mr. Rowlands called the Council's attention, that under the existing zoning A & P Stores could build on a different part of the block.

Mr. Steele said he would move that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and that Ordinance No. 16612 be amended to zone the entire block, number 630 and 631 of Amended Plat of the Ainsworth Addition as requested in the original petition of Northwestern Homes. Seconded by Mrs Olson. Roll call was taken on the motion resulting as follows: Ayes 2; Nays 6; Easterday, Murtland, Olson, Price, Bott, Cvitanich; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson. Motion Lost.

Mr. Easterday moved that a vote be taken on Ordinance No. 16612; Seconded by Mr. Cvitanich. Voice vote on the motion resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Mr. Porter then called for a roll call on Ordinance No. 16612 which resulted as follows:

Ayes 2; Nays 6; Murtland, Olson, Price, Cvitanich, Easterday; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson. The Ordinance was declared lost by the Chairman.

The status of the vacation was then discussed. The Council was told they had the choice of either denying the vacation or of requesting that an Ordinance be brought in to vacate the alley.

Mr. Bott suggested that the Council take no action until it was ascertained whether or not the A & P Stores planned to build inasmuch as their rezoning request had been denied. If they did still plan to go ahead with the construction, action could then be taken to vacate the alley in question. Otherwise there would be no need to take this step.

Mrs. Olson moved to table the petition to vacate the alley. Seconded by Mr. Cvitanich. Voice vote on the motion resulted as follows: Ayes 7; Nays 1, Steele; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

#### COMMUNICATIONS:

Communication from the Tacoma Transit Company requesting that a Lease and Management Agreement with the City of Tacoma be extended to 2:00 o'clock A.M. on the 1st day of April 1961. 408

Mr. Rowlands said if this request were approved it would require the passage of a Resolution to extend the Lease and Management Agreement.

Mr. Bott said in the event the stockholders foreclose and liquidate, could it be provided that this extension would be null and void upon such an occurrence.

Mr. McCormick said if the Council desires such a condition, it can be included in the Resolution.

Mr. Easterday moved that the City Attorney be instructed to prepare a resolution authorizing the extension of time. Seconded by Mr. Bott. Voice vote resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

#### RESOLUTIONS:

##### Resolution No. 16274

Awarding contract to Woodworth & Co., and Tucci & Sons for L I D No. 3511 on their joint bid of \$31,654.27 and for the supplemental bid in the amount of \$3,191.25 plus sales tax, which was determined to be the lowest and best bid.

SEP 6 1960

It was moved by Mrs. Price that the Resolution be adopted. Seconded by Mr. Easterday.

Voice vote on the Resolution resulted as follows:

Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent Mayor Hanson.

The Resolution was then declared adopted by the Chairman.

Resolution No. 16275:

Amending the rules of the City Council to provide that the regular meetings be held at 3:00 P.M. on Tuesday of each week, instead of 7:00 P.M. on Tuesday of each week.

Mr. Porter explained according to the rules of the Council this Resolution cannot be acted upon until the next meeting.

Resolution No. 16276.

Retaining the firm of Preston, Thorgrimson & Horowitz, Attorneys at Law as bond attorneys in connection with the acquisition of the Tacoma Transit System.

It was moved by Mr. Steele that the Resolution be adopted. Seconded by Mr. Bott.

Mr. Rowlands said if the vote is favorable on the Transit Co. proposition and the City goes through with this transaction, the total fees will be \$1,250. In the event the proposition fails to carry at the election, the expense to the City will be only \$100.

Voice vote was then taken on the Resolution, resulting as follows:

Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

The Resolution was then declared adopted by the Chairman.

Resolution No. 16277:

Retaining the firm of Preston, Thorgrimson & Horowitz, Attorneys at Law, as bond attorneys in connection with the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$6,500,000 for the purpose of acquiring a site and for constructing and equipping a multi-purpose auditorium.

It was moved by Mr. Steele that the Resolution be adopted. Seconded by Mrs. Price.

Mr. Rowlands said the same matter is applicable to this Resolution. If the vote is successful, there will be a higher retainer fee based on the number of bonds, if the vote is unsuccessful, the City's expense will only be \$200.

Voice vote was taken on the Resolution, resulting as follows:

Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

The Resolution was then declared adopted by the Chairman.

Mr. Porter said he would like to entertain a motion to suspend the Rules in order that two Resolutions that do not appear on the agenda can be taken up at this time.

Mr. Steele moved that the Rules be suspended in order that Resolutions No. 16278 and 16279 can be taken up at this time. Seconded by Mr. Cvitanich. Voice vote resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Resolution No 16278.

Authorizing the proper officers of the City to transfer the sum of \$6,000 from the Non-Departmental Classification of Demolition of City Hall to the Non-Departmental classification of Independent Audit.

It was moved by Mr. Steele that the Resolution be adopted. Seconded by Mrs. Price.

