LAKEWOOD CITY COUNCIL
STUDY SESSION AGENDA

Monday, September 12, 2022
7:00 P.M.
City of Lakewood
Council Chambers
6000 Main Street SW
Lakewood, WA 98499

Residents can virtually attend City Council meetings by watching them live on the city's YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/user/cityoflakewoodwa

Those who do not have access to YouTube can call in to listen by telephone via Zoom: Dial +1(253) 215-8782 and enter meeting ID: 868 7263 2373

Page No.

CALL TO ORDER

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Presentation from the Pierce County Library System.
   – *Gretchen Caserotti, Executive Director*

(3) 2. Review of 2nd Quarter (2022) Financial Report. – (Memorandum)

(140) 3. Review of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Request for Proposals. – (Memorandum)

(186) 4. Review of Lakewood Housing Needs by Income. – (Memorandum)

(189) 5. Review Tree Preservation Code Update. – (Memorandum)

ITEMS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2022 REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING:

1. Proclamation recognizing September 25, 2022 through October 1, 2022 as Childhood Cancer Awareness Week.

2. Proclamation recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Lakewood Chamber of Commerce.

Persons requesting special accommodations or language interpreters should contact the City Clerk, 253-983-7705, as soon as possible in advance of the Council meeting so that an attempt to provide the special accommodations can be made.

3. American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Sub recipient Presentations.
   – *Diana Sullivan, Boys and Girls Club of South Puget Sound and Edison Velez, Northwest Youth Corps*

4. Authorizing the execution of an amendment to the agreement for the JBLM North Access Improvement Phase 1 project. – (Motion – Consent Agenda)

5. Reappointing Jason Gerwen and appointing Anessa McClendon to serve on the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board through September 19, 2025. – (Motion – Consent Agenda)

6. Appointing Kamarie Wilson to serve on the Public Safety Advisory Committee through August 6, 2025. – (Motion – Consent Agenda)

7. Approving amendments to the Downtown Subarea Plan, Planned Action Ordinance and Development Code (LMC Title 18B). – (Ordinance – Regular Agenda)

8. Amending the Critical Areas Ordinance, Title 14, and Chapters 2.48, 18A.70.300-350, 18A.80.060, 18B.600, 18C.600, 18A.60.110, 18B.200.230, 18C.200.230, 18B.700.720, 18C.700.720, 18A.70.140, 18A.60.030-070, related to the Tree Preservation Code.
   – (Ordinance – Regular Agenda)

REPORTS BY THE CITY MANAGER

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

Persons requesting special accommodations or language interpreters should contact the City Clerk, 253-983-7705, as soon as possible in advance of the Council meeting so that an attempt to provide the special accommodations can be made.

Return to Agenda

To: Mayor and City Councilmembers

From: Tho Kraus, Deputy City Manager

Through: John J. Caulfield, City Manager

Date: September 12, 2022

Subject: 2nd Quarter 2022 Financial Report

Introduction

The intent of the financial report is to provide an overview of activity in all funds through June 30, 2022. Additionally, performance measures and other data reporting are included at the end of this report.

Page	In This Report	Page	In This Report
2	Consolidated Funds - General/Street O&M	47	Community Development Block Grant
5	Property Tax	61	Neighborhood Stabilization Program
6	Sales & Use Tax	61	South Sound Military Partnership
13	Criminal Justice Sales Tax	62	American Rescue Plan Act
14	Utility Tax	70	Park Sales Tax
15	Gambling Tax	71	Cost Recovery - Parks Recreation
16	Admissions Tax	72	Farmers Market Financial & Metrics
17	Franchise & Non-Compete Fees	73	Human Services Program
18	State Shared Revenues	74	Property Management
19	Photo Infraction - Red Light/School Zone Enforcement	75	Capital Projects - Parks
21	Jail Services	76	Real Estate Excise Tax
22	Dispatch Services	81	Transportation Benefit District
23	Animal License & Animal Control Services	85	Capital Projects - Transportation
24	Alarm Permits & Fees	86	Capital Projects - Sewer
25	Seizure Fund - Narcotics	87	Surface Water Mangement Operations & Capital
26	Seizure Fund - Felony	88	Hotel/Motel Lodging Tax
27	Seizure Fund - Federal	90	Fleet & Equipment Fund
28	Public Safety Grants	91	Information Technology Fund
29	Municipal Court Fines & Forfeitures, Filings and Finances	92	Risk Management Fund
34	Business License	93	Debt Service
35	City Tree Fund	95	Cash & Investments
36	Development Services Permits & Fees	95	By Fund Summary
42	Cost Recovery - Development Services Permits & Fees	96	Financial Statements by Fund
	(Combines CED & PWE Permits & Fees)	116	Building Permit Activity Report
43	Property Abatement	118	MyLakewood311 Data Report
45	Rental Housing Safety Program	125	Performance Measures
46	1406 Affordable Housing Program		

Return to Agenda

Consolidated Funds - General/Street O&M

The funds are combined in this presentation, as these two funds are the City's primary general governmental operating funds. In 2022, the General Fund anticipates providing an annual subsidy of $1.55M, which equates to 61% of the Street O&M Fund sources.

Consolidated General & Street O&M Funds	2016 Annual Actual	2017 Annual Actual	2018 Annual Actual	2019 Annual Actual	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2022 Annual Budget
Operating Revenue	$ 37,796,664	$ 40,002,901	$ 41,764,092	$ 43,289,960	$ 41,318,153	$ 46,338,464	$ 43,391,788
Operating Expenditures	$ 35,172,853	$ 36,480,054	$ 38,468,132	$ 39,409,137	$ 35,808,185	$ 38,201,881	$ 43,391,318
Operating Income / (Loss)	**$2,623,811**	**$ 3,522,847**	**$ 3,295,960**	**$ 3,880,823**	**$ 5,509,968**	**$ 8,136,582**	**$ 470**

The following table and charts provide a comparison of operating revenues, operating expenditures and the resulting operating income/loss for the current and historical years.

The following graph illustrates the total current budgeted and historical operating revenues and expenditures.

The following graph illustrates the change in total revenues collected and expenditures compared to the prior year.

Return to Agenda

General & Street O&M Funds	2021		2022			2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual Over / (Under)		2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget Over / (Under)	
Combined Summary	Annual Actual	YTD Actual	Revised Bdgt	YTD Budget	YTD Actual	$ Chg	% Chg	$ Chg	% Chg
REVENUES:									
Property Tax	$ 7,431,434	$ 4,093,191	$ 7,605,010	$ 4,131,608	$ 4,174,366	81,174	2.0%	42,758	1.0%
Local Sales & Use Tax	14,413,902	7,277,365	11,800,000	5,729,145	7,102,332	(175,033)	-2.4%	1,373,187	24.0%
Sales/Parks	789,461	382,526	750,000	359,676	414,714	32,188	8.4%	55,038	15.3%
Brokered Natural Gas Use Tax	54,213	22,078	45,000	20,433	32,355	10,278	46.6%	11,922	58.3%
Criminal Justice Sales Tax	1,434,092	687,122	1,368,900	649,056	740,320	53,198	7.7%	91,264	14.1%
Admissions Tax	226,165	63,869	235,000	120,640	168,501	104,631	163.8%	47,861	39.7%
Utility Tax	5,436,800	2,864,862	5,556,700	2,923,103	2,966,030	101,169	3.5%	42,927	1.5%
Leasehold Tax	6,936	3,744	5,000	2,640	3,888	145	3.9%	1,249	47.3%
Gambling Tax	3,786,769	1,721,801	3,550,000	1,700,389	2,004,114	282,313	16.4%	303,725	17.9%
Franchise Fees	4,364,450	2,075,896	4,397,000	2,120,401	2,174,256	98,360	4.7%	53,855	2.5%
Development Service Fees (CED)	2,066,139	1,126,993	1,914,825	910,653	1,052,168	(74,825)	-6.6%	141,515	15.5%
Permits & Fees (PW)	200,882	98,865	152,500	81,668	118,176	19,311	19.5%	36,508	44.7%
License & Permits (BL, Alarm, Animal)	409,993	205,938	382,500	215,312	227,880	21,942	10.7%	12,568	5.8%
State Shared Revenues	2,164,992	1,085,244	2,140,245	1,057,468	1,142,524	57,280	5.3%	85,057	8.0%
Intergovernmental	224,685	127,331	264,936	134,241	147,544	20,214	15.9%	13,304	9.9%
Parks & Recreation Fees	153,762	88,211	274,000	147,904	107,671	19,460	22.1%	(40,233)	-27.2%
Police Contracts, including Extra Duty	1,085,414	405,879	1,138,500	319,944	319,944	(85,935)	-21.2%	-	0.0%
Other Charges for Services	4,162	2,718	1,800	1,250	2,821	104	3.8%	1,571	125.7%
Fines & Forfeitures - Municipal Court	546,047	320,005	588,205	328,950	167,364	(152,641)	-47.7%	(161,585)	-49.1%
Fines & Forfeitures - Camera Enforcement	1,083,951	476,740	800,000	405,802	621,920	145,180	30.5%	216,118	53.3%
Miscellaneous/Interest/Other	169,515	53,390	136,967	60,187	53,225	(165)	-0.3%	(6,963)	-11.6%
Interfund Transfers	284,700	142,350	284,700	142,350	142,350	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
Subtotal Operating Revenues	**$ 46,338,464**	**$ 23,326,116**	**$ 43,391,788**	**$ 21,562,818**	**$ 23,884,464**	**$ 558,348**	**2.4%**	**$ 2,321,646**	**10.8%**
EXPENDITURES:									
City Council	132,143	62,948	148,304	73,793	69,873	6,925	11.0%	(3,921)	-5.3%
City Manager	618,248	284,502	815,043	407,502	376,422	91,919	32.3%	(31,080)	-7.6%
Municipal Court	1,745,159	887,568	2,134,372	1,075,662	867,995	(19,574)	-2.2%	(207,667)	-19.3%
Administrative Services	1,398,748	713,064	1,543,746	1,249,930	714,095	1,031	0.1%	(535,835)	-42.9%
Legal	2,161,184	994,899	2,379,523	1,159,148	1,067,533	72,634	7.3%	(91,615)	-7.9%
Community & Economic Development	2,439,060	1,087,437	2,905,420	1,291,287	1,427,477	340,040	31.3%	136,190	10.5%
Parks, Recreation & Community Services	2,788,467	1,251,309	3,421,562	1,549,547	1,342,229	90,919	7.3%	(207,319)	-13.4%
Police	24,337,584	11,505,599	27,104,423	13,507,366	13,173,692	1,668,093	14.5%	(333,675)	-2.5%
Street Operations & Engineering	2,097,795	1,060,773	2,456,386	1,251,194	1,080,365	19,592	1.8%	(170,830)	-13.7%
Interfund Transfers	483,494	268,885	482,538	269,394	269,394	509	0.2%	-	0.0%
Subtotal Operating Expenditures	**$ 38,201,881**	**$ 18,116,984**	**$ 43,391,318**	**$ 21,834,824**	**$ 20,389,072**	**2,272,089**	**12.5%**	**(1,445,751)**	**-6.6%**
OPERATING INCOME (LOSS)	**$ 8,136,582**	**$ 5,209,133**	**$ 470**	**$ (272,006)**	**$ 3,495,392**	**$ (1,713,741)**	**-32.9%**	**$ 3,767,397**	**-1385.0%**
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:									
Grants, Contrib, 1-Time Source	715,833	259,086	823,384	229,209	229,209	(29,876)	-11.5%	-	0.0%
Subtotal Other Financing Sources	**$ 715,833**	**$ 259,086**	**$ 823,384**	**$ 229,209**	**$ 229,209**	**$ (29,876)**	**-11.5%**	**$ -**	**0.0%**
OTHER FINANCING USES:									
Capital & Other 1-Time	1,324,735	468,984	2,211,426	498,080	498,080	29,097	6.2%	-	0.0%
Interfund Transfers	3,484,047	1,353,750	2,497,325	2,497,325	2,497,325	1,143,575	84.5%	-	0.0%
Subtotal Other Financing Uses	**$ 4,808,782**	**$ 1,822,734**	**$ 4,708,751**	**$ 2,995,405**	**$ 2,995,405**	**$ 1,172,672**	**64.3%**	**$ -**	**0.0%**
Total Revenues and Other Sources	**$ 47,054,297**	**$ 23,585,202**	**$ 44,215,172**	**$ 21,792,027**	**$ 24,113,673**	**$ 528,471**	**2.2%**	**$ 2,321,646**	**10.7%**
Total Expenditures and other Uses	**$ 43,010,663**	**$ 19,939,717**	**$ 48,100,069**	**$ 24,830,229**	**$ 23,384,478**	**$ 3,444,760**	**17.3%**	**$ (1,445,751)**	**-5.8%**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$ 13,730,803**	**$ 13,730,803**	**$ 17,774,437**	**$ 17,774,437**	**$ 17,774,437**	**$ 4,043,634**	**29.4%**	**$ -**	**0.0%**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$ 17,774,437**	**$ 17,376,288**	**$ 13,889,540**	**$ 14,736,235**	**$ 18,503,633**	**$ 1,127,345**	**6.5%**	**$ 3,767,397**	**25.6%**
Ending Fund Balance as a % of Oper Rev	38.4%	74.5%	32.0%	68.3%	77.5%				
Reserve - Total Target 12% of Oper Rev:	$ 5,560,616	$ 5,560,616	$ 5,207,015	$ 5,207,015	$ 5,207,015				
2% Contingency Reserves	$ 926,769	$ 926,769	$ 867,836	$ 867,836	$ 867,836				
5% General Fund Reserves	$ 2,316,923	$ 2,316,923	$ 2,169,589	$ 2,169,589	$ 2,169,589				
5% Strategic Reserves	$ 2,316,923	$ 2,316,923	$ 2,169,589	$ 2,169,589	$ 2,169,589				
Set Aside Economic Dev Opportunity Fund	$ 1,000,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,000,000				
Undesignated/Reserved for 2022-2024 Budgets	$ 11,213,821	$ 10,815,672	$ 6,682,526	$ 7,529,221	$ 11,296,618				

Note: Undesignated/Reserved Balances are are one-time funds and per the city's financial policies may not be used for ongoing operations.

Return to Agenda

Consolidated Funds – General and Street O&M Ending Fund Balance and Cash

In support of the City's financial integrity, the City Council adopted on September 15, 2014, a set of financial policies including fund balance reserves totaling 12% of General/Street O&M Funds operating revenues. For the 2022, this 12% equates to $5.20M as follows:

- ***2% General Fund Contingency Reserves:*** The purpose of this reserve is to accommodate unexpected operational changes, legislative impacts, or other economic events affecting the City's operations which could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time the original budget was prepared. A 2% reserve fund based on the General/Street O&M Funds operating revenues equates to $868K.

- ***5% General Fund Ending Fund Balance Reserves:*** The purpose of this reserve is to provide financial stability, cash flow for operations and the assurance that the City will be able to respond to revenue shortfalls with fiscal strength. A 5% reserve fund based on the General/Street O&M Funds operating revenues equates to $2.2M.

- ***5% Strategic Reserves****:* The purpose of this reserve is to provide some fiscal means for the City to respond to potential adversities such as public emergencies, natural disasters or similarly major unanticipated events. A 5% reserve fund based on the General/Street O&M Funds operating revenues equates to $2.2M.

Additionally, on November 15, 2021 the City Council via Ordinance 764 established an Economic Development Opportunity Fund within the General Fund ending fund balance for the purpose of accumulating excess funds from the General Fund and other funds that are eligible to provide funding for economic development opportunity related expenditures. The set aside amount as approved in the 2021/2022 mid-biennium budget adjustment is $1,000,000 in each year of 2021 and 2022 for a total of $2,000,000. The City shall appropriate and use the funds as approved by the City Council.

The following table and graph below provides the current and historical General/Street O&M Funds ending balance and cash & investment.

Year	Total Ending Fund Balance	Total Cash
2017	$ 9,163,535	6,634,879
2018	$ 8,847,536	6,986,782
2019	$ 9,878,841	7,483,611
2020	$ 13,730,802	10,769,320
2021	$ 17,774,437	14,473,577
2022 YTD June	$ 18,503,633	14,355,712

Return to Agenda

Property Tax

A property tax rate is placed on each piece of property within the City and is used for general governmental purpose. The rate is expressed in "dollars per $1,000 assessed value (AV), and is a function of the property tax levy permitted by law and adopted by the City Council. In the City of Lakewood, as in other Washington cities, the maximum regular levy cannot exceed $3.60, which includes the maximum regular levy of $3.375 plus an additional $0.225 per $1,000 AV to provide for the Firemen's Pension Fund. Property tax is assessed on land, buildings, and residential homes, and on inventory and improvements to commercial property.

Levy Rate Per $1,000 Assessed Value (AV)			
Taxing District	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**
City of Lakewood	$ 0.98	$ 0.91	$ 0.81
Emergency Medical Services	0.50	0.49	0.45
Flood Control	0.10	0.10	0.10
Pierce County	1.05	0.98	0.88
Port of Tacoma	0.18	0.17	0.15
Rural Library	0.47	0.44	0.39
School District	3.78	3.74	3.46
Sound Transit	0.20	0.20	0.18
Washington State	3.01	2.93	2.66
West Pierce Fire District	2.81	2.67	2.26
Total Levy Rate	**$ 13.08**	**$ 12.63**	**$ 11.35**
Total AV ($ in billions)	$ 7.46	$ 8.11	$ 9.33

Property Tax *Year-to-date through June*								
			2022		Over / (Under)			
					2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget	
Month	**2020 Actual**	**2021 Actual**	**Budget**	**Actual**	**$**	**%**	**$**	**%**
Jan	$ 167,149	$ 175,819	$ 149,453	$ 162,826	$ (12,993)	-7.4%	$ 13,373	8.9%
Feb	288,602	386,370	380,855	409,507	23,137	6.0%	28,652	7.5%
Mar	2,212,886	2,765,349	2,662,966	2,887,483	122,134	4.4%	224,517	8.4%
Apr	786,517	631,535	768,511	636,792	5,257	0.8%	(131,719)	-17.1%
May	412,020	68,297	125,794	50,958	(17,339)	-25.4%	(74,836)	-59.5%
Jun	66,088	65,822	44,029	26,799	(39,023)	-59.3%	(17,230)	-39.1%
Jul	59,647	42,677	47,668	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	99,526	160,391	144,086	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	2,517,610	2,579,648	2,643,939	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	559,245	493,759	569,088	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	73,883	43,186	48,241	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	16,583	18,581	20,380	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 3,933,262**	**$ 4,093,192**	**$ 4,131,608**	**$4,174,365**	**$ 81,173**	**2.0%**	**$ 42,758**	**1.0%**
Total Annual	**$ 7,259,756**	**$ 7,431,434**	**$ 7,605,010**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
AV (in billions)	$7.46	$8.11	$9.33					
5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021):		2.0%						

Return to Agenda

Sales & Use Tax

The City imposes a sales and use tax of 1% to fund general government programs. Of this total, 15% is provided to Pierce County per state law. The City imposes both the basic 0.5% and the optional 0.5% sales and use tax. This tax is imposed on personal and business purchases of tangible property. The retail sales tax is also assessed on some services such as repairs and construction. The City receives 1% of the sales tax rate. Of the 1%, the City receives 0.84% (Pierce County receives 15% of the 1% and the State receives 1% of the 1% leaving 0.84% to the City).

Agency	Rate
State of Washington	6.50%
City of Lakewood	1.00%
Criminal Justice Sales Tax	0.10%
Pierce Transit	0.60%
Sound Transit	1.40%
Pierce County Juvenile Facilities	0.10%
Zoo-Park Fee	0.10%
South Sound 911	0.10%
Pierce County Mental Health & Chemical Dependency	0.10%
Total Tax on Sales & Use	**10.00%**

Sales Tax
Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 921,305	$ 1,045,104	$ 860,233	1,010,937	$ (34,167)	-3.3%	$ 150,704	17.5%
Feb	815,257	1,069,437	850,424	1,105,666	36,229	3.4%	255,243	30.0%
Mar	801,220	1,339,293	1,025,466	1,269,314	(69,979)	-5.2%	243,848	23.8%
Apr	835,856	1,254,417	915,650	1,271,098	16,680	1.3%	355,448	38.8%
May	1,069,435	1,223,441	986,829	1,150,945	(72,496)	-5.9%	164,116	16.6%
Jun	1,105,668	1,345,673	1,090,544	1,294,372	(51,300)	-3.8%	203,828	18.7%
Jul	1,047,578	1,225,560	996,831	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	1,008,016	1,186,091	991,393	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	1,145,841	1,185,976	1,048,444	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	1,072,199	1,164,053	976,283	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	909,197	1,107,278	940,866	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	1,214,472	1,267,578	1,117,039	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 5,548,740**	**$ 7,277,365**	**$ 5,729,145**	**$ 7,102,332**	**$ (175,033)**	**-2.4%**	**$ 1,373,187**	**24.0%**
Annual Total	**$ 11,946,044**	**$ 14,413,902**	**$ 11,800,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 8.9%

Return to Agenda

Retail trade, the largest economic sector, accounts for 43% of collections, followed by services and construction, which account for 23% and 15%, respectively.

Top 10 Taxpayers (Grouped by Sector) *Year-to-date through June*				
			Over / (Under)	
			Change from 2021	
Sector	2021	2022	$	%
General Merchandise Stores	$ 442,169	$ 418,769	$ (23,400)	-5.3%
Motor Vehicle and Parts Dealers	257,971	204,857	(53,115)	-20.6%
Miscellaneous Store Retailers	162,880	161,924	(955)	-0.6%
Building Material, Garden Equip & Supplies	170,091	158,755	(11,336)	-6.7%
Administrative and Support Services	102,836	99,311	(3,525)	-3.4%
Construction of Buildings	255,509	95,851	(159,658)	-62.5%
Rental and Leasing Services	97,509	84,779	(12,730)	-13.1%
Administration of Economic Programs	78,765	80,885	2,121	2.7%
Couriers and Messengers	-	66,456	66,456	100.0%
Total	**$ 1,567,730**	**$ 1,371,588**	**$(196,142)**	**-12.5%**

The Marketplace Fairness Act, effective January 1, 2018, resulted in an increase in sales tax distributions for all cities and counties, but also eliminated the Streamlined Sales Tax (SST) mitigation payments that many cities and counties have received since 2008. SST mitigation helped compensate jurisdictions for sales tax revenues that were lost when the state switched from an origin-based to destination-based sales tax for delivery of goods. As jurisdictions receive increased sales tax revenues from internet and remote sales, their SST mitigation payments are reduced by a corresponding amount, and all mitigation payments will cease of as October 1, 2019. The City's SST mitigation ceased mid-2018 since sales tax from the Marketplace Fairness Act exceeded SST mitigation.

Marketplace Fairness Act				
	AWC	Annual	Over/Under Estimate	
Year	Annual Est	Actual	$	%
2018	$ 83,017	$ 121,932	$ 38,915	46.9%
2019	$ 254,620	$ 157,863	$ (96,757)	-38.0%
2020	$ 325,104	$ 268,037	$ (57,067)	-17.6%
2021	$ 364,509	$ 331,969	$ (32,540)	-8.9%
2022	$ 397,231			
2023	$ 433,026			
Total	**$ 1,857,507**			

Marketplace Fairness Act Quarterly Distributions							
						Chg From Prior Year Over/(Under)	
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	$	%
Q1	$ 27,107	$ 32,686	$ 44,164	$ 79,229	$ 77,632	$ (1,597)	-2.0%
Q2	28,007	36,003	69,638	83,651	84,292	641	0.8%
Q3	29,402	39,758	68,020	76,691			
Q4	37,416	49,416	86,215	92,398			
Total YTD	**$ 55,114**	**$ 68,689**	**$ 113,802**	**$ 162,880**	**$ 161,924**	**$ (956)**	**-0.6%**
Total Annual	**$ 121,932**	**$ 157,863**	**$ 268,037**	**$ 331,969**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

Return to Agenda

Sales & Use Tax by Sector

($ in thousands)

Sector	2017 Revenue	2017 % of Total	2017 Change Prior Yr	2018 Revenue	2018 % of Total	2018 Change Prior Yr	2019 Revenue	2019 % of Total	2019 Change Prior Yr	2020 Revenue	2020 % of Total	2020 Change Prior Yr	2021 Revenue	2021 % of Total	2021 Change Prior Yr
Retail Trade	$ 4,587	46%	$ 366 9%	$ 5,013	46%	$ 426 9%	$ 5,348	45%	$ 335 7%	$ 5,572	47%	$ 224 4%	$ 6,659	46%	$ 1,087 20%
Services	$ 2,381	24%	$ 47 2%	$ 2,650	24%	$ 269 11%	$ 2,759	23%	$ 109 4%	$ 2,555	21%	$ (204) -7%	3,117	22%	$ 562 22%
Construction	$ 1,176	12%	$ 254 28%	$ 1,502	14%	$ 326 28%	$ 1,977	17%	$ 476 32%	$ 1,958	16%	$ (19) -1%	2,375	16%	$ 417 21%
Wholesale Trade	$ 494	5%	$ 100 25%	$ 467	4%	$ (27) -5%	$ 556	5%	$ 89 19%	$ 517	4%	$ (40) -7%	668	5%	$ 151 29%
Information	$ 500	5%	$ (4) -1%	$ 484	4%	$ (15) -3%	$ 478	4%	$ (6) -1%	$ 483	4%	$ 5 1%	517	4%	$ 34 7%
Finance, Ins, Real Estate	$ 385	4%	$ (16) -4%	$ 408	4%	$ 23 6%	$ 466	4%	$ 58 14%	$ 467	4%	$ 1 0%	559	4%	$ 92 20%
Manufacturing	$ 206	2%	$ (12) -5%	$ 222	2%	$ 16 8%	$ 175	1%	$ (46) -21%	$ 170	1%	$ (5) -3%	216	1%	$ 45 26%
Government	$ 135	1%	$ 8 6%	$ 171	2%	$ 36 27%	$ 124	1%	$ (47) -27%	$ 160	1%	$ 36 29%	212	1%	$ 53 33%
Other	$ 95	1%	$ 36 60%	$ 61	1%	$ (34) -36%	$ 70	1%	$ 9 15%	$ 63	1%	(7) -10%	91	1%	$ 28 44%
Total	**$ 9,959**		**$ 779 8%**	**$ 10,978**		**$ 1,019 10%**	**$ 11,956**		**$ 978 9%**	**$ 11,946**		**$ (10) 0%**	**$ 14,414**		**$ 2,468 21%**

Return to Agenda

Sales & Use Tax by Sector
Year-to-date through June

Sector	Actual 2021	Actual 2022	Over / (Under) Change from 2021 $	Over / (Under) Change from 2021 %	Explanation of Variance Increase / (Decrease) *$ in Thousands*		
Retail Trade	$ 3,411,042	$ 3,018,489	$ (392,554)	-11.5%	$ 26	20%	Sporting Goods, Hobby, Musical Instrument & Books
					$ 12	16%	Gasoline Stations
					$ 4	100%	Motor Vehicle and Parts Dealers
					$ 3	1%	Miscellaneous Store Retailers
					$ (3)	-3%	Electronics and Appliance Stores
					$ (6)	-2%	Building Material and Garden Equipment and Supplies
					$ (10)	-5%	Food and Beverage Stores
					$ (15)	-16%	Nonstore Retailers
					$ (18)	-11%	Health and Personal Care Stores
					$ (19)	-15%	Furniture and Home Furnishings Stores
					$ (23)	-14%	Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores
					$ (34)	-6%	General Merchandise Stores
					$ (315)	-34%	Motor Vehicle and Parts Dealers
Services	1,483,861	1,651,611	167,750	11.3%	$ 76	10%	Food Services and Drinking Places
					$ 26	11%	Repair and Maintenance
					$ 15	21%	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
					$ 14	29%	Accommodation
					$ 14	7%	Administrative and Support Services
					$ 11	24%	Amusement, Gambling, and Recreation Industries
					$ 3	82%	Ambulatory Health Care Services
					$ 3	5%	Personal and Laundry Services
					$ (1)	-9%	Educational Services
Construction	1,282,687	1,078,226	(204,461)	-15.9%	$ 111	38%	Specialty Trade Contractors
					$ (122)	-60%	Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction
					$ (193)	-25%	Construction of Buildings
Wholesale Trade	299,041	411,817	112,775	37.7%	$ 68	31%	Merchant Wholesalers, Durable Goods
					$ 43	55%	Merchant Wholesalers, Nondurable Goods
					$ 1	100%	Merchant Wholesalers, Durable Goods
Information	249,932	265,810	15,878	6.4%	$ 12	206%	Motion Picture and Sound Recording Industries
					$ 6	4%	Telecommunications
					$ 3	22%	Data Processing, Hosting, and Related Services
					$ (8)	-21%	Other Information Services
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	293,523	338,269	44,746	15.2%	$ 34	14%	Rental and Leasing Services
					$ 10	21%	Credit Intermediation and Related Activities
					$ 2	127%	Insurance Carriers and Related Activities
					$ (2)	-76%	Securities, Commodity Contracts, and Other Financi
Manufacturing	105,549	121,709	16,161	15.3%	$ 13	157%	Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing
					$ 5	48%	Printing and Related Support Activities
					$ 2	35%	Beverage and Tobacco Product Manufacturing
					$ (2)	-33%	Food Manufacturing
					$ (3)	-47%	Plastics and Rubber Products Manufacturing
Government	107,136	109,379	2,243	2.1%	$ 2	118%	Executive, Legislative, and Other General Government
					$ 2	3%	Administration of Economic Programs
					$ (2)	-49%	Justice, Public Order, and Safety Activities
Other	44,593	107,023	62,429	140.0%	$ 67	14319%	Couriers and Messengers
					$ 11	56%	Support Activities for Transportation
					$ (2)	-76%	Utilities
					$ (13)	-67%	Transit and Ground Passenger Transportation
Total	**$ 7,277,365**	**$ 7,102,332**	**$ (175,033)**	**-2.4%**			

Note on Wholesale Tax Classification: Sales tax applies if the buyer does not have a reseller permit or exemption certificate. Additionally, purchases made for personal or household use is not exempt from sales tax. This includes items used in a business that are not resold, such as office supplies, tools, equipment and equipment rentals.

Return to Agenda

The following section provides a sales tax comparison by retail area and is based on UBI numbers and physical location addresses received from the Washington State Business License database, matched against UBI numbers in the City's sales tax database.

The area category title "All Other" which includes food services & drinking places, construction, and telecommunications attempts to capture: businesses that have multiple locations reporting under a single UBI number is excluded from the retail area reporting (such as Walgreens, O'Reilly's, Starbucks, Dollar Tree, McDonald's, etc.); businesses that do not fall under the retail area as currently defined (such food services & drinking places); or businesses that do not have a physical location in the City but are providing services within the City limits (telecommunications and construction). Businesses are added to the sales and use tax area periodically throughout the year; therefore, amounts reported in previous periods may differ.

Area	Map ID	Location
Bridgeport & Steilacoom	1	Steilacoom Boulevard from John Dower Road to Lakewood Drive
Bridgeport North	2	Bridgeport Wy from Custer Rd to University Place city limit & Custer Road from Bridgeport Way to Tacoma city limit
Bridgeport South	3	Bridgeport Way from 108th Street to 59th Avenue
Central Business District	4	Lakewood Towne Center, the Colonial Center, and Lowes/Hobby Lobby Complex
International District	5	South Tacoma Way and Durango Avenue from 87th Street to the B&I
Lakewood Industrial Park	6	Lakeview Avenue from 108th Street to Steilacoom Boulevard and Lakewood Industrial Park
Pacific Highway TOC	7	Pacific Highway from 108th St SW to Bridgeport Way
Pacific Highway Ponders	8	Pacific Highway from Gravelly Lake Drive to Bridgeport Way
Springbrook	9	Springbrook Neighborhood
Steilacoom West	10	Steilacoom Drive from 87th Avenue to Phillips Road
Tillicum	11	Tillicum Neighborhood
Woodbrook	12	Woodbrook Neighborhood
Woodworth	13	112th Street & South Tacoma Way/Steel Street/Sales Road (East Lakewood)

Retail Tax Areas

Map Date: April 03, 2015
:\Projects\Finance\RetailTax\RTAs.mxd

This product was prepared with care by City of Lakewood GIS. City of Lakewood expressly disclaims any liability for any inaccuracies which may yet be present. This is not a survey. Datasets were collected at different accuracy levels by various sources. Data on this map may be shown at scales larger than its original compilation. Call 253-589-2489 for further information.

Return to Agenda

Sales & Use Tax by Area

Year-to-date through June

Map ID/Area	2021	2022	Over / (Under) Change from 2021 $	%	Explanation of Variance Increase / (Decrease) $ in Thousands		
1 Bridgeport & Steilacoom	$ 87,762	$ 93,080	$ 5,318	6.1%	$ 5	6%	Retail Trade
2 Bridgeport North	325,553	302,504	(23,049)	-7.1%	$ 5	21%	Services
					$ (26)	-9%	Retail Trade
3 Bridgeport South	331,808	353,704	21,896	6.6%	$ 15	78%	Construction
					$ 14	46%	Fin, Ins, Real Est
					$ 13	12%	Services
					$ 6	26%	Wholesale Trade
					$ 4	535%	Information
					$ 2	32%	Manufacturing
					$ (31)	-23%	Retail Trade
4 Central Business District	1,056,936	1,015,911	(41,025)	-3.9%	$ 6	40%	Information
					$ 2	258%	Government
					$ (50)	-6%	Retail Trade
5 International District	503,319	516,225	12,906	2.6%	$ 41	32%	Services
					$ 5	42%	Other
					$ 3	324%	Wholesale Trade
					$ (12)	-12%	Fin, Ins, Real Est
					$ (25)	-10%	Retail Trade
6 Lakewood Industrial Park	49,246	52,472	3,225	6.5%	$ 1	224%	Construction
					$ 1	16%	Retail Trade
					$ (1)	-40%	Wholesale Trade
7 Pacific Highway (TOC)	365,219	316,286	(48,933)	-13.4%	$ 4	16%	Services
Transit Oriented Commercial					$ 3	394%	Construction
					$ (6)	-75%	Wholesale Trade
8 Pacific Highway Ponders	119,185	69,253	(49,932)	-41.9%	$ 7	19%	Services
					$ 3	29%	Construction
					$ (62)	-95%	Retail Trade
9 Springbrook	3,578	4,696	1,118	31.2%	$ (1)	-100%	Fin, Ins, Real Est
10 Steilacoom West	87,786	84,412	(3,374)	-3.8%	$ 5	35%	Services
					$ (8)	-11%	Retail Trade
11 Tillicum	84,067	94,269	10,201	12.1%	$ 11	33%	Retail Trade
					$ 2	78%	Construction
					$ 1	9%	Manufacturing
					$ (4)	-9%	Services
12 Woodbrook	1,436	36	(1,400)	-97.5%	$ (1)	-100%	Retail Trade
13 Woodworth	9,599	19,226	9,626	100.3%	$ 6	80%	Services
					$ 3	100%	Other
Other:							
Food Services, Drinking Places	333,122	355,946	22,824	6.9%	$ 22	7%	Services
					$ 1	2%	Retail Trade
Construction	1,244,706	1,017,270	(227,436)	-18.3%	$ (227)	-18%	Construction
Telecommunications	158,052	165,973	7,921	5.0%	$ 7	5%	
All Other Categories	2,515,992	2,641,070	125,079	5.0%	$ 105	41%	Wholesale Trade
					$ 60	13%	Services
					$ 54	196%	Other
					$ 44	27%	Fin, Ins, Real Est
					$ 13	16%	Manufacturing
					$ (2)	-3%	Information
Total	**$ 7,277,365**	**$ 7,102,332**	**$ (175,033)**	**-2.4%**			

Return to Agenda

Criminal Justice Sales Tax

Criminal Justice Sales Tax is a local option sales tax of 0.10 percent that is collected in addition to retail sales tax and use taxes by the Department of Revenue. Only counties may impose this non-voted 0.1% sales tax for criminal justice purposes, but the county must share its revenues with all cities and towns in the county. 10% of the funds are distributed to the county in which the tax was collected. The remaining 90% of the funds is distributed to the county (for unincorporated areas) and cities within the county based on population as last determined by the Office of Financial Management. The Department of Revenue retains 1% as an administrative fee.