Mr. Rowlands said there were two methods in which funds could be made available for this particular study, making it possible for the Council to undertake a survey or running audit as outlined in the City Charter. The same procedure has been followed for the last seven years, he added.

One method was by an emergency appropriation, which failed by one vote. Secondly, in checking this matter carefully with the Finance Director, and the City Attorney, it was ascertained that the \$6,000 could be transferred from the non-departmental expenditure budget.

In the 1960 Budget, \$20,000 has been set aside for the demolition of the old City Hall Annex and on September 20, 1960, the Council will be receiving a report from Anderson and Associates, who have been preparing plans for the possible reuse of the City Hall; and in the report it is contemplated that the full amount of \$20,000 will not be needed. Therefore, in order to comply with the City Charter and also to undertake this study in which the Council members expressed interest previously, this can be accomplished by Resolution transferring \$6,000 from this fund.

Voice vote was then taken on the Resolution, resulting as follows:

Ayes 7; Nays 1, Cvitanich; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.  
The Resolution was then declared adopted by the Chairman.

Resolution No. 16279

Authorizing the Utility Board to initiate the necessary proceedings to amend Sec. 12.06.250 of the Official Code of the City to set the rate for energy charges on Street lighting to 3 mills per KWH.

It was moved by Mr. Steele that the Resolution be adopted. Seconded by Mr. Easterday.

Mr. Rowlands said this matter was presented to the City Council by the Utility Board about a year ago. At that time in the new rate structure, it was suggested that street lighting energy be charged at 6 mills per KWH rather than the 3 mills which the City has been paying for many years. He explained it is not too unusual for the City Government to pay less than the going rate.

The reason this is being brought to the Council's attention at this time is that this will give the Council an opportunity to refer it back as a matter of policy, to the Public Utility Board which meets next week. Then when the matter again comes before the Council, we are hopeful that it can be delayed for at least another year before any changes in street lighting energy rate would be considered, since such a change, at this time, would adversely affect an already tight budget by another \$47,000.00

SEP 6 1960

Last year consideration was given to reciprocal agreements whereby some of the rates of the signal lights would be changed and that study is now being completed.

Inasmuch as we have at this time a very tight budget, it is felt this should be held in abeyance for another year or maybe indefinitely. Therefore the Utility Board is being asked by way of this Resolution that the City be charged only 3 mills per KWH until January 1, 1962.

Attention was called to an error in the Resolution whereby the last paragraph states the rate to be .003 mills per kwh instead of 3 mills per kwh.

Mrs Price moved that the Resolution be amended to read 3 mills per kwh. Seconded by Mr. Steele. Voice vote on the motion resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Voice vote was then taken on the Resolution as amended, resulting as follows:

Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

The Resolution was then declared adopted by the Chairman.

#### FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES:

##### Ordinance No. 16633:

Submitting to the qualified voters of the City at the general election to be held on November 8, 1960, a proposition for the financing and operation of the Tacoma Transit System, in the amount not to exceed \$850,000. Read by title and placed in order of final reading.

##### Ordinance No. 16634 :

Submitting to the qualified voters of the City of Tacoma at the general election to be held on November 8, 1960, a proposition for the purpose of providing funds to pay the cost of acquiring a site and constructing and equipping a Multi-purpose Civic Auditorium, and to levy general obligation bonds in the principal sum of \$6,500,000. Read by title and placed in order of final reading.

##### Ordinance No. 16635:

Vacating the alley from McKinley Avenue to East "I" between East 35th and Harrison Streets. (Safeway Stores Petition) Read by title and placed in order of final reading.

#### FINAL READING OF ORDINANCES:

##### Ordinance No. 16620:

Amending Sec. 12.06.220 fo the Official Code of the City regarding Electric Energy-regulations and Rates. Read by title.

Mr. J. Ferguson, City Light Supt., said this Ordinance would lower the minimum load requirements for institutions such as schools, hospitals and governmental buildings from the present 500 kilowatts to 200 kilowatts, wishing to qualify for the wholesale rate.

He said the lowering of the requirements would simply make it possible for primary and small elementary schools to qualify and this is a desirable off-peak load, which would enable the City Light to better utilize its capacity.

Mr Steele said he understood the rate was designed strictly for the Clover Park District School near Lake Louise.

Mr. Ferguson said that was an erroneous impression that was circulated. The School in question would have qualified under existing requirements, he added.

Mr. Porter said he had asked that this be postponed some time ago so that he could make some investigation on the matter. He said since then he has talked to quite a few people on this matter and their opinion was that this rate has been a losing proposition for the City Light and that this change from 500 to 200 kilowatts could simply mean a further loss.

Mr. Ferguson said he questioned that opinion. The rate was once part of a broader City Light rate which had been criticized by its consultants, but the rate had been changed in the recent action increasing City Light rates and the wholesale rate now provides a satisfactory return.