Moneys received from this tax are restricted for criminal justice purposes. Criminal justice purposes are defined as activities that substantially assist the criminal justice system, which may include circumstances where ancillary benefit to the civil justice system occurs, and which includes domestic violence services such as those provided by domestic violence programs, community advocates, and legal advocates, as defined by RCW 70.123.020.

Criminal Justice Sales Tax
Year-to-date through June

			2022		Over / (Under)			
					2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget	
Month	**2020 Actual**	**2021 Actual**	**Budget**	**Actual**	**$**	**%**	**$**	**%**
Jan	$ 89,960	$ 99,947	$ 98,713	111,289	$ 11,342	11.3%	$ 12,576	12.7%
Feb	79,544	99,087	94,149	112,135	13,048	13.2%	17,986	19.1%
Mar	80,282	127,037	113,668	132,162	5,125	4.0%	18,494	16.3%
Apr	84,461	111,841	104,337	126,749	14,908	13.3%	22,412	21.5%
May	105,683	121,585	114,984	122,597	1,012	0.8%	7,613	6.6%
Jun	110,982	127,625	123,204	135,388	7,763	6.1%	12,184	9.9%
Jul	109,830	121,635	118,140	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	106,236	122,384	118,315	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	110,656	126,914	121,713	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	106,529	121,150	114,981	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	104,888	121,484	113,885	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	124,037	133,605	132,809	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 550,912**	**$ 687,122**	**$ 649,056**	**$ 740,320**	**$ 53,198**	**7.7%**	**$ 91,264**	**14.1%**
Annual Total	**$ 1,213,087**	**$ 1,434,294**	**$ 1,368,900**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 7.4%

Return to Agenda

Utility Tax

The City levies a tax on utilities provided within the city. The tax is currently 5% of gross income for electric and gas services and 6% of gross income for solid waste, cable, cellular phone, landlines and storm drainage.

In May 2021, the City received $73K from an audit of a major phone provider for the tax period May 2012 through December 2020.

Utility Tax *Year-to-date through June*								
			2021		Over / (Under)			
					2022 Budget vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget	
Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	Budget	Actual	$	%	$	%
Jan	$ 492,960	$ 462,655	$ 510,932	$ 522,437	$ 59,782	12.9%	$ 11,505	2.3%
Feb	497,700	490,246	506,639	507,053	16,807	3.4%	414	0.1%
Mar	515,720	496,804	518,969	506,388	9,584	1.9%	(12,581)	-2.4%
Apr	509,190	548,293	526,219	561,128	12,835	2.3%	34,909	6.6%
May	434,542	490,158	457,344	457,928	(32,230)	-6.6%	584	0.1%
Jun	402,144	376,706	403,000	411,096	34,390	9.1%	8,096	2.0%
Jul	384,505	375,618	390,455	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	377,613	377,828	390,785	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	375,303	388,283	394,521	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	480,846	484,797	478,134	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	445,436	453,199	465,095	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	486,985	492,214	514,607	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 2,852,256**	**$ 2,864,862**	**$ 2,923,103**	**$ 2,966,030**	**$ 101,168**	**3.5%**	**$ 42,927**	**1.5%**
Annual	**$ 5,402,944**	**$ 5,436,800**	**$ 5,556,700**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**-**	**$ -**	**-**
5-Year Ave Change (2017 -		-1.1%						

Utility Tax by Type *Year-to-date through June*									
						Over / (Under)			
	2021		2022			2022 YTD Actual vs 2021 YTD Actual		2022 Actual vs 2022 YTD Budget	
Type	Annual Actual	YTD Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Budget	YTD Actual	$	%	$	%
Electricity	$ 1,727,158	$ 904,010	$ 1,783,000	$ 922,388	$ 969,260	$ 65,250	7.2%	$ 46,872	5.1%
Natural Gas	769,024	459,550	694,600	468,892	545,333	85,783	18.7%	76,441	16.3%
Solid Waste	922,789	454,431	903,700	463,669	482,042	27,611	6.1%	18,373	4.0%
Cable	1,080,300	529,519	1,082,200	540,284	530,652	1,133	0.2%	(9,632)	-1.8%
Phone/Cell	655,674	362,051	825,200	369,411	272,975	(89,076)	-24.6%	(96,436)	-26.1%
SWM	281,855	155,301	268,000	158,458	165,769	10,468	6.7%	7,311	4.6%
Total	**$ 5,436,800**	**$2,864,862**	**$ 5,556,700**	**$2,923,103**	**$ 2,966,030**	**$ 101,168**	**3.5%**	**$ 42,927**	**1.5%**

Return to Agenda

Gambling Tax

The City levies a gambling tax on gross receipts derived by operators of gambling activities, including punchboards; pull tabs, bingo, raffles, amusement games, and social card rooms. Fund raising activities and charitable and non-profit organizations that involve game of chance are subject to the tax. The gambling tax rates by activity are as follows: card rooms (11% of gross receipts), punch boards (3% of gross receipts), pull tabs (5% of gross receipts), bingo (5% off gross receipts less amounts paid as prizes), raffles (5% of gross receipts less amount paid as prizes); amusement games (2% of gross receipts less amount paid as prizes). Gambling tax from card rooms account for the majority of the revenues.

Gambling Tax

Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 221,353	$ 232,113	$ 284,522	$ 290,597	$ 58,484	25.2%	$ 6,075	2.1%
Feb	239,499	223,710	295,404	319,743	96,033	42.9%	24,339	8.2%
Mar	116,855	347,645	314,516	404,314	56,669	16.3%	89,798	28.6%
Apr	764	306,619	263,935	292,542	(14,077)	-4.6%	28,607	10.8%
May	-	338,481	278,566	332,710	(5,771)	-1.7%	54,144	19.4%
Jun	113,131	273,233	263,446	364,209	90,976	33.3%	100,763	38.2%
Jul	200,210	361,766	295,313	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	118,950	295,328	295,333	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	281,165	330,022	328,127	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	226,662	406,522	303,974	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	167,453	345,800	304,882	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	224,388	325,531	321,983	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 691,602**	**$ 1,721,801**	**$ 1,700,389**	**$ 2,004,114**	**$ 282,313**	**16.4%**	**$ 303,725**	**17.9%**
Total Annual	**$ 1,910,428**	**$ 3,786,771**	**$ 3,550,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 7.0%

COVID-19 caused closure affected 2020.

Card Room Gambling Tax - Major Establishments Only

Year-to-date through June

Major Establishment	2020 Actual	2020 YTD	2021 Actual	2021 YTD	2022 YTD Actual	Over / (Under) YTD 2022 Actual vs YTD 2021 Actual $	%
Chips Casino	$ 548,388	$ 172,733	$ 1,344,141	$ 559,993	$ 840,965	$ 280,972	50.2%
Great American Casino	351,655	152,435	493,162	232,202	242,129	9,928	4.3%
Macau Casino	566,617	199,635	1,074,966	509,533	489,217	(20,317)	-4.0%
Palace Casino	374,182	137,971	770,399	372,806	375,666	2,860	0.8%
Total	**$1,840,841**	**$ 662,774**	**$3,682,668**	**$1,674,534**	**$1,947,977**	**$ 273,443**	**16.3%**

Covid-19 Restrictions closed the card rooms for mid-March through mid-June 2020.

Return to Agenda

Admissions Tax

The City levies an admissions tax of 5% on activities such as movie and play tickets, entrance fees and over charges to clubs. The tax is levied on the person or organization collecting the admission fee.

Admissions Tax *Year-to-date through June*								
			2021		Over / (Under)			
					2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs Budget	
Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	Budget	Actual	$	%	$	%
Jan	$ 39,325	$ 7	$ 20,075	$ 18,817	$ 18,810	268714.3%	$ (1,258)	-6.3%
Feb	30,115	6,301	20,707	19,992	13,691	217.3%	(715)	-3.5%
Mar	11,369	6,970	19,035	23,308	16,338	234.4%	4,273	22.4%
Apr	-	16,432	21,728	31,455	15,023	91.4%	9,727	44.8%
May	2	10,354	17,668	33,180	22,826	220.5%	15,512	87.8%
Jun	-	23,805	21,426	41,748	17,943	75.4%	20,322	94.8%
Jul	3,752	22,495	20,878	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	2,058	23,271	17,419	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	-	16,122	12,820	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	5,339	33,390	17,964	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	2,105	23,463	18,862	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	2,535	43,555	26,417	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 80,811**	**$ 63,869**	**$ 120,640**	**$ 168,500**	**$ 104,631**	**163.8%**	**$ 47,860**	**39.7%**
Total Annual	**$ 96,600**	**$ 226,164**	**$ 235,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021)	-11.6%	*Decreases in 2020 and 2021 due to COVID-19 caused closure/reduced capacity.*						

Admissions Tax by Payer *Year-to-Date through June*							
	2020		2021		2022	Over / (Under) YTD 2022 Actual vs YTD 2021 Actual	
Major Establishment	Annual	YTD	Actual	YTD	YTD Actual	$	%
AMC Theatres	$ 61,598	$ 57,297	$ 141,501	$ 39,761	$ 113,052	$ 73,291	184.3%
Fandango Media	-	-	5,101	-	-	-	-
Grand Prix Raceway	6,455	-	14,176	7,358	7,523	165	2.2%
Oakbrook Golf Club	5,030	-	21,170	10,742	9,632	(1,109)	-10%
Regal Cinemas	23,516	23,514	44,217	6,009	38,293	32,285	537.3%
Total	**$ 96,600**	**$ 80,811**	**$ 226,164**	**$ 63,869**	**$ 168,500**	**$ 104,631**	**163.8%**

Note: Oakbrook Golf Club tax effective 10/1/2020. Regal Cinemas reopened May 2021.

Return to Agenda

Franchise Fees & Non-Compete Fees

Franchise fees are charges levied on private utilities for their use of City streets and other public properties to place utility infrastructure and to recoup City costs of administering franchise agreements. The franchise fees on light, natural gas, and telephone utilities are limited by statute to the actual administrative expenses incurred by the City directly related to receiving and approving permits, licenses, or franchises. Cable TV franchise fees are governed by the Federal Cable Communications Policy Act of 1996 and are negotiated with cable companies for an amount not to exceed 5% of gross revenues.

Utility	Contract Expiration	Utility Tax	Franchise Fee	Non-Compete Fee
Comcast Phone	11/02/25	6.00%	-	-
Comcast Cable	12/04/25	6.00%	5.00%	-
Integra Communications	07/27/24	6.00%	-	-
Lakeview Light & Power	12/22/27	5.00%	-	-
Lakewood Water District	12/22/26	-	-	6.00%
Pierce County Sanitary Sewer	03/13/31	-	-	6.00%
Puget Sound Energy	01/20/26	5.00%	-	-
Rainier Connect (formerly Click!)	05/07/24	6.00%	5.00%	-
TPU Light	06/01/25	-	-	6.00%
TPU Water	11/19/26	-	-	8.00%
Waste Connections	12/31/25	6.00%	4.00%	-
Small Cell Wireless (fee is admin cost) - AT&T Small Wireless	06/08/25	-	-	-

Franchise Fees/Non-Compete Fees by Type
Year-to-date through June

Type	2020	2021		2022				Over / (Under)			
								2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs YTD Budget	
	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	YTD Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Budget	Annual Actual	YD % of Total Revenue	$	%	$	%
Cable	$ 898,527	$ 899,002	$ 440,491	$ 928,000	$ 458,217	$ 441,947	20%	1,456	0.3%	(16,270)	-3.6%
Water	528,130	560,212	218,094	446,000	174,976	214,201	10%	(3,893)	-1.8%	39,225	22.4%
Sewer	999,895	1,044,648	491,980	1,058,800	502,504	550,857	25%	58,877	12.0%	48,353	9.6%
Solid Waste	655,787	687,654	338,864	687,000	341,162	359,007	17%	20,143	5.9%	17,845	5.2%
Electric	1,204,366	1,172,934	586,467	1,277,200	643,542	608,244	28%	21,777	3.7%	(35,298)	-5.5%
Small Cell	3,200	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-	n/a	-	n/a
Total	**$4,289,902**	**$4,364,450**	**$2,075,895**	**$ 4,397,000**	**$2,120,401**	**$2,174,256**	**100%**	**$ 98,361**	**4.7%**	**$ 53,855**	**2.5%**

Franchise Fees/Non-Compete Fees by Type
Year-to-date through June

Type	2020	2021		2022				Over / (Under)			
								2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs YTD Budget	
	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	YTD Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Budget	Annual Actual	YD % of Total Revenue	$	%	$	%
Cable	$ 898,527	$ 899,002	$ 440,491	$ 928,000	$ 458,217	$ 441,947	20%	1,456	0.3%	(16,270)	-3.6%
Water	528,130	560,212	218,094	446,000	174,976	214,201	10%	(3,893)	-1.8%	39,225	22.4%
Sewer	999,895	1,044,648	491,980	1,058,800	502,504	550,857	25%	58,877	12.0%	48,353	9.6%
Solid Waste	655,787	687,654	338,864	687,000	341,162	359,007	17%	20,143	5.9%	17,845	5.2%
Electric	1,204,366	1,172,934	586,467	1,277,200	643,542	608,244	28%	21,777	3.7%	(35,298)	-5.5%
Small Cell	3,200	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-	n/a	-	n/a
Total	**$4,289,902**	**$4,364,450**	**$2,075,895**	**$ 4,397,000**	**$2,120,401**	**$2,174,256**	**100%**	**$ 98,361**	**4.7%**	**$ 53,855**	**2.5%**

Return to Agenda

State Shared Revenues

State-shared revenues are from taxes and fees collected by the State and disbursed to municipalities based on population or other criteria. The source of these shared revenues include: sales tax mitigation, criminal justice, leasehold excise tax, state lodging tax sharing, liquor excise tax and liquor profits, and motor vehicle fuel tax.

The following tables provides a comparison of state shared revenues, including the portion of motor vehicle fuel tax, increased gas tax and multi-modal revenue receipted directly in the transportation capital fund.

State Shared Revenue *Year-to-date through June*							
Revenue	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 YTD Actual	2022 Annual Budget	2022 YTD Actual	2022 YTD Actual vs 2021 YTD Actual Over/(Under) $	%
CJ-Violent Crimes/Population	$ 102,436	$ 104,137	$ 51,072	$ 95,000	$ 53,803	$ 2,731	5.3%
CJ-Special Programs	67,713	72,951	35,142	73,235	38,744	3,602	10.2%
CJ-DUI Cities	9,072	10,254	4,912	8,000	2,525	(2,387)	-48.6%
CJ-High Crime	427,878	275,031	176,033	249,500	178,362	2,329	1.3%
Liquor Excise Tax	393,098	436,678	210,152	389,129	222,016	11,864	5.6%
Liquor Board Profits	478,969	474,288	237,208	469,971	246,660	9,452	4.0%
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax	709,693	791,652	370,726	855,410	400,414	29,688	8.0%
Subtotal - General/Street	**$ 2,188,859**	**$ 2,164,991**	**$ 1,085,245**	**$ 2,140,245**	**$ 1,142,524**	**$ 57,280**	**5.3%**
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax	289,874	323,351	151,423	330,560	163,550	12,127	8.0%
Increase Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax	71,174	71,360	35,249	69,635	36,653	1,404	4.0%
Multi-Modal	82,400	81,553	40,284	79,240	41,889	1,605	4.0%
Subtotal - Capital Projects	**443,448**	**476,264**	**226,956**	**479,435**	**242,092**	**$ 15,136**	**6.7%**
Total	**$ 2,632,307**	**$ 2,641,255**	**$ 1,312,201**	**$ 2,619,680**	**$ 1,384,616**	**$ 72,415**	**5.5%**

Motor vehicle fuel tax decrease in 2020 is due to COVID-19 stay home/work from home whereas hybrid telework/in office in 2021.

Return to Agenda

POLICE

Photo Infraction – Red Light/School Zone Enforcement

The City currently has eight cameras operating at five locations:

- Two (2) school zone cameras located at: 5405 Steilacoom Blvd – WB and 9904 Gravelly Lake Drive – SB.
- Six (6) red light cameras located at:
    - Bridgeport Blvd SW & San Francisco Ave SW – SB & NB
    - Steilacoom Blvd SW & Phillips Rd SW – WB & EB
    - South Tacoma Way & SR 512 – NB & SB.

Photo Infraction - Red Light / School Zone Enforcement
Year-to-Date through June

Month	Year 2020			Year 2021			Year 2022			Over / (Under) Net Revenue 2022 vs 2021	
	Gross Revenue	Vendor Payment	Net Revenue	Gross Revenue	Vendor Payment	Net Revenue	Gross Revenue	Vendor Payment	Net Revenue	$	%
Jan	$ 97,729	$ 32,240	$ 65,489	$ 30,145	$ 22,500	$ 7,645	$ 117,106	$ 32,240	$ 84,866	$ 77,221	1010.1%
Feb	69,584	32,240	37,344	29,016	32,240	(3,224)	101,450	32,240	69,210	72,434	-2246.7%
Mar	79,403	22,500	56,903	26,207	32,240	(6,033)	111,985	32,240	79,745	85,778	-1421.8%
Apr	97,456	22,500	74,956	144,618	32,240	112,378	137,962	32,240	105,722	(6,656)	-5.9%
May	57,712	15,000	42,712	129,806	32,240	97,566	93,839	32,240	61,599	(35,967)	-36.9%
Jun	39,750	18,750	21,000	116,950	32,240	84,710	59,580	32,240	27,340	(57,370)	-67.7%
Jul	34,022	22,500	11,522	119,476	32,240	87,236	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	33,450	22,500	10,950	82,813	32,240	50,573	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	45,915	22,500	23,415	88,671	32,240	56,431	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	42,056	22,500	19,556	86,712	32,240	54,472	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	36,846	23,798	13,048	100,345	32,240	68,105	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	31,227	22,500	8,727	129,194	32,240	96,954	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$441,634**	**$143,230**	**$298,404**	**$ 476,740**	**$183,700**	**$293,042**	**$ 621,920**	**$193,440**	**$428,482**	**$ 135,440**	**46.2%**
Total Annual	**$665,150**	**$279,528**	**$385,622**	**$1,083,953**	**$377,140**	**$706,813**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

Return to Agenda

# of Infraction Notices Generated *Year-to-date through June*															
	BP Way & San Francisco			Steilacoom & Phillips			South Tacoma Way & SR512			School Zones			Total		
Month	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**
Jan	67	69	100	273	143	235	498	538	717	746	-	1,260	1,584	750	2,312
Feb	49	76	99	292	207	234	587	611	822	927	1,082	1,273	1,855	1,976	2,428
Mar	48	78	109	244	219	242	408	778	954	554	1,892	1,406	1,254	2,967	2,711
Apr	53	113	124	251	243	266	282	850	913	-	1,180	830	586	2,386	2,133
May	77	114	118	123	324	323	495	902	1,003	-	1,127	983	695	2,467	2,427
Jun	101	108	169	101	361	344	673	974	1,019	-	599	437	875	2,042	1,969
Jul	85	110	-	185	433	-	819	1,137	-	-	345	-	1,089	2,025	-
Aug	97	100	-	248	330	-	843	1,010	-	-	-	-	1,188	1,440	-
Sep	87	98	-	179	285	-	728	1,006	-	-	1,228	-	994	2,617	-
Oct	89	86	-	166	256	-	780	1,016	-	-	955	-	1,035	2,313	-
Nov	98	81	-	121	230	-	549	775	-	-	1,273	-	768	2,359	-
Dec	62	107	-	157	285	-	610	780	-	-	861	-	829	2,033	-
Total YTD	**395**	**558**	**719**	**1,284**	**1,497**	**1,644**	**2,943**	**4,653**	**5,428**	**2,227**	**5,880**	**6,189**	**6,849**	**12,588**	**13,980**
Total Annual	**913**	**1,140**	**n/a**	**2,340**	**3,316**	**n/a**	**7,272**	**10,377**	**n/a**	**2,227**	**10,542**	**n/a**	**12,752**	**25,375**	**13,980**

COVID-19 caused school closures and stay home/work from home affected school zone and red light camera infractions notices generated in 2020 and early 2021. The huge spike beginning in April 2021 is due to schools opening up and violations after pandemic.

Return to Agenda

Jail Services

The City contracts with various agencies to provide jail services. Current contracts are with Nisqually and Pierce County.

2022 Jail Rates					
Pierce County	Booking Fee	$63.49	Nisqually	Booking Fee	$20.00
	Daily Rate	$94.25		Daily Rate	$65.00
	Escort Fee	$142.72		Major Medical Costs	City Pays
	Mental Health Fee	$259.79			
	Special Identification Proces	$63.49			
	Major Medical Costs	City Pays			

Service Period	Year 2020				Year 2021				Year 2022			
	Nisqually	Pierce County	Medical	Total by Month	Nisqually	Pierce County	Medical	Total by Month	Nisqually	Pierce County	Medical	Total by Month
Jan	$ 32,955	$ 12,167	$ -	$ 45,122	$ 14,662	$ 1,349	$ 1,085	$ 17,095	$ 17,412	$ 2,200	$ -	$ 19,613
Feb	22,685	16,085	-	38,770	16,610	513	-	17,123	16,301	1,698	-	18,000
Mar	24,310	12,645	-	36,955	27,534	300	-	27,834	24,381	2,299	-	26,680
Apr	13,994	7,630	-	21,624	18,087	572	-	18,659	22,516	7,748	-	30,264
May	20,995	5,188	-	26,183	17,353	2,178	-	19,531	21,515	5,476	-	26,991
Jun	19,305	6,808	-	26,113	11,146	2,992	-	14,138	30,095	5,188	1,475	36,758
Jul	18,891	9,864	208	28,963	21,419	4,530	-	25,949			-	-
Aug	21,522	9,740	-	31,262	21,516	1,765	-	23,281			-	-
Sep	28,176	9,454	-	37,630	27,079	1,918	-	28,996			-	-
Oct	26,251	5,451	-	31,702	25,762	676	-	26,437			-	-
Nov	21,965	3,694	-	25,659	33,150	3,389	-	36,539			-	-
Dec	13,698	1,908	-	15,606	28,910	1,732	-	30,641			-	-
Annual Total	**$ 264,747**	**$ 100,636**	**$ 208**	**$ 365,591**	**$ 263,226**	**$ 21,914**	**$ 1,085**	**$ 286,225**	**$ 132,221**	**$ 24,609**	**$ 1,475**	**$ 158,305**
			Annual Budget	$ 950,000			Annual Budget	$ 950,000			Annual Budget	$ 950,000
			YTD as % of Annual Budget	38.5%			YTD as % of Annual Budget	30.1%			YTD as % of Annual Budget	16.7%

Return to Agenda

Dispatch Services

South Sound 911 PDA (Public Development Authority) provides dispatch emergency communication, records and technology services, and regional, interoperable first responder radio system.

South Sound 911 Dispatch Services *Year-to-date through June*				
	2020	2021	2022	
Category	Annual	Annual	Annual Budget	Actual
Communication	$ 1,448,880	$ 1,390,920	$ 1,390,920	$ 667,640
Records/Warrant/Public Services	188,013	188,060	188,060	128,050
Information Technology/Core Services	294,480	298,750	298,750	135,735
Subtotal	**$ 1,931,373**	**$ 1,877,730**	**$ 1,877,730**	**$ 931,425**
Radio User Fees City of Tacoma	117,464	146,481	145,560	79,968
Total Dispatch Services	**$ 2,048,837**	**$ 2,024,211**	**$ 2,023,290**	**$ 1,011,393**
Change Over Prior Year - $	$ (70,082)	$ (24,626)	$ (921)	
Change Over Prior Year - %	-3.3%	-1.2%	0.0%	

Return to Agenda

Animal License

The City requires all dogs and cats over the age of eight weeks and residing in the city limits to be licensed annually. All licenses expire on December 31. Licenses not renewed by February 28 are subject to a $2 late penalty.

Animal License Fees		
Fee Type	Regular	Senior (65+) or Physically Disabled
Unaltered Dogs/Cats	$55.00	$30.00
Spayed/Neutered Dogs	$20.00	$10.00
Spayed/Neutered Cats	$12.00	$4.00
Pets Unders 6 Months Old	$4.00	$4.00
Service Dogs	$0.00	$0.00
Late Fee (after February 28)	$2.00	$2.00

Animal License
Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs Budget $	%
Jan	$ 1,055	$ 6,557	$ 3,785	$ 8,072	$ 1,515	23.1%	$ 4,287	113.2%
Feb	16,839	11,271	12,378	7,693	(3,578)	-31.7%	(4,685)	-37.8%
Mar	2,291	5,453	7,819	4,757	(696)	-12.8%	(3,062)	-39.2%
Apr	7,986	2,927	3,742	1,964	(963)	-32.9%	(1,778)	-47.5%
May	410	3,275	1,883	3,302	27	0.8%	1,419	75.3%
Jun	3,216	1,193	1,803	1,464	271	22.7%	(339)	-18.8%
Jul	1,049	704	1,161	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	943	1,115	983	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	995	869	708	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	370	370	577	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	1,011	460	709	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	213	754	451	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 31,797**	**$ 30,676**	**$ 31,410**	**$ 27,252**	**$ (3,424)**	**-11.2%**	**$ (4,158)**	**-13.2%**
Total Annual	**$ 36,378**	**$ 34,948**	**$ 36,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): -2.2%

Animal Control
Year-to-date through June

Operating Revenues & Expenditures	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 YTD Actual	2022 Annual Budget	2022 YTD Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%
Operating Revenue:							
Animal License	$ 36,378	$ 34,947	$ 30,676	$ 36,000	$ 27,252	$ (3,424)	-11.2%
Animal Services - City of Dupont	33,917	34,595	17,298	35,164	18,644	1,346	7.8%
Animal Services - Town of Steilacoom	15,630	17,543	7,436	16,843	9,177	1,741	23.4%
Total Operating Revenues	**$ 85,925**	**$ 87,085**	**$ 55,410**	**$ 88,007**	**$ 55,073**	**$ (337)**	**-0.6%**
Operating Expenditures:							
Personnel	196,614	213,976	106,821	223,968	111,686	4,865	4.6%
Supplies	569	1,657	500	3,360	507	7	1.4%
Humane Society	121,795	153,478	75,851	161,824	81,240	5,389	7.1%
Other Services & Charges	151	-	-	1,200	-	-	n/a
Total Operating Expenditures	**$ 319,129**	**$ 369,110**	**$ 183,172**	**$ 390,352**	**$ 193,432**	**$ 10,260**	**5.6%**
Net Program Cost	**$ (233,204)**	**$ (282,025)**	**$ (127,762)**	**$ (302,345)**	**$ (138,359)**	**$ (10,597)**	**8.3%**

Note - operating expenditures do not include internal service allocations (such as vehicle repairs & maintenance, vehicle replacement reserves, etc.) as all police internal service charges are accounted for under Command Section.

Return to Agenda

Alarm Permits and Fees

False alarms cost the City and citizens thousands of dollars per year and take officers away from actual emergencies. The false alarm ordinance includes a registration process, provides for annual alarm permit fees for residential and business alarms, and provides for fees for false alarms to encourage all alarm users to maintain the reliability of and to properly use their alarm equipment.

Alarm Permits and Fees
Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 4,333	$ 2,564	$ 3,963	$ 3,793	$ 1,229	47.9%	$ (170)	-4.3%
Feb	4,933	3,930	3,874	10,385	6,455	164.2%	6,511	168.1%
Mar	1,832	2,425	2,695	4,975	2,550	105.2%	2,280	84.6%
Apr	2,219	1,259	2,855	5,114	3,855	306.2%	2,259	79.1%
May	2,184	3,917	2,893	8,577	4,660	119.0%	5,684	196.5%
Jun	3,638	16,442	5,775	11,545	(4,897)	-29.8%	5,770	99.9%
Jul	1,001	2,868	4,644	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	7,619	4,117	3,375	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	7,009	3,223	5,708	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	9,543	4,074	14,393	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	13,577	26,341	11,957	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	5,647	21,336	7,869	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 19,139**	**$ 30,537**	**$ 22,056**	**$ 44,389**	**$ 13,852**	**45.4%**	**$ 22,333**	**101.3%**
Total Annual	**$ 63,535**	**$ 92,496**	**$ 70,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): -3.9%

Note: The table reflects gross revenue and does not take into account of related processing and other fees totaling $31,736 in 2020, $47,004 in 2021, and $27,227 year-to-date through June 2022.

Return to Agenda

Seizure Funds

Fund 180 Narcotics Seizure Fund

The purpose of this fund is for tracking assets seized as a result of involvement with the illegal sale, possession, or distribution of drugs or controlled substances, and for the purchase of controlled substances or drugs by law enforcement officers or agents, as well as other expenses to enhance and improve law enforcement activities having a close and demonstrable relationship to enforce enforcement of controlled substances. Funds may not be used to supplant existing funding sources.

The 2021 original adopted budget includes $120,000 to provide for half of the cost of the new SRT vehicle. The other half of the new vehicle is funded by federal seizures. The 2022 carry forward budget adjustment rolled over $120,000 for the vehicle and added $72,000 funded by 2021 ending fund for potential eligible narcotics seizure related activity.

Fund 180 - Narcotics Seizure *Year-to-date through June*				
	2020	2021	2022	
	Annual	Annual	Annual	
	Actual	Actual	Budget	Actual
Sources:				
Forfeitures	$ 71,670	$ 30,294	$ -	$ 5,628
Law Enforcement Contracts	33,485	2,217	-	4,421
Interest /Misc	1,197	171	-	1,183
Total Sources	**$ 106,352**	**$ 32,681**	**$ -**	**$ 11,232**
Uses:				
Investigations	162,477	66,876	72,000	43,401
Capital	-	-	120,000	133,375
Total Uses	**$ 162,477**	**$ 66,876**	**$ 192,000**	**$ 176,776**
Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ (56,125)**	**$ (34,195)**	**$ (192,000)**	**$ (165,544)**
Beginning Balance	**$ 282,321**	**$ 226,196**	**$ 192,000**	**$ 192,000**
Ending Balance	**$ 226,196**	**$ 192,000**	**$ -**	**$ 26,456**

Return to Agenda

Fund 181 Felony Seizure Fund

The state statute authorizes the seizure of assets that have been or was actually employed as an instrumentality in the commission or in the aiding or abetting in the commission of any felony, or which was furnished or was intended to be furnished by any person in the commission of, as a result of, or as a compensation for the commission of, any felony, or which was acquired in whole or in part with the proceeds traceable to the commission of a felony. Funds shall be used exclusively by the City in the expansion and improvement of law enforcement activity; however may not be used to supplant existing funding sources.

The 2022 carry forward budget adjustment added $16,198 funded by 2021 ending fund for potential eligible felony seizure related activity, and added $20,000 for Virtual Reality Based Police Officer Training Simulator. The total simulator project cost is $65,000 of which $25,000 is funded via WCIA (Washington Cities Insurance Authority) grant and $40,000 is proposed to be funded by eligible seizure funds (Felony Seizure $20,000 & Federal Seizure $20,000)

Fund 181 - Felony Seizure *Year-to-date through June*				
	2020	2021	2022	
	Annual	Annual	Annual	
	Actual	Actual	Budget	Actual
Sources:				
Forfeitures	$ 42,620	$ -	$ -	$ 6,908
Interest /Misc	40	40	-	50
Total Sources	**$ 42,660**	**$ 40**	**$ -**	**$ 6,958**
Uses:				
Investigations	2,966	11,679	16,198	14,386
Capital Purchases	-	-	20,000	-
Total Uses	**$ 2,966**	**$ 11,679**	**$ 36,198**	**$ 14,386**
Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ 39,694**	**$ (11,640)**	**$ (36,198)**	**$ (7,428)**
Beginning Balance	**$ 8,143**	**$ 47,837**	**$ 36,198**	**$ 36,198**
Ending Balance	**$ 47,837**	**$ 36,198**	**$ -**	**$ 28,770**

Return to Agenda

Fund 182 Federal Seizure Fund

The Federal Equity Sharing Guidelines lists the following (funds shall be used to increase or supplement and not be used to replace or supplant):

Permissible Uses: law enforcement investigations; law enforcement training, law enforcement and detention facilities; law enforcement equipment; law enforcement travel and transportation; law enforcement awards and memorials; drug and gang education awareness programs; matching fund for grants; pro rata funding of the law enforcement agency's percentage of costs associated with supporting multi-agency items or facilities; asset accounting and tracking of expenditures of federally shared funds; language assistance services in connection with law enforcement activity; transfers of cash to other law enforcement agencies; support of community-based programs (cash transfers to community-based programs are not permitted); and windfall situations to provide additional support to community –based programs.

Impermissible Uses: Salaries and benefits of permanent law enforcement personnel, except in limited circumstances (i.e. express statutory authorization, overtime of officers and investigators, new positions and temporary or not-to-exceed one year appointments and salary of an officer hired to replace an officer assigned to a task force, specialized programs that generally to not involve traditional law enforcement functions); use of forfeited property by non-law enforcement personnel; payment of education-related costs; uses contrary to the laws of the state or local jurisdiction; non-official government use of shared assets; personal or political use of shared assets; purchase of food and beverage (except for conference and meals during local operations); extravagant expenditures or wasteful expenditures and entertainment; cash on hand, secondary accounts, and stored value cards (such as prepaid credit cards); transfers to other law enforcement agencies; purchase of items for other law enforcement agencies; costs related to lawsuits; loans; and money laundering operations.

The 2021 original adopted budget includes $120,000 to provide for half of the cost of the new SRT vehicle. The other half of the new vehicle is funded by narcotics seizures. The 2022 carry forward budget adjustment rolled over the vehicle balance of $101,499, added $22,006 funded by 2021 ending fund for potential eligible federal seizure related activity, and added $20,000 for Virtual Reality Based Police Officer Training Simulator. The total simulator project cost is $65,000 of which $25,000 is funded via WCIA (Washington Cities Insurance Authority) grant and $40,000 is proposed to be funded by eligible seizure funds (Felony Seizure $20,000 & Federal Seizure $20,000)

Fund 182 - Federal Seizure *Year-to-date through June*				
	2020	**2021**	**2022**	
	Annual	**Annual**	**Annual**	
	Actual	**Actual**	**Budget**	**Actual**
Sources:				
Forfeitures	$ 63,492	$ -	$ -	$ 2,590
Interest/Misc	1,132	1,100	-	147
Total Sources	**$ 64,624**	**$ 1,100**	**$ -**	**$ 2,737**
Uses:				
Crime Prevention	399	-	22,006	93
Capital Purchases	163,147	18,501	121,499	142,650
Total Uses	**$ 163,546**	**$ 18,501**	**$ 143,505**	**$ 142,743**
Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ (98,922)**	**$ (17,401)**	**$ (143,505)**	**$ (140,006)**
Beginning Balance	**$ 259,829**	**$ 160,907**	**$ 143,505**	**$ 143,505**
Ending Balance	**$ 160,907**	**$ 143,505**	**$ -**	**$ 3,499**

Return to Agenda

Fund 195 Public Safety Grants

The purpose of this fund is to account for the revenues and expenditures related to public safety grants. The following table provides a financial summary of these grants.