Roll call was then taken on the Ordinance, resulting as follows:

Ayes 1; Nays 7; Bott, Cvitanich, Easterday, Murtland, Olson, Steele and Porter; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

The Ordinance was declared lost by the Chairman.

Ordinance No. 16632:

Amending the Official Code of the City in reference to zoning and adding a new section known as Section 13.06.050 (6) to include property located at the N.E. corner of No. 30th and White Streets. (Beverly G Hoffman Petition) Read by title and passed. 368

Roll call was taken on the Ordinance, resulting as follows:

Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

The Ordinance was declared passed by the Chairman.

COMMENTS:

Mr. Rowlands submitted the preliminary budget for 1961 for the Council's consideration. He said this Budget is unique in this respect. He said there are really two budgets. The first is the normal budget at a total of \$10,968,006.00; this is an increase of \$411,072.00 over the 1960 Budget. The second is a supplemental budget totaling \$1,618,269.00 which the Council, would be willing to appropriate if the money were available. 414

Mr. Rowlands said in order to balance the preliminary budget, it was necessary to cut the proposed budgets of Department Directors by \$1,172,501.00. He said these items which were cut out, along with other expenditures deemed to be necessary make up the supplemental budget totaling \$1,618,269.00. These items are spelled out on the blue sheets which follow each department's balanced budget.

He said throughout the Budget message an explanation has been given why changes were made. He said he would appreciate it if the Council members would read this Budget message for this information.

Mr. Rowlands said the First Class Cities are having their meeting in Seattle, Thursday, September 8th beginning at 10:00 A.M. in the Ben Franklin Hotel. He asked that as many Council members attend the meeting as possible as it is very vital in regard to the Legislative Program. He asked that they meet in the Mayor's Office at 8:45 A.M. Thursday morning previous to the meeting.

Mr. Rowlands said an outstanding significant Airport letter came out, and he had a copy made for each Council member. He said it demonstrates irrefutably the tremendous value of an Airport to any community.

Mr. Porter said he had a phone call from Mr. Durham today who requested that the Council reconsider their action taken on Ordinance No. 16631 on August 30, 1960 and would like to speak before the City Council on this matter.

Mr. Durham said a petition was submitted to the Public Works Department requesting that sidewalks on 14th Street from Alder to Lawrence be constructed. After the petition was submitted, the P.T.A. made a request that the area of So. 43rd and Junett Street near the Madison School be added. He said at this time he is not in a position to obligate himself to the sum of \$1100 for which he is being assessed; therefore he is requesting the City Council to delete from the Ordinance, the area on So. 43rd and Junett Street. He said the Madison School and himself are the only property owners involved in this area.

Mr. Easterday asked if Mr. Durham had appeared at the L I D Hearing to protest this L I D.

Mr. Durham replied that he had and at that time he was told there was only 9% protest against the improvement. However since then he has found that the originators of the L I D were those persons in the 14th and Cedar Street area three miles away from his area and that the So. 43rd and Junett property had been added on at the request of the P. T. A.

Mr. Schuster explained that this L I D contains three or four areas. Mr. Durham's protest amounted to approximately 14% of the area in which he is involved. The remonstrance filed in the entire L I D is 9%. Mr. Schuster said the reason that Mr. Durham's property was included was that it was the only property without sidewalks in the area of So. 43rd and Junett.

Mr. Bott moved that the Council reconsider this action at a later date. Seconded by Mr. Steele.

Mr. Schuster said if this is to be reconsidered all the property owners should be notified.

Mrs. Price asked if it were possible to delete this one portion without affecting the rest of the district.

Mr. Schuster said it would be.

Mr. McCormick said as he recalls, the State Statute provides that a non-contiguous district can be deleted without holding another hearing. However, as a matter of courtesy it might be well to notify all the property owners in the L I D of the reconsideration.

Mrs Price then moved that Mr. Bott's motion be amended to postpone the reconsideration until September 20th. Seconded by Mr. Steele. Voice vote on the motion resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Voice vote was then taken on the motion as amended - to reconsider Ordinance No. 16631 on September 20, 1960, resulting as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

Mr Cvitanich asked Mr. Schuster how the Leach Creek project was progressing.

Mr. Schuster explained that there was a clause in the purchase of the property which provided that one of the property owners was to receive 120 days notice before actual construction of the Impounding Basin began. He added that the 120 day period has not yet expired.

Mr. Schuster said the Department's plan has been sent to the Pollution Control Commission and to the Fisheries Department. They have approved the design for the holding area and as soon as the time element of 120 days has elapsed the work can begin.

Mr. Easterday asked that he be excused from the Council meeting of September 13th. Mr. Steele moved that this request be granted. Seconded by Mrs. Price. Voice vote on the motion resulted as follows: Ayes 8; Nays 0; Absent 1, Mayor Hanson.

There being no further business to come before the Council, upon motion duly seconded and passed the meeting adjourned at 12:45 A.M.

Attest:

*[Handwritten signatures and initials]*