Public Safety Grants	*Year-to-date through June*			
	Beginning Balance	Revenue	Expenditure	Ending Balance
Dept. of Justice - Bulletproof Vest Partnership	$ -	$ 12,803	$ 12,803	$ -
Dept. of Justice - Justice Assistance Grant - COVID	-	10,450	10,450	-
Dept. of Justice - Justice Assistance Grant - FARO Scene Scanner	-	41,309	41,309	-
Dept. of Justice - Veterans Treatment Court	-	32,981	32,981	-
Pierce County - STOP Violence Against Women Training	-	3,515	3,515	-
Pierce County - WTSC - Phlebotomy Certification	-	13,036	13,036	-
Washington Auto Theft Prevention Authority (WATPA)	-	116,803	116,803	-
Washington State Parks & Recreation Boaters Safety	-	2,108	2,108	-
Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) Impaired Driving	-	7,274	7,274	-
Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) Seatbelts	-	6,186	6,186	-
Total	**$ -**	**$ 246,463**	**$ 246,463**	**$ -**

Public Safety Grants	2022	
	Annual Budget	YTD Jun
Dept. of Justice - Bulletproof Vest Partnership	$ 21,163	$ 12,803
Dept. of Justice - JAG Bicycles	5,397	-
Dept. of Justice - JAG COVID Emergency Supplement	16,388	10,450
Dept. of Justice - JAG Rifle Noise Suppressors	2,069	-
Dept. of Justice - JAG Scanner	42,903	41,309
Dept. of Justice - Veterans Treatment Court	286,891	32,981
Pierce County - STOP Violence Against Women	-	3,515
Washington AGO SAKI	4,900	-
Washington Auto Theft Prevention Authority (WATPA)	260,000	116,803
Washington State Military Department - Emergency Management (EMPG)	25,406	-
Washington State Parks & Recreation Boaters Safety	12,021	2,108
Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) PC Phlebotomy	-	13,036
Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) Impaired & Distracted Driving	8,377	7,274
Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) Motorcycle/Seatbelt	2,500	6,186
Total	**$ 688,015**	**$ 246,463**

Return to Agenda

MUNICIPAL COURT

Effective January 2015, as part of the new contracts, fines and forfeiture revenues from the Town of Steilacoom and City of University Place are no longer retained by the City, other than for past cases. Revenues from 2015 cases and forward are collected by the City and remitted on a monthly basis to the contract jurisdictions (City of DuPont, City of University Place and Town of Steilacoom).

Municipal Court Fines & Forfeitures *Year-to-date through June*								
			2022		Over / (Under)			
					2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs Budget	
Month	2020 Actual	2021	Budget	Actual	$	%	$	%
Jan	$ 71,738	$ 40,542	$ 50,391	$ 29,625	$ (10,917)	-26.9%	$ (20,766)	-41.2%
Feb	70,791	40,724	56,366	25,074	(15,650)	-38.4%	(31,292)	-55.5%
Mar	70,471	37,627	55,223	28,855	(8,772)	-23.3%	(26,368)	-47.7%
Apr	80,802	88,547	70,506	31,236	(57,311)	-64.7%	(39,270)	-55.7%
May	44,622	62,056	53,987	19,193	(42,863)	-69.1%	(34,794)	-64.4%
Jun	38,097	50,509	42,476	33,380	(17,129)	-33.9%	(9,096)	-21.4%
Jul	58,687	54,057	54,482	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	58,214	38,634	46,046	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	56,595	39,934	47,849	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	44,210	32,347	45,246	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	47,094	38,969	45,673	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	(33,161)	22,101	19,959	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 376,521**	**$ 320,005**	**$ 328,950**	**$ 167,363**	**$ (152,642)**	**-47.7%**	**$ (161,587)**	**-49.1%**
Total Annual	**$ 608,160**	**$ 546,047**	**$ 588,205**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021):		-7.8%						

Municipal Court Fines & Forfeitures *Year-to-date through June*										
		2021		2022			Over / (Under)		Over / (Under)	
							2022 YTD Actual vs 2021 YTD Actual		2022 YTD Actual vs 2022 YTD Budget	
Category	2020 Actual	Annual Actual	YTD Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Budget	YTD Actual	$	%	$	%
Admin, Filing, Copy, Forms, Legal	$ 42,168	$ 35,376	$ 18,700	$ 41,050	$ 19,223	$ 14,765	$ (3,935)	-21.0%	$ (4,458)	-23.2%
Detention & Corrrection Services	95,415	101,691	57,047	190,255	58,642	39,600	(17,447)	-30.6%	(19,042)	-32.5%
Civil Penalties	1,740	1,142	726	1,800	746	138	(588)	-81.0%	(608)	-81.5%
Civil Infraction Penalties	384,788	339,875	220,248	283,000	226,404	86,678	(133,570)	-60.6%	(139,726)	-61.7%
Civil Parking Infractions	1,420	6,691	2,560	2,000	2,632	641	(1,919)	-75.0%	(1,991)	-75.6%
Criminal Traffic Misdemeanor Fines	10,961	12,648	6,127	13,000	6,298	5,422	(705)	-11.5%	(876)	-13.9%
Criminal Non-Traffic Fines	20,678	209	(9,601)	8,000	(9,869)	2,155	11,756	-122.4%	12,024	-121.8%
Court Cost Recoupment	18,633	20,439	10,193	18,800	10,478	7,891	(2,302)	-22.6%	(2,587)	-24.7%
Interest/Other/Misc	32,358	27,976	14,005	30,300	14,396	10,074	(3,931)	-28.1%	(4,322)	-30.0%
Total	**$ 608,160**	**$ 546,047**	**$ 320,005**	**$ 588,205**	**$ 328,950**	**$ 167,363**	**$ (152,642)**	**-47.7%**	**$ (161,587)**	**-49.1%**

Return to Agenda

Municipal Court *Year-to-date through June*							
	2020	2021		2022		Over / (Under) 2022 YTD Actual vs 2021 YTD Actual	
Operating Revenues & Expenditures	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	YTD Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Actual	$	%
Operating Revenue:							
Fines & Forfeitures	$ 608,160	$ 546,047	$ 320,005	$ 588,205	$ 167,363	$ (152,643)	-47.7%
Court Services - City of University Place	251,187	6,000	6,000	(13,500)	(13,520)	(19,520)	-325.3%
Court Services - Town of Steilacoom	87,364	63,917	37,810	99,062	55,722	17,912	47.4%
Court Services - City of DuPont	35,565	68,080	38,680	100,367	61,891	23,211	60.0%
Total Operating Revenues	**$ 982,276**	**$ 684,044**	**$ 402,495**	**$ 774,134**	**$ 271,456**	**$ (131,039)**	**-32.6%**
Operating Expenditures:							
Judicial Services	1,045,965	1,007,638	529,816	1,135,669	513,795	(16,021)	-3.0%
Professional Services*	562,198	573,451	260,837	624,000	254,185	(6,652)	-2.6%
Probation & Detention	245,393	164,071	96,915	374,703	100,015	3,100	3.2%
Total Operating Expenditures	**$ 1,853,556**	**$ 1,745,160**	**$ 887,568**	**$ 2,134,372**	**$ 867,995**	**$ (19,573)**	**-2.2%**
Net Revenue (Cost)	**$ (871,280)**	**$ (1,061,116)**	**$ (485,073)**	**$ (1,360,238)**	**$ (596,539)**	**$ (111,466)**	**23.0%**

** Professional Services includes Pro-Tem Judge , Public Defender, Jury/Wit ness Fees and Interpreter Services.*

The following charts provides current and historical filings and fines & forfeitures for Lakewood (does not include photo infraction filings and revenues).

Return to Agenda

Fines & Forfeitures Retained by Contract Jurisdictions
(Received by the City of Lakewood and Remitted to Contract Jurisdictions)

Contract Jurisdiction	2016 Annual	2017 Annual	2018 Annual	2019 Annual	2020 Annual	2021 Annual	2022 YTD Jun
City of University Place	$ 64,187	$ 70,720	$ 86,876	$ 63,086	$ 68,482	$ 35,207	$ 9,841
Town of Steilacoom	69,060	90,649	104,858	99,374	65,191	64,007	41,525
City of DuPont	88,908	95,501	78,473	68,131	40,715	42,426	11,251
Total	**$ 222,155**	**$ 256,870**	**$ 270,208**	**$ 230,591**	**$ 174,388**	**$ 141,640**	**$ 62,617**

Filings and Hearings by Jurisdiction – YTD June

Total YTD June	FILINGS			HEARINGS			Photo/Camera	
	Infractions	Criminal	Total Filings	Infractions	Criminal	Total Hearings	Filings	Hearings
2022	**1,374**	**849**	**2,223**	**368**	**5,130**	**5,498**	**10,184**	**200**
Lakewood	603	757	1,360	178	4,621	4,799	10,184	200
University Place	4	1	5	1	121	122	-	-
Steilacoom	642	57	699	164	208	372	-	-
DuPont	125	34	159	25	180	205	-	-
2021	**1,552**	**875**	**2,427**	**797**	**4,490**	**5,287**	**10,331**	**112**
Lakewood	1,146	763	1,909	635	3,918	4,553	10,331	112
University Place	9	5	14	34	250	284	-	-
Steilacoom	279	57	336	80	168	248	-	-
DuPont	118	50	168	48	154	202	-	-
2020	**2,358**	**1,151**	**3,509**	**1,274**	**5,213**	**6,487**	**5,633**	**149**
Lakewood	1,676	948	2,624	1,002	4,371	5,373	5,633	149
University Place	202	108	310	119	529	648	-	-
Steilacoom	307	52	359	87	175	262	-	-
DuPont	173	43	216	66	138	204	-	-
2019	**2,972**	**1,397**	**4,369**	**1,252**	**7,328**	**8,580**	**7,986**	**171**
Lakewood	2,051	1,144	3,195	910	5,855	6,765	7,986	171
University Place	207	132	339	130	876	1,006	-	-
Steilacoom	511	90	601	157	335	492	-	-
DuPont	203	31	234	55	262	317	-	-
2018	**3,322**	**1,734**	**5,056**	**1,194**	**6,831**	**8,025**	**7,162**	**175**
Lakewood	2,053	1,302	3,355	813	5,325	6,138	7,162	175
University Place	325	186	511	108	771	879	-	-
Steilacoom	480	107	587	151	284	435	-	-
DuPont	464	139	603	122	451	573	-	-
2017	**4,383**	**1,486**	**5,869**	**1,318**	**6,653**	**7,971**	**7,264**	**198**
Lakewood	2,991	1,047	4,038	981	5,021	6,002	7,264	198
University Place	385	228	613	108	966	1,074	-	-
Steilacoom	532	90	622	90	303	393	-	-
DuPont	475	121	596	139	363	502	-	-
2016	**4,326**	**1,836**	**6,162**	**1,370**	**5,903**	**7,273**	**8,681**	**182**
Lakewood	3,233	1,341	4,574	1,049	4,555	5,604	8,681	182
University Place	267	205	472	76	704	780	-	-
Steilacoom	317	77	394	96	240	336	-	-
DuPont	509	213	722	149	404	553	-	-
2015	**6,454**	**2,235**	**8,689**	**2,556**	**6,200**	**8,756**	**5,458**	**185**
Lakewood	5,299	1,765	7,064	2,426	5,413	7,839	5,458	185
University Place	198	251	449	130	787	917	-	-
Steilacoom	405	115	520	-	-	-	-	-
DuPont	552	104	656	-	-	-	-	-

Return to Agenda

Filings and Hearings by Jurisdiction – Annual Totals

Annual Totals	FILINGS			HEARINGS			Photo/Camera	
	Infractions	Criminal	Total Filings	Infractions	Criminal	Total Hearings	Filings	Hearings
2021	**2,600**	**1,576**	**4,176**	**1,201**	**8,713**	**9,914**	**20,982**	**351**
Lakewood	1,724	1,395	3,119	929	7,694	8,623	20,982	351
University Place	12	5	17	42	393	435	-	-
Steilacoom	606	87	693	160	327	487	-	-
DuPont	258	89	347	70	299	369	-	-
2020	**4,120**	**2,274**	**6,394**	**2,408**	**10,762**	**13,170**	**10,143**	**267**
Lakewood	2,777	1,876	4,653	1,788	9,005	10,793	10,143	267
University Place	392	201	593	242	1,067	1,309	-	-
Steilacoom	633	102	735	226	374	600	-	-
DuPont	318	95	413	152	316	468	-	-
2019	**7,638**	**3,050**	**10,688**	**2,710**	**14,346**	**17,056**	**16,644**	**298**
Lakewood	5,678	2,481	8,159	2,070	11,598	13,668	16,644	298
University Place	419	302	721	194	1,655	1,849	-	-
Steilacoom	922	188	1,110	301	596	897	-	-
DuPont	619	79	698	145	497	642	-	-
2018	**6,494**	**3,187**	**9,681**	**2,392**	**13,724**	**16,116**	**15,680**	**333**
Lakewood	4,008	2,390	6,398	1,608	10,727	12,335	15,680	333
University Place	687	340	1,027	264	1,585	1,849	-	-
Steilacoom	1,053	234	1,287	313	604	917	-	-
DuPont	746	223	969	207	808	1,015	-	-
2017	**7,910**	**3,097**	**11,007**	**2,615**	**13,055**	**15,670**	**14,413**	**364**
Lakewood	5,303	2,235	7,538	1,890	9,898	11,788	14,413	364
University Place	629	396	1,025	227	1,843	2,070	-	-
Steilacoom	1,151	204	1,355	266	583	849	-	-
DuPont	827	262	1,089	232	731	963	-	-
2016	**7,733**	**3,569**	**11,302**	**2,581**	**12,414**	**14,995**	**15,107**	**398**
Lakewood	5,463	2,623	8,086	1,933	9,567	11,500	15,107	398
University Place	602	409	1,011	199	1,583	1,782	-	-
Steilacoom	678	162	840	179	487	666	-	-
DuPont	990	375	1,365	270	777	1,047	-	-
2015	**10,453**	**4,197**	**14,650**	**4,806**	**12,322**	**17,128**	**10,761**	**368**
Lakewood	8,204	3,308	11,512	4,569	10,784	15,353	10,761	368
University Place	316	458	774	237	1,538	1,775	-	-
Steilacoom	787	197	984	-	-	-	-	-
DuPont	1,146	234	1,380	-	-	-	-	-

Return to Agenda

COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Business License

Businesses located or doing business in the City are required to obtain a local business license prior to commencing operations. Business license fees are set by the City Council and may change from time to time. Currently, the cost of a general business license is $60 for a 12-month period. Additional fees may apply to specialty businesses. Organization exempt from taxation under 26 USC 501(C)(3) and (4) must apply and obtain a business license, but are exempt from the business license fee. The number of business licenses in a given year range between 3,800 – 4,200 with roughly 3,800 renewals annually.

Business License
Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 26,180	$ 26,370	$ 41,983	$ 29,635	$ 3,265	12.4%	$ (12,348)	-29.4%
Feb	22,935	21,420	28,574	25,930	4,510	21.1%	(2,644)	-9.3%
Mar	26,790	34,490	33,511	31,620	(2,870)	-8.3%	(1,891)	-5.6%
Apr	17,625	21,490	20,569	22,970	1,480	6.9%	2,401	11.7%
May	17,350	18,780	17,673	22,980	4,200	22.4%	5,307	30.0%
Jun	22,220	22,175	19,536	23,105	930	4.2%	3,569	18.3%
Jul	26,814	22,945	20,722	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	20,090	19,855	18,256	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	16,815	20,350	16,777	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	17,240	21,060	18,164	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	16,775	20,140	16,257	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	23,270	33,475	24,478	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 133,100**	**$ 144,725**	**$ 161,846**	**$ 156,240**	**$ 11,515**	**8.0%**	**$ (5,606)**	**-3.5%**
Annual Total	**$ 254,104**	**$ 282,550**	**$ 276,500**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 1.7%

General business licenses were down in 2020 due to the closure of the State Business License Services (BLS) office as a result of COVID-19 causing delays in processing. BLS deferred the general business license expirations dates, thus less revenue from renewals. Business activity is overall is down due to the pandemic, however picked up in 2021 and continues to increase in 2022.

Business License By Type
Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Annual	2021 Annual	2021 YTD	2022 Budget	2022 YTD Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 YTD Actual vs 2021 YTD Actual $	%
General	$ 239,815	$ 271,075	$ 134,150	$ 240,000	$ 144,215	$ 10,065	7.5%
Specialty	14,289	11,475	10,575	36,500	12,025	1,450	13.7%
Total	**$ 254,104**	**$ 282,550**	**$ 144,725**	**$ 276,500**	**$ 156,240**	**$ 11,515**	**8.0%**

Return to Agenda

City Tree Fund

The City collects money for its City Tree Fund as payment in lieu of onsite tree replacement for removal of trees in excess of retention requirements, and as mitigation for oak trees removed in conjunction with development projects. The City has an obligation to spend the funds received for planting of trees to include oak trees and activities intended to improve Oregon White Oak Woodland habitat as well as improving the health of current or new tree and natural areas citywide.

City Tree Fund				
Date	**Received From / Project**	**Sources**	**Uses**	**Balance**
9/15/2009	Claude Remy: Mitigate oak tree removal for Gravelly Lake Brownstones Development.	$ 5,000	$ -	$ 5,000
11/23/2009	Claude Remy: Mitigate oak tree removal for Gravelly Lake Brownstones Development.	8,230	-	13,230
12/31/2009	Parks Tree Planting - Oak Prairie Mediations: attempt (unsuccessful) to replant Garry Oak trees in Fort Steilacoom Park.	-	379	12,851
10/8/2013	Claude Remy: Mitigate oak tree removal for Gravelly Lake Brownstones Development.	7,560	-	20,411
11/10/2015	Clover Park School District	8,000	-	28,411
4/26/2017	Pierce County Restoration Project: purchase of small oak trees for planting.	-	2,000	26,411
5/16/2017	Jeffrey Edwards Trust Fine imposed for fir tree removal without City permit. Portion of family inheritance was used to pay the fine.	82,000		108,411
8/24/2017	Beaumont Grand	6,400		114,811
12/31/2017	Fort Steilacoom Park Waughop Lake and Angle Lane: trees and shrubs.	-	9,321	105,490
12/31/2017	Fort Steilacoom Park Waughop Lake: Trees & shrubs, irrigation and contractor services.	-	6,044	99,446
12/31/2018	Removal of 33 trees at Fort Steilacoom Park by Stumpy Tree Service.	-	24,000	75,446
12/31/2019	FSP South Angle Lane Parking & Trail: trees, shrubs and landscaping services.	-	20,000	55,446
12/31/2021	Megan Court: Applicant submitted cash guarantee in lieu of providing the required landscaping within the Farwest Drive SW right-of-way.	1,050	-	56,496
	Life-to-date Totals & Balance at @ June 30, 2022	**$ 118,240**	**$ 61,744**	**$ 56,496**

Return to Agenda

Development Services Permits & Fees

Development Services Permits & Fees include revenues from Community & Economic Development (Fund 001 General Fund) and Public Works Engineering Services (Fund 101 Street Engineering and Fund 401 SWM Engineering).

Community and Economic Development permits and fees include building and related permits (i.e. mechanical, plumbing), plan review fees, plan check fees and zoning and development fees. Public Works Engineering permits and fees include oversize load permits, right-of-way permits, site development permits street vacation permits, street opening permits and engineering review services.

Total - Development Services Permits & Fees
(Combined CED & PWE)
Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 104,008	$ 223,911	$ 193,466	$ 217,123	$ (6,788)	-3.0%	$ 23,657	12.2%
Feb	246,268	121,333	129,907	98,603	(22,730)	-18.7%	(31,304)	-24.1%
Mar	104,847	157,680	134,645	243,269	85,589	54.3%	108,624	80.7%
Apr	137,944	363,968	192,933	191,918	(172,050)	-47.3%	(1,015)	-0.5%
May	249,214	214,688	163,038	216,359	1,671	0.8%	53,321	32.7%
Jun	138,946	187,746	209,444	244,909	57,163	30.4%	35,465	16.9%
Jul	150,805	140,942	150,271	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	283,230	196,127	177,838	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	261,246	104,430	144,048	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	329,860	195,559	251,600	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	111,357	149,695	141,934	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	354,208	297,086	228,207	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 981,227**	**$ 1,269,326**	**$ 1,023,432**	**$ 1,212,181**	**$ (57,145)**	**-4.5%**	**$ 188,749**	**18.4%**
Total Annual	**$ 2,471,933**	**$ 2,353,164**	**$ 2,117,327**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021):		5.7%						

Return to Agenda

CED - Building Permit Fees

Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 50,272	$ 87,473	$ 113,232	$ 114,127	$ 26,654	30.5%	$ 895	0.8%
Feb	136,871	39,191	65,033	43,211	4,020	10.3%	(21,822)	-33.6%
Mar	37,180	70,527	66,969	154,372	83,845	118.9%	87,403	130.5%
Apr	71,701	233,354	109,540	106,305	(127,049)	-54.4%	(3,235)	-3.0%
May	89,589	117,693	87,088	81,581	(36,112)	-30.7%	(5,507)	-6.3%
Jun	70,566	100,532	122,884	143,130	42,598	42.4%	20,246	16.5%
Jul	62,726	64,643	82,276	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	176,682	121,642	113,515	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	177,112	51,690	92,801	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	190,511	110,674	170,759	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	55,369	61,142	86,329	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	147,713	80,167	75,397	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 456,179**	**$ 648,770**	**$ 564,747**	**$ 642,726**	**$ (6,044)**	**-0.9%**	**$ 77,979**	**13.8%**
Total Annual	**$ 1,266,292**	**$ 1,138,728**	**$ 1,185,825**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 6.5%

Return to Agenda

CED - Plan Review/Plan Check Fees

Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 19,758	$ 113,615	$ 52,146	$ 44,030	$ (69,585)	-61.2%	$ (8,116)	-15.6%
Feb	71,472	47,394	35,373	26,293	(21,101)	-44.5%	(9,080)	-25.7%
Mar	43,523	57,098	45,419	66,306	9,208	16.1%	20,887	46.0%
Apr	40,794	82,668	51,650	53,275	(29,393)	-35.6%	1,625	3.1%
May	62,631	41,850	35,160	90,850	49,000	117.1%	55,690	158.4%
Jun	58,319	44,261	53,836	45,259	998	2.3%	(8,577)	-15.9%
Jul	56,290	39,689	40,246	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	76,218	48,110	38,821	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	67,124	25,868	30,630	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	101,986	43,315	51,207	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	34,565	29,548	27,829	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	177,955	174,532	124,882	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 296,497**	**$ 386,886**	**$ 273,585**	**$ 326,013**	**$ (60,873)**	**-15.7%**	**$ 52,428**	**19.2%**
Total Annual	**$ 810,635**	**$ 747,948**	**$ 587,200**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Ave Change (2017 - 2021):		2.6%						

Return to Agenda

CED - Zoning/Development Fees

Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 12,112	$ 11,960	$ 15,136	$ 25,310	$ 13,350	111.6%	$ 10,174	67.2%
Feb	29,024	8,472	13,776	7,300	(1,172)	-13.8%	(6,476)	-47.0%
Mar	7,118	11,295	8,385	8,802	(2,493)	-22.1%	417	5.0%
Apr	13,770	21,462	12,632	13,119	(8,343)	-38.9%	487	3.9%
May	15,459	31,379	13,187	12,790	(18,589)	-59.2%	(397)	-3.0%
Jun	5,611	6,769	9,203	16,110	9,341	138.0%	6,907	75.1%
Jul	17,829	8,080	9,394	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	14,780	21,070	13,027	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	13,060	15,354	11,795	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	18,487	10,580	12,551	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	10,130	20,581	12,770	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	18,460	12,460	9,945	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 83,094**	**$ 91,337**	**$ 72,319**	**$ 83,431**	**$ (7,906)**	**-8.7%**	**$ 11,112**	**15.4%**
Total Annual	**$ 175,840**	**$ 179,462**	**$ 141,800**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 6.8%

Return to Agenda

PW Street Engineering - ROW Permits & Fees *Year-to-date through June*								
			2022		Over / (Under)			
					2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget	
Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	Budget	Actual	$	%	$	%
Jan	$ 17,366	$ 9,113	$ 11,237	$ 28,596	$ 19,483	213.8%	$ 17,359	154.5%
Feb	7,276	17,841	11,552	21,339	3,498	19.6%	9,787	84.7%
Mar	13,526	11,865	10,832	8,524	(3,341)	-28.2%	(2,308)	-21.3%
Apr	8,679	18,289	13,842	9,559	(8,730)	-47.7%	(4,283)	-30.9%
May	42,492	16,846	18,457	20,098	3,252	19.3%	1,641	8.9%
Jun	3,825	23,714	15,749	30,060	6,346	26.8%	14,311	90.9%
Jul	9,210	19,785	13,470	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	10,925	5,305	10,127	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	3,950	11,518	8,488	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	10,738	19,720	12,928	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	7,408	28,304	11,974	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	8,955	18,582	13,846	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 93,164**	**$ 97,668**	**$ 81,668**	**$ 118,176**	**$ 20,508**	**21.0%**	**$ 36,508**	**44.7%**
Total Annual	**$ 144,350**	**$ 200,881**	**$ 152,500**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 10.0%

Return to Agenda

PW SWM - Permits & Fees

Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 4,500	$ 1,750	$ 1,715	$ 5,060	$ 3,310	189.1%	$ 3,345	195.0%
Feb	1,625	8,435	4,173	460	(7,975)	-94.5%	(3,713)	-89.0%
Mar	3,500	6,895	3,038	5,265	(1,630)	-23.6%	2,227	73.3%
Apr	3,000	8,195	5,269	9,660	1,465	17.9%	4,391	83.3%
May	39,043	6,920	9,144	11,040	4,120	59.5%	1,896	20.7%
Jun	625	12,470	7,772	10,350	(2,120)	-17.0%	2,578	33.2%
Jul	4,750	8,745	4,885	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	4,625	-	2,349	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	-	-	334	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	8,138	11,270	4,154	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	3,885	10,120	3,032	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	1,125	11,345	4,137	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 52,293**	**$ 44,665**	**$ 31,112**	**$ 41,835**	**$ (2,830)**	**-6.3%**	**$ 10,723**	**34.5%**
Total Annual	**$ 74,816**	**$ 86,145**	**$ 50,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 23.6%

Return to Agenda

Cost Recovery – Development Services

In May 2016, the City Council adopted a set of revised financial policies to include cost recovery. The following is an excerpt of the cost recovery policy as it relates specifically to target cost recovery for development review services:

> *Target Cost Recovery Level for Development Review Services.* The cost recovery policy applies to the following development programs/services: planning (long and short plats, privately initiated re-zonings and comprehensive plan amendments, variances, use permits); building and safety (building permits, structural plan checks, inspections); engineering (public improvement plan checks, inspections, subdivision requirements, encroachments, right-of-way permits); and fire plan check. Cost recovery for these services should generally be very high. In most instances, the City's cost recovery ratio goal should be 85%. The timeline to achieve the cost recovery is no later than year 2021. In setting cost recovery levels, the City shall clearly establish and articulate performance measurements to ensure that there is "value for cost."

The table below provides historical annual and current estimated annual and actual subsidy and recovery ratio by program.

Development Services Permits & Fees
(Includes Community & Economic Development, Public Works Engineering & Surface Water Management)
Year-to-date through June

	2017 Annual Actual	2018 Annual Actual	2019 Annual Actual	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2022 Annual Budget	2022 Annual Actual
Operating Revenues:							
Building Related Permits	860,776	1,390,775	1,005,902	1,266,291	1,138,728	1,185,825	642,726
Plan Review/Plan Check Fees	661,291	625,754	603,498	810,634	617,048	587,200	326,013
Other Zoning/Development Fees	134,106	188,137	139,627	175,840	179,462	141,800	83,431
Oversize Load Permits	6,851	6,636	4,591	3,370	9,778	6,000	-
ROW Permits	88,026	97,528	97,035	65,164	81,630	94,000	13,734
Site Development Permits	79,678	113,246	93,936	149,632	188,850	100,000	106,670
Other PWE Permits & Fees	2,754	2,620	2,000	1,000	3,641	2,500	39,607
Total Operating Revenue	**$1,833,482**	**$ 2,424,696**	**$ 1,946,589**	**$ 2,471,931**	**$ 2,219,137**	**$ 2,117,325**	**$ 1,214,021**
Operating Expenditures:							
Current Planning	630,971	659,093	718,158	715,817	849,705	885,049	573,291
Long Range Planning	171,058	192,837	218,809	196,147	203,805	282,779	144,725
Building	1,014,891	1,035,962	1,146,618	1,135,909	1,186,925	1,500,609	568,144
Development Services	325,821	331,330	382,403	365,394	359,601	431,312	200,781
Total Operating Expenditures	**$2,142,741**	**$ 2,219,222**	**$ 2,465,988**	**$ 2,413,267**	**$ 2,600,036**	**$ 3,099,749**	**$ 1,486,941**
General Fund Subsidy Amount	**$ 309,259**	**$ (205,474)**	**$ 519,399**	**$ (58,664)**	**$ 380,899**	**$ 982,424**	**$ 272,920**
Recovery Ratio	**86%**	**109%**	**79%**	**102%**	**85%**	**68%**	**82%**

5-Year Average Actual Recovery:

General Fund Subsidy (2017 - 2021)	$ 189,084
Recovery Ratio (2017 - 2021)	92%

Note:

- Expenditures do not include indirect overhead cost allocation for finance, human resources, legal, legislative and executive functions.

- Public Works Development Services Permits includes associated revenues and expenditures accounted for in the SWM Fund; also includes 10% overhead cost.

Return to Agenda

Fund 105 Property Abatement / Rental Housing Safety Program / 1406 Affordable Housing Program

Property Abatement

The Property Abatement portion of this fund accounts for projects that the City has identified and processed through the abatement program. All revenue and the rightful recovery of those project expenses, along with all revenues from fees, fines, and interest, and other rightful recoveries from those projects are deposited into the program for the purpose of funding additional abatement projects.

Property Abatement *Year-to-date through June*				
	2020	2021	2022	
Operating Revenues & Expenditures	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Operating Revenue:				
Abatement Charges	$ 59,134	$ 93,741	$ 45,000	$ 11,392
Misc/Interest/Other	13,401	44,768	6,500	1,469
Total Operating Revenues	**$ 72,535**	**$ 138,509**	**$ 51,500**	**$ 12,861**
Operating Expenditures:				
Personnel Costs	31,419	49,737	50,322	31,482
Supplies	642	767	-	-
Professional Services	60,513	313,842	954,888	53,102
Other Services & Charges	360	840	-	1,511
Total Operating Expenditures	**$ 92,934**	**$ 365,186**	**$ 1,005,210**	**$ 86,095**
Net Program Income (Cost)	**$ (20,398)**	**$ (226,676)**	**$ (953,710)**	**$ (73,234)**
Other Sources / (Uses)				
Transfer In From General Fund	60,000	35,000	535,000	535,000
Total Sources / (Uses)	**$ 60,000**	**$ 35,000**	**$ 535,000**	**$ 535,000**
Beginning Balance	**$ 570,784**	**$ 610,387**	**$ 418,710**	**$ 418,710**
Ending Balance	**$ 610,386**	**$ 418,710**	**$ -**	**$ 880,474**

Return to Agenda

DANGEROUS BUILDING AND PUBLIC NUISANCES As of June 30, 2022							
	Owner's Name	Property Address	Year Built	Date Started	Abatement Order Date	Date Completed	Abatement/ Nuisance
1	Karwan Village LLC	2621 84th St. S. Lakewood, 98499	1967	1/9/2019	7/9/2019	In-process;	A
2	WFC Lakewood Colonial LLC	9314-16 Bridgeport Way SW, Lakewood, 98499	1978	11/15/2018	7/16/2019	On hold; superior court	A
3	WFC Lakewood Colonial LLC	9320-30 Bridgeport Way SW, Lakewood, 98499	1965/78	11/15/2018	7/16/2019	On hold; superior court	A
4	Kenneth & Donna Buster	7119 Foster St. SW, Lakewood, 98499	1927/ 1962	10/30/2019	2/6/2020	-	A
5	Moon & Jung Kim	12314 Pacific Hwy SW, Lakewood, 98499	1971	4/9/2020	11/9/2020	-	A
6	Mitch Homes LLC/ Ladder Properties LLC	7407-7409 146th St. SW, Lakewood 98439	1908	1/28/2021	3/1/2021	-	A
7	Idella Whitfield	573 Lake Louise Dr. SW, Lakewood, 98498	1979	12/14/2020	4/15/2021	-	A
8	Zhao Xiu Fen & Jin Yang	12521 Addison St. SW, Lakewood 98439	1940	1/27/2021	5/6/2021	2/15/2022	A
9	Patsy Lininger	9704-9706 121st St. SW, Lakewood, 98498	1968	1/21/2021	2/17/2021	7/20/2022	N
10	Dirk Mayberry	9616 Gravelly Lake Dr. SW, Lakewood, 98499	1955	11/1/2021	12/17/2021	Abatement Contract for Review	A
11	Verna Cheatham	5501 116th St. SW, Lakewood, 98499	1974	12/14/2020	7/12/2021	-	A
12	5408SBLVD LLC	5408 Steilacoom Blvd. SW, Lakewood 98499	1927	11/1/2021	12/9/2021	5/31/2022	A
13	Dong H Shin & Sang J Han	3407 86th St. S., Lakewood, 98499	1934	5/11/2021	10/14/2021	4/3/2022	A
14	Benjamin M. Stockman	11206 Military Rd. SW, Lakewood, 98498	1942	7/29/2021		-	N
15	Brian Buckner	8808 Wildaire Rd. SW, Lakewood, 98498	1995	10/21/2021		-	A
16	Hye Cha Galvan	10408-10410 112th St. SW. Lakewood, 98498	1968	1/10/2022	NA	-	N
17	Larry E. & Carol E. Bell	9808 Lawndale Ave. SW, Lakewood, 98498	1963	1/21/2022	NA	1/28/2022	N
18	Bluestar Management Services LLC	9018 Lawndale Ave. SW, Lakewood, 98498	1940	3/16/2022		-	A
19	DCI Development Inc.	15225 Washington Blvd SW, Lakewood, 98439	1976	3/16/2022		3/31/2022	A
20	VD Holdings	3712-3714 88th St. SW, Lakewood, 98499	1949	6/7/2022	-		6/11/2022 N
21	Youn H. Sim & Suk Chong	3851 Steilacoom Blvd. SW, Lakewood, 98499	1950	6/1/2022	-		6/30/2022 A
22	Celeste Avery	8206 North Way SW, Lakewood, WA 98498	1948	11/17/2020	-		6/2/2022 A
23	Larry E. & Carol E. Bell	9808 Lawndale Ave. SW, Lakewood, 98498	1963	1/21/2022	1/28/2022	6/16/2022	N

The symbol "-" means that the abatement/nuisance is in process, but action is delayed for a variety of reasons. Some of the delays are related to: the department's internal process of triaging projects; COVID; elderly property owners who may be working on the abatement/nuisance, but for financial reasons, need more time; legal disputes between business partners; family issues; probate; fire investigations; etc. A good rule of thumb is that about 20-percent of abatements/nuisances involve persons with mental health related issues.

Return to Agenda

Rental Housing Safety Program

On August 1, 2016, the Lakewood City Council approved Ordinance No. 644 creating a Rental Housing Safety Program (RHSP). The program requires all residential rental properties (apartments, single family homes, duplexes, etc.) within Lakewood city limits to be registered. The program is designed to ensure that all rental housing units comply with specific life and safety standards and are providing a safe place for tenants to live. As of October 4, 2017, all rental properties owners will be required to register their property with the City every year and have the property inspected once every five years.

Rental Housing Safety Program *Year-to-date through June*				
	2020	2021	2022	
Operating Revenues & Expenditures	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Budget	Actual
Operating Revenue:				
Registration Program Fees	$ 179,398	$ 162,967	$ 182,910	$ 140,916
Total Operating Revenues	**$ 179,398**	**$ 162,967**	**$ 182,910**	**$ 140,916**
Operating Expenditures:				
Personnel Costs	218,137	219,368	200,985	114,617
Supplies	687	823	-	692
Professional Services	222	370	-	6,860
Other Services & Charges	329	15	300	72
Internal Service Charges	44,345	17,836	81,179	37,337
Total Operating Expenditures	**$ 263,719**	**$ 238,412**	**$ 282,464**	**$ 159,579**
Net Program Income (Cost)	**$ (84,321)**	**$ (75,445)**	**$ (99,554)**	**$ (18,663)**
Other Sources / (Uses)				
Transfer In From General Fund	25,000	149,287	50,000	50,000
Total Sources / (Uses)	**$ 25,000**	**$ 149,287**	**$ 50,000**	**$ 50,000**
Beginning Balance	**$ 35,034**	**$ (24,287)**	**$ 49,554**	**$ 49,554**
Ending Balance	**$ (24,287)**	**$ 49,554**	**$ -**	**$ 80,890**

Rental Housing Safety Program Fees *Year-to-date through Jun*			
Month	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**
Jan	$ 72,979	79,429	45,406
Feb	24,523	24,951	32,733
Mar	9,715	25,589	29,016
Apr	6,480	9,181	20,487
May	1,844	3,907	9,517
Jun	5,867	4,039	3,757
Jul	4,330	2,938	-
Aug	12,498	1,720	-
Sep	9,453	5,643	-
Oct	11,754	1,338	-
Nov	16,058	298	-
Dec	3,814	3,934	-
Total YTD	**$ 121,408**	**$ 147,096**	**$ 140,916**
Annual Total	**$ 179,315**	**$ 162,967**	**n/a**
		2022 Annual Estimate =	**$ 182,910**
		% of Revenue Collected =	**77%**

Return to Agenda

1406 Affordable Housing Program

On March 2, 2020, the City Council approved Ordinance 731 relating to local sales and use tax, authorizing the maximum capacity of the tax authorized under the provisions of Substitute House Bill 1406 for affordable and supporting housing. The revenue to the City is a credit of the state's sales tax. With adoption of this ordinance, the City is able to impose the rate of 0.0073%. According to the Department of Revenue (DOR), the maximum amount the City may receive is $98K per state fiscal year for twenty years totaling an estimated $1.95M. The City notified DOR on March 13, 2020 and DOR began imposing the tax effective May 1, 2020. The City received its first full distribution amount in July 2020 with some funds trickling through in May and June due to early returns filed.

The direction from the Lakewood City Council is to use the funds in conjunction with the City's CDBG Major Home Repair Program, CDBG Major Home Repair and Sewer Loan Program, and HOME Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program given that there is a high demand for home repair and rehabilitation loans in the City.

CDBG is a federal entitlement program and provides annual grants on a formula basis to states, cities, and counties to provide decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons. The City processes on average six to eight CDBG housing repair programs annually.

"1406" Affordable Housing Program Funds are reserved for persons and/or housing repairs not eligible under CDBG, those who fall just outside CDBG program guidelines but where some level of assistance may be required.

There are currently four "1406" projects in process as follows:

- 8509 Veterans Drive SW, repairs to garage, windows, doors, and siding, $25,000;
- 12522 Nyanza Road SW, major rehabilitation of residence due to tree damage, $60,000;
- 9006 71st St. Ct. SW, furnace, heat pump, water heater, approx. $15,000; and
- 8804 Veterans Drive SW, fence and fir tree removal, $14,500.

1406 Affordable Housing Program *Year-to-date through June*			
Month	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**
Jan	$ -	$ 8,941	8,742
Feb	-	9,198	5,401
Mar	-	7,349	-
Apr	107	-	-
May	7,811	10,758	10,152
Jun	9,379	11,237	10,783
Jul	8,959	10,527	-
Aug	8,618	10,243	-
Sep	10,203	10,211	-
Oct	8,924	10,153	-
Nov	7,860	9,524	-
Dec	10,456	10,901	-
Total YTD	**$ 17,297**	**$ 47,483**	**$ 35,078**
Annual Total	**$ 72,317**	**$ 109,042**	**n/a**

1406 Affordable Housing Program *Year-to-date through June*				
	2020	**2021**	**2022**	
Operating Revenues & Expenditures	**Annual Actual**	**Annual Actual**	**Annual Budget**	**YTD Actual**
Operating Revenue:				
Sales & Use Tax	$ 72,316	$ 109,042	$ 98,000	$ 35,078
Total Operating Revenues	**$ 72,316**	**$ 109,042**	**$ 98,000**	**$ 35,078**
Operating Expenditures:				
Program Costs	-	-	279,358	-
Total Operating Expenditures	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 279,358**	**$ -**
Net Program Income (Cost)	**$ 72,316**	**$ 109,042**	**$ (181,358)**	**$ 35,078**
Other Sources / (Uses)				
Transfer In From General Fund	-	-	-	-
Total Sources / (Uses)	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Beginning Balance	**$ -**	**$ 72,316**	**$ 181,358**	**$ 181,358**
Ending Balance	**$ 72,316**	**$ 181,358**	**$ -**	**$ 216,436**

Return to Agenda

Fund 190 Community Development Block Grant

Fund 190 CDBG is predominantly comprised of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development funds for Community Development Block Grant Entitlements (CDBG), HOME program funding through the Lakewood and Tacoma HOME Consortium and Section 108 Loan Guarantees. There is also a grant from the Nisqually Tribe for minor home repairs and West Pierce Fire & Rescue for emergency assistance for displaced residents.

Through the planning and citizen participation process CDBG and HOME spending priorities are set on an annual basis, to be broken out into funding projects for physical improvements, public service (not to exceed 15%), housing, economic development, and administration (not to exceed 20%).

CDBG:

CDBG Funds may be used to fund an array of projects and activities qualifying under any of four categories:

(1) Physical/Infrastructure Improvements
(2) Public Service
(3) Housing
(4) Economic Development

Investments made in various housing programs (Major Home Repair/Sewer Loan Program, Down Payment Assistance, and Multi-family Housing), and economic development activities (Microenterprise Loan Program) have created multiple Revolving Loan Funds (RLF) for each of the funded activities.

In addition to tracking the various CDBG grant allocation's revenue and expenditures in Fund 190 CDBG, notes receivable for Housing Program Loans are also tracked. These are revolving loans for Major Home Repair, Major Home Repair for Sewer and Down Payment Assistance for qualifying homebuyers.

CDBG Entitlement Funding History			
		Change Over Prior Year	
Program Year	Annual Allocation	$	%
2022	$ 553,819	$ (19,533)	-3.4%
2021	573,352	(22,563)	-3.8%
2020	595,915	32,791	5.8%
2019	563,124	1,893	0.3%
2018	561,231	76,865	15.9%
2017	484,366	17,316	3.7%
2016	467,050	(698)	-0.1%
2015	467,748	(4,004)	-0.8%
2014	471,752	(9,846)	-2.0%
2013	481,598	10,703	2.3%
2012	470,895	(106,895)	-18.5%
2011	577,790	(114,016)	-16.5%
2010	691,806	50,755	7.9%
2009	641,051	5,749	0.9%
2008	635,302	(24,966)	-3.8%
2007	660,268	(3,682)	-0.6%
2006	663,950	(77,700)	-10.5%
2005	741,650	(43,350)	-5.5%
2004	785,000	(21,000)	-2.6%
2003	806,000	(91,000)	-10.1%
2002	897,000	(46,000)	-4.9%
2001	943,000	30,000	3.3%
2000	913,000	n/a	n/a
Total	**$ 14,092,848**		

Return to Agenda

The following tables provide a summary of loans and grants for Major Home and Sewer Repair Down Payment Assistance. These are zero interest loans with 20-year terms. Payments are revolving which dictates that the principal received is applied to current program expenditures before billing CDBG.

Major Home Repairs & Sewer and Down Payment Assistance Loans and Grants:

Major Home Repairs & Sewers (MHRS) / Down Payment Assistance (DPA) Loans and Grants *As of June 30, 2022*				
	MHRS		DPA	
Program Year	# of Projects	Original Amount	# of Projects	Original Amount
2022	3	$ 170,000	1	$ 27,500
2021	8	$ 411,988	-	$ -
2020	4	$ 99,996	-	$ -
2019	6	$ 158,982	-	$ -
2018	9	$ 181,800	-	$ -
2017	4	$ 72,323	-	$ -
2016	6	$ 129,356	-	$ -
2015	1	$ 37,144	-	$ -
2014	5	$ 72,979	1	$ 3,365
2013	8	$ 144,408	-	$ -
2012	9	$ 106,977	1	$ 2,250
2011	8	$ 170,407	-	$ -
2010	13	$ 256,287	2	$ 8,619
2009	6	$ 102,652	5	$ 23,791
2008	3	$ 37,224	4	$ 19,379
2007	4	$ 56,345	2	$ 8,700
2006	6	$ 67,556	1	$ 7,000
2005	7	$ 69,634	-	$ -
2004	4	$ 36,058	3	$ 14,901
2003	8	$ 49,136	8	$ 35,336
2002	3	$ 19,999	-	$ -
2001	-	$ -	11	$ 51,621
2000	-	$ -	1	$ 5,000
Total	**125**	**$ 2,451,251**	**40**	**$ 207,462**

Return to Agenda

Major Home Repairs & Sewer Loans Detail:

Major Home Repair & Sewer Loans (MHRS)

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan / Grant Amount	Principal & Interest Paid / Other	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Status	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2002								
3 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 19,999**	**$ 19,999**	**$ -**					
MHR-001	$ 6,000	$ 6,000	$ -	9/23/2002		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-003	$ 5,999	$ 5,999	$ -	2/24/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-004	$ 8,000	$ 8,000	$ -	5/5/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2003								
8 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 49,137**	**$ 41,181**	**$ 7,956**					
MHR-006	$ 7,831	$ 7,831	$ -	7/23/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-008	$ 4,523	$ 4,523	$ -	9/8/2003	10/1/2023	Paid Off	9/8/2023	0.0%
MHR-009	$ 7,956	$ -	$ 7,956	9/16/2003	10/1/2023		9/10/2023	0.0%
MHR-011	$ 7,237	$ 7,237	$ -	10/21/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-018	$ 6,950	$ 6,950	$ -	1/28/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-016	$ 6,640	$ 6,640	$ -	3/2/2004	3/1/2024	Paid Off	2/25/2024	0.0%
MHR-019	$ 8,000	$ 8,000	$ -	5/12/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-017	$ -	$ -	$ -	5/21/2004		Written Off		0.0%
Year 2004								
4 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 36,058**	**$ 36,058**	**$ -**					
MHR-020	$ 12,554	$ 12,554	$ -	9/15/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-030	$ 7,504	$ 7,504	$ -	9/23/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-029	$ 8,000	$ 8,000	$ -	11/1/2004		Written Off		0.0%
MHR-024	$ 8,000	$ 8,000	$ -	12/3/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2005								
7 = Total # Loans/Grants								
2 = Total Outstanding	**$ 69,634**	**$ 49,989**	**$ 19,645**					
MHR-038	$ 7,064	$ 7,064	$ -	8/29/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-031	$ 9,235	$ 1,590	$ 7,645	9/1/2005	4/1/2016		3/1/2026	0.0%
MHR-032	$ 7,302	$ 7,302	$ -	9/2/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-034	$ 7,993	$ 7,993	$ -	10/19/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-036	$ 15,840	$ 15,840	$ -	12/15/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-040	$ 10,200	$ 10,200	$ -	4/11/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-047	$ 12,000	$ -	$ 12,000	6/7/2006	6/1/2026		6/1/2026	0.0%
Year 2006								
6 = Total # Loans/Grants								
2 = Total Outstanding	**$ 67,556**	**$ 48,942**	**$ 18,614**					
MHR-046	$ 9,697	$ 9,697	$ -	7/26/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-052	$ 11,927	$ 11,927	$ -	11/14/2006	12/1/2026	Paid Off	11/8/2026	0.0%
MHR-053	$ 11,858	$ 11,858	$ -	12/20/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-055	$ 10,126	$ 3,500	$ 6,626	1/3/2007	1/1/2027		12/27/2026	0.0%
MHR-056	$ 11,960	$ 11,960	$ -	5/22/2007		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-054	$ 11,988	$ -	$ 11,988	4/25/2007	5/1/2027		4/19/2027	0.0%
Year 2007								
4 = Total # Loans/Grants								
2 = Total Outstanding	**$ 56,346**	**$ 29,179**	**$ 27,167**					
MHR-061	$ 11,777	$ -	$ 11,777	11/8/2007	12/1/2027		11/2/2027	0.0%
MHR-062	$ 18,390	$ 3,000	$ 15,390	11/20/2007	12/1/2027		11/14/2027	0.0%
MHR-063	$ 19,291	$ 19,291	$ -	11/20/2007		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-064	$ 6,888	$ 6,888	$ -	2/4/2008		Paid Off		0.0%

Return to Agenda

Major Home Repair & Sewer Loans (MHRS) - continued

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan / Grant Amount	Total Principal & Interest Paid / Other	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Status	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2008								
3 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 37,224**	**$ 25,325**	**$ 11,899**					
MHR-066	$ 11,899	$ -	$ 11,899	8/21/2008	9/1/2028		8/15/2028	0.0%
MHR-069	$ 11,980	$ 11,980	$ -	12/29/2008		Written Off		0.0%
MHR-070	$ 13,345	$ 13,345	$ -	2/12/2009		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2009								
6 = Total # Loans/Grants								
2 = Total Outstanding	**$ 102,653**	**$ 82,396**	**$ 20,257**					
MHR-075	$ 14,397	$ 14,397	$ -	9/21/2009	9/1/2013	Paid Off	9/1/2016	0.0%
MHR-077	$ 12,597	$ 3,677	$ 8,920	11/13/2009	12/1/2013		11/1/2016	0.0%
MHR-079	$ 23,168	$ 23,168	$ -	11/4/2009		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-073	$ 14,137	$ 2,800	$ 11,337	12/23/2009	6/1/2013		12/1/2017	0.0%
MHR-080	$ 13,164	$ 13,164	$ -	4/16/2010		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-082	$ 25,190	$ 25,190	$ -	5/28/2010	6/1/2030	Paid Off	6/1/2030	0.0%
Year 2010								
13 = Total # Loans/Grants								
6 = Total Outstanding	**$ 256,287**	**$ 163,045**	**$ 93,242**					
MHR-076	$ 25,110	$ -	$ 25,110	7/2/2010	7/1/2030		6/25/2013	0.0%
MHR-087	$ 19,930	$ 4,260	$ 15,670	9/30/2010	9/1/2030		9/23/2030	0.0%
MHR-088	$ 21,124	$ -	$ 21,124	9/30/2010	10/1/2030		9/24/2030	0.0%
MHR-083	$ 26,232	$ 26,232	$ -	10/8/2010		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-089	$ 3,474	$ -	$ 3,474	10/29/2010	11/1/2030		10/22/2030	0.0%
MHR-086	$ 21,778	$ 21,778	$ -	11/29/2010		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-093	$ 24,390	$ 24,390	$ -	2/28/2011	6/1/2016	Paid Off	2/18/2031	0.0%
MHR-092 (Grant)	$ 12,100	$ 12,100	$ -	2/28/2011			n/a	n/a
MHR-090	$ 16,770	$ 16,770	$ -	3/14/2011	4/1/2031	Paid Off	3/8/2031	0.0%
MHR-094	$ 25,020	$ 25,020	$ -	4/4/2011	4/1/2031	Paid Off	3/29/2031	0.0%
MHR-085	$ 22,449	$ 9,900	$ 12,549	5/14/2014	7/1/2014		7/1/2029	0.0%
MHR-096 (Grant)	$ 11,120	$ 11,120	$ -	4/21/2011			n/a	n/a
MHR-095	$ 26,790	$ 11,475	$ 15,315	6/28/2011	4/1/2015		4/1/2031	0.0%
Year 2011								
8 = Total # Loans/Grants								
3 = Total Outstanding	**$ 170,407**	**$ 111,986**	**$ 58,421**					
MHR-098	$ 22,293	$ -	$ 22,293	7/21/2011	8/1/2031		7/13/2031	0.0%
MHR-100	$ 18,858	$ 18,858	$ -	9/20/2011	6/1/2017	Paid Off	9/14/2016	0.0%
MHR-101	$ 26,182	$ 26,182	$ -	11/9/2011	12/1/2031	Paid Off	11/2/2016	0.0%
MHR-102	$ 6,386	$ 6,386	$ -	12/19/2011		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-099	$ 19,414	$ -	$ 19,414	12/30/2011	1/1/2031		12/21/2031	0.0%
MHR-107	$ 27,300	$ 27,300	$ -	1/10/2012		Short Sale		0.0%
MHR-103	$ 24,974	$ 8,260	$ 16,714	1/11/2012	8/1/2017		1/5/2017	0.0%
MHR-105/to MHR-162	$ 25,000	$ 25,000	$ -	5/14/2012	6/1/2022	Sub-Ordinatec	5/8/2017	0.0%
Year 2012								
9 = Total # Loans/Grants								
5 = Outstanding Loans	**$ 106,977**	**$ 27,714**	**$ 79,263**					
MHR-106	$ 28,913	$ -	$ 28,913	8/28/2012	9/1/2022		8/21/2022	0.0%
MHR-112	$ 12,230	$ -	$ 12,230	2/27/2013	3/1/2033		2/20/2033	0.0%
MHR-113	$ 17,850	$ -	$ 17,850	12/8/2012	12/1/2032		12/4/2032	0.0%
MHR-114 (Grant)	$ 1,696	$ 1,696	$ -	7/18/2012			n/a	n/a
MHR-117	$ 10,174	$ 10,174	$ -	6/17/2013		Paid Off		0.0%
MHRS-01	$ 7,150	$ 7,150	$ -	9/27/2012		Paid Off		0.0%
MHRS-05	$ 10,022	$ -	$ 10,022	9/18/2012	10/1/2032		9/11/2032	0.0%
MHRS-06	$ 10,248	$ -	$ 10,248	9/27/2012	12/1/2017		9/20/2017	0.0%
MHRS-07	$ 8,694	$ 8,694	$ -	9/11/2012	12/1/2017		9/5/2017	0.0%

Return to Agenda

Major Home Repair & Sewer Loans (MHRS) - continued

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan / Grant Amount	Total Principal & Interest Paid / Other	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Status	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2013								
8 = Total # Loans/Grants								
3 = Total Outstanding	**$ 144,408**	**$ 87,876**	**$ 56,532**					
MHR-118	$ 27,921	$ 27,921	$ -	10/16/2013	10/10/2018	Paid Off	10/10/2018	0.0%
MHR-119	$ 11,969	$ 11,969	$ -	7/1/2013		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-120	$ 15,100	$ 15,100	$ -	11/22/2013	1/1/2014	Paid Off	12/1/2033	0.0%
MHR-121 (Grant)	$ 8,457	$ 8,457	$ -	9/6/2013			n/a	n/a
MHR-122 (Grant)	$ 12,597	$ 12,597	$ -	10/3/2013			n/a	n/a
MHR-123	$ 24,938	$ 4,938	$ 20,000	3/6/2014	5/1/2014		5/1/2034	0.0%
MHR-124	$ 31,238	$ 6,894	$ 24,344	4/14/2014	8/1/2014		8/1/2034	0.0%
MHR-091	$ 12,188	$ -	$ 12,188	1/23/2014	8/17/2034		8/17/2015	0.0%
Year 2014								
5 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 72,979**	**$ 62,648**	**$ 10,331**					
MHR-126	$ 11,140	$ 11,140	$ -	9/22/2014	12/1/2014	Paid Off	1/12/2034	0.0%
MHR-127	$ 12,558	$ 12,558	$ -	2/5/2015		Paid Off		0.0%
MHR-128	$ 14,014	$ 3,683	$ 10,331	1/14/2015	4/1/2015		3/1/2035	0.0%
MHR-129	$ 24,497	$ 24,497	$ -	12/30/2014	3/1/2015	Paid Off	3/1/2035	0.0%
MHRS-04	$ 10,770	$ 10,770	$ -	1/29/2015	4/1/2015	Paid Off	4/1/2035	0.0%
Year 2015								
1 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Outstanding Loans	**$ 37,144**	**$ 8,322**	**$ 28,822**					
MHR-132	$ 37,144	$ 8,322	$ 28,822	12/22/2015	2/1/2016		1/1/2036	0.0%
Year 2016								
6 = Total # Loans/Grants								
3 = Total Outstanding	**$ 129,356**	**$ 82,087**	**$ 47,269**					
MHR-133	$ 25,000	$ 25,000	$ -	8/16/2016	8/1/2036	Paid Off	7/1/2036	0.0%
MHR-135	$ 28,303	$ 5,168	$ 23,135	12/9/2016	2/1/2017		1/1/2037	0.0%
MHR-136	$ 10,702	$ 10,702	$ -	12/5/2016	1/1/2037	Paid Off	1/1/2037	0.0%
MHRS-09	$ 12,724	$ 3,456	$ 9,268	12/19/2016	2/1/2017		1/1/2037	0.0%
MHRS-10	$ 37,761	$ 37,761	$ -	12/19/2016	2/1/2017	Paid Off	1/1/2037	0.0%
MHR-138	$ 14,866	$ -	$ 14,866	1/20/2017	12/1/2037		12/31/2037	0.0%
Year 2017								
4 = Total # Loans/Grants								
2 = Total Outstanding	**$ 72,322**	**$ 42,385**	**$ 29,937**					
MHRS-08	$ 8,243	$ -	$ 8,243	6/15/2017	6/1/2037		6/1/2037	0.0%
MHRS-11	$ 23,289	$ 23,289	$ -	6/19/2017	8/1/2017	Paid Off	7/1/2037	0.0%
MHR-137	$ 28,225	$ 6,531	$ 21,694	11/15/2017	12/1/2037		11/1/2037	0.0%
MHR-145	$ 12,565	$ 12,565	$ -	11/16/2017	1/1/2037	Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2018								
9 = Total # Loans/Grants								
6 = Total Outstanding	**$ 181,800**	**$ 35,931**	**$ 145,869**					
MHR-140	$ 14,779	$ 14,779	$ -	1/29/2018	1/1/2038	Paid Off	1/29/2038	0.0%
MHR-142	$ 9,405	$ -	$ 9,405	1/29/2018	1/1/2038		1/29/2038	0.0%
MHR-146	$ 23,625	$ -	$ 23,625	2/16/2018	2/1/2038		2/16/2038	0.0%
MHR-149	$ 5,701	$ 5,701	$ -	2/6/2018	2/1/2038	Paid Off	2/1/2038	0.0%
MHR-150	$ 5,201	$ -	$ 5,201	1/11/2018	1/1/2038		1/11/2038	1.0%
MHR-151	$ 12,686	$ 12,686	$ -	2/16/2018	3/1/2018	Paid Off	3/1/2038	1.0%
MHR-147	$ 15,000	$ 1,715	$ 13,285	7/28/2018	7/1/2038		7/28/2038	0.0%
MHR-154	$ 70,203	$ 1,050	$ 69,153	11/29/2018	11/1/2038		11/29/2038	0.0%
MHR-162/MHR-105	$ 25,200	$ -	$ 25,200	12/6/2018	12/1/2038		12/6/2038	0.0%

Return to Agenda

Major Home Repair & Sewer Loans (MHRS) - continued
As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan / Grant Amount	Total Principal & Interest Paid / Other	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Status	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2019								
6 = Total # Loans/Grants								
5 = Total Outstanding	**$ 158,982**	**$ 42,163**	**$ 116,819**					
MHR-155	$ 22,442	$ 3,602	$ 18,840	2/28/2019	6/1/2019		5/1/2039	1.0%
MHR-158	$ 44,800	$ 465	$ 44,335	5/15/2019	8/1/2019		6/1/2039	1.0%
MHR-160	$ 36,736	$ 36,736	$ -	4/26/2019	6/1/2019	Paid Off	5/1/2039	1.0%
MHR-161	$ 33,595	$ 769	$ 32,826	5/8/2019	6/30/2019		6/1/2039	1.0%
MHR-164	$ 12,215	$ -	$ 12,215	2/13/2020	1/1/2039		1/1/2039	1.0%
MHR-165	$ 9,194	$ 591	$ 8,603	8/1/2019	8/1/2019		7/1/2039	1.0%
Year 2020								
4 = Total # Loans/Grants								
4 = Total Outstanding	**$ 99,994**	**$ 1,826**	**$ 98,168**					
MHR-163	$ 23,791	$ 1,826	$ 21,965	3/12/2020	3/1/2040		3/1/2040	1.0%
MHR-168	$ 30,500	$ -	$ 30,500	2/6/2020	2/1/2040		2/1/2040	0.0%
MHR-173	$ 3,440	$ -	$ 3,440	5/26/2020	5/26/2040		5/26/2040	0.0%
MHR-177	$ 42,263	$ -	$ 42,263	11/20/2020	11/1/2040		11/1/2040	1.0%
Year 2021								
8 = Total # Loans/Grants								
8 = Total Outstanding	**$ 411,988**	**$ 830**	**$ 411,158**					
MHR-170	$ 118,000	$ -	$ 118,000	5/12/2021	5/1/2041		5/1/2041	0.0%
MHR-172	$ 46,652	$ -	$ 46,652	3/8/2021	3/1/2041		3/1/2041	0.0%
MHR-175	$ 12,336	$ 788	$ 11,548	1/14/2021	1/1/2041		1/1/2041	1.0%
MHR-178	$ 17,000	$ -	$ 17,000	3/8/2021	3/1/2041		3/1/2041	0.0%
MHR-180	$ 30,000	$ -	$ 30,000	3/8/2021	3/1/2041		3/1/2041	0.0%
MHR-181	$ 60,000	$ 42	$ 59,958	9/7/2021	9/1/2041		9/1/2041	0.0%
MHR-183	$ 48,000	$ -	$ 48,000	9/7/2021	9/1/2041		9/1/2041	0.0%
MHR-184	$ 80,000	$ -	$ 80,000	9/3/2021	9/1/2041		9/1/2041	0.0%
Year 2022								
3 = Total # Loans/Grants								
3 = Total Outstanding	**$ 170,000**	**$ -**	**$ 170,000**					
MHR-185	$ 55,000	$ -	$ 55,000	4/5/2022	5/1/2042		5/1/2042	0.0%
MHR-186	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 100,000	5/23/2022	7/1/2042		7/1/2042	1.0%
MHR-193	$ 15,000	$ -	$ 15,000	5/26/2022	7/1/2042		7/1/2042	0.0%
Life-to-Date Total								
125 = Total # Loans/Grants								
60 = Total Outstanding	**$ 2,451,251**	**$ 999,882**	**$ 1,451,369**					

Return to Agenda

Down Payment Assistance Loans & Grants Detail:

Down Payment Assistance - Loans & Grants

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan/Grant Amount	Principal Payments & Other	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Status	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2000								
1 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 5,000**	**$ 5,000**	**$ -**					
DPA-001	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	12/5/2001		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2001								
11 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 51,622**	**$ 51,622**	**$ -**					
DPA-002	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	7/2/2001		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-004	$ 3,366	$ 3,366	$ -	8/28/2001		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-005	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	9/4/2001		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-006	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	9/20/2001		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-007	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	9/21/2001		Written Off		0.0%
DPA-008	$ 4,425	$ 4,425	$ -	10/18/2001		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-009	$ 3,973	$ 3,973	$ -	12/5/2001		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-012	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	1/25/2002		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-011	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	1/31/2002		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-013	$ 4,778	$ 4,778	$ -	2/28/2002		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-014	$ 5,080	$ 5,080	$ -	3/21/2002		Paid Off	2/1/2022	0.0%
Year 2003								
8 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 35,336**	**$ 35,336**	**$ -**					
DPA-015	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	8/1/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-016	$ 2,167	$ 2,167	$ -	8/20/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-017 (Grant)	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	n/a	12/3/2003			n/a	n/a
DPA-018 (Grant)	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	n/a	1/22/2004			n/a	n/a
DPA-020 (Grant)	$ 3,169	$ 3,169	n/a	2/17/2004			n/a	n/a
DPA-022 (Grant)	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	n/a	4/22/2004			n/a	n/a
DPA-021 (Grant)	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	n/a	4/29/2004			n/a	n/a
DPA-023 (Grant)	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	n/a	6/30/2004			n/a	n/a
Year 2004								
3 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 14,901**	**$ 14,901**	**$ -**					
DPA-024	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	9/2/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-025	$ 4,901	$ 4,901	$ -	9/28/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-026	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -	5/2/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2006								
1 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 7,000**	**$ 1,638**	**$ 5,362**					
DPA-027	$ 7,000	$ 1,638	$ 5,362	7/26/2006	7/17/2026		7/17/2026	0.0%
Year 2007								
2 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 8,700**	**$ 3,500**	**$ 5,200**					
DPA-029	$ 5,200	$ -	$ 5,200	2/28/2008	2/27/2028		2/27/2028	0.0%
DPA-030	$ 3,500	$ 3,500	$ -			Written Off		0.0%
Year 2008								
4 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 19,379**	**$ 19,379**	**$ -**					
DPA-032	$ 6,959	$ 6,959	$ -	11/21/2008		Written Off		0.0%
DPA-033	$ 2,550	$ 2,550	$ -	12/22/2008	2/18/2028	Paid Off	12/18/2028	0.0%
DPA-034	$ 6,995	$ 6,995	$ -	Short Sale		Written Off		0.0%
DPA-035	$ 2,875	$ 2,875	$ -	5/11/2009	4/27/2029	Paid Off	4/27/2029	0.0%

Return to Agenda

Down Payment Assistance - Loans & Grants (continued)

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan/Grant Amount	Principal Payments & Other	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Status	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2009								
5 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 23,791**	**$ 23,791**	**$ -**					
DPA-041	$ 7,000	$ 7,000	$ -	9/30/2009		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-042	$ 4,410	$ 4,410	$ -	10/9/2009	10/7/2029	Paid Off	10/7/2029	0.0%
DPA-044	$ 2,091	$ 2,091	$ -	11/30/2009		Paid Off		0.0%
DPA-046	$ 7,000	$ 7,000	$ -	5/12/2010		Paid Off	5/5/2030	0.0%
DPA-055	$ 3,290	$ 3,290	$ -	6/18/2010		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2010								
2 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 8,619**	**$ 7,000**	**$ 1,619**					
DPA-048	$ 1,619	$ -	$ 1,619	11/18/2010	10/29/2030		10/29/2030	0.0%
DPA-049	$ 7,000	$ 7,000	$ -	5/25/2011	5/16/2031	Paid Off	5/16/2031	0.0%
Year 2012								
1 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 2,250**	**$ -**	**$ 2,250**					
DPA-050	$ 2,250	$ -	$ 2,250	10/24/2012	10/16/2032		10/16/2032	0.0%
Year 2014								
1 = Total # Loans/Grants								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 3,364**	**$ 3,364**	**$ -**					
DPA-051	$ 3,364	$ 3,364	$ -	9/30/2014		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2022								
1 = Total # Loans/Grants								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 27,500**	**$ -**	**$ 27,500**					
DPA-059	$ 27,500	$ -	$ 27,500	4/28/2022	5/1/2052		5/1/2052	1.0%
Life-to-Date Total								
40 = Total # Loans/Grant								
5 = Total Outstanding	**$ 207,462**	**$ 165,531**	**$ 41,931**					

CDBG Loan Detail:

The City of Lakewood note receivable from Living Access Support Alliance (LASA) of $250,000 is for partial funding of the Client Services Center project. This is a 20 year deferred loan at zero interest.

CDBG Entitlement Loan - Living Access Support Alliance Loan (LASA)

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan/Grant Amount	Total Principal Paid	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
2013-01	$ 250,000	$ -	$ 250,000	6/2/2014	7/23/2023	6/2/2034	0.0%
Life-to-Date Total							
1 = Total # Loans							
1 = Outstanding	**$ 250,000**	**$ -**	**$ 250,000**				

Return to Agenda

HOME:

In accordance with HOME federal regulations, expenditures for the HOME program have primarily focused investment in the creation of, maintenance of, or acquisition of affordable housing for low and moderate income individuals. Programs funded include the Housing Rehabilitation Program (single-family homeowner rehabilitation), Down Payment Assistance, and the Affordable Housing Fund (investments primarily with Habitat for Humanity and various non-profit housing providers). The Housing Rehabilitation, Down Payment, and Affordable Housing Funds all have corresponding Revolving Loan Funds (RLF) established in accordance with HUD regulations, which allow for the recapture and reuse of loan funds for similar housing activities.

The HOME program is funded annually through the Lakewood and Tacoma HOME Consortium. The Consortium reimburses expenditures for the City of Lakewood's projects/programs, which include Housing Rehabilitation, Affordable Housing, and Home Down Payment Loans, to the City of Lakewood. The notes on these loans are held and tracked by the Lakewood and Tacoma HOME Consortium in Tacoma, and are not accounted for in Fund 190 CDBG.

HOME Housing Rehabilitation Loans As of June 30, 2022		
Program Year	**# of Projects**	**Original Amount**
2022	-	$ -
2021	-	$ -
2020	-	$ -
2019	-	$ -
2018	1	$ 82,718
2017	1	$ 37,432
2016	1	$ 74,611
2015	2	$ 88,697
2014	-	$ -
2013	1	$ 36,258
2012	4	$ 201,175
2011	2	$ 131,300
2010	3	$ 178,130
2009	6	$ 412,750
2008	7	$ 289,765
2007	3	$ 179,627
2006	7	$ 379,452
2005	7	$ 286,313
2004	10	$ 390,697
2003	11	$ 363,099
2002	5	$ 155,471
2001	3	$ 126,899
2000	1	$ 40,000
Total	**75**	**$ 3,454,394**

HOME Housing Rehabilitation Loan Detail:

HOME Housing Rehabilitation Loans

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan Amount	Loan Reduction	Net Loan Amount	Principal Paid & Write Offs	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Status	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2000										
1 = Total # Loans	**$ 40,000**	**$ -**	**$ 40,000**	**$ 40,000**	**$ -**					
LHR-001	$ 40,000	$ -	$ 40,000	$ 40,000	$ -	9/23/2002		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2001										
3 = Total # Loans	**$ 126,899**	**$ -**	**$ 126,899**	**$ 126,899**	**$ -**					
LHR-002	$ 49,979	$ -	$ 49,979	$ 49,979	$ -	7/23/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-004	$ 40,000	$ -	$ 40,000	$ 40,000	$ -	9/8/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-005	$ 36,920	$ -	$ 36,920	$ 36,920	$ -	9/16/2003		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2002										
5 = Total # Loans	**$ 155,471**	**$ 361**	**$ 155,110**	**$ 139,663**	**$ 15,447**					
LHR-003	$ 39,028	$ -	$ 39,028	$ 39,028	$ -	9/15/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-006	$ 50,000	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ -	7/22/2002		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-007	$ 30,735	$ -	$ 30,735	$ 30,735	$ -	9/23/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-008	$ 15,808	$ 361	$ 15,447	$ -	$ 15,447	2/28/2003	2/1/2023		2/28/2023	0.0%
LHR-011	$ 19,900	$ -	$ 19,900	$ 19,900	$ -	12/3/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2003										
11 = Total # Loans	**$ 363,099**	**$ 6,806**	**$ 356,293**	**$ 225,435**	**$ 130,858**					
LHR-009	$ 40,000	$ -	$ 40,000	$ -	$ 40,000	7/31/2003	4/1/2023		8/23/2025	0.0%
LHR-013	$ 35,328	$ -	$ 35,328	$ 35,328	$ -	9/1/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-020	$ 18,744	$ -	$ 18,744	$ 18,744	$ -	11/13/2003	11/1/2023	Paid Off	11/13/2023	0.0%
LHR-012	$ 68,321	$ -	$ 68,321	$ 68,321	$ -	10/19/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-019	$ 23,344	$ 2,100	$ 21,244	$ -	$ 21,244	12/18/2003	12/18/2023		12/18/2023	0.0%
LHR-016	$ 42,304	$ -	$ 42,304	$ 42,304	$ -	4/11/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-012B	$ 23,145	$ -	$ 23,145	$ 23,145	$ -	5/14/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-026	$ 28,760	$ 4,702	$ 24,058	$ -	$ 24,058	5/4/2004	5/1/2024		5/4/2024	0.0%
LHR-032	$ 13,473	$ -	$ 13,473	$ 13,473	$ -	6/21/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-014	$ 45,560	$ 4	$ 45,556	$ -	$ 45,556	6/1/2024	6/1/2024			0.0%
LHR-022	$ 24,120	$ -	$ 24,120	$ 24,120	$ -	6/7/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2004										
10 = Total # Loans	**$ 390,697**	**$ 1,849**	**$ 388,848**	**$ 287,690**	**$ 101,158**					
LHR-021	$ 34,100	$ 111	$ 33,989	$ -	$ 33,989	7/28/2004	7/1/2024		7/28/2024	0.0%
LHR-018/099X	$ 44,153	$ -	$ 44,153	$ 44,153	$ -	11/14/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-031	$ 13,072	$ -	$ 13,072	$ 13,072	$ -	12/20/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-025R	$ 54,015	$ 918	$ 53,097	$ 53,097	$ -	10/11/2004		Paid Off	10/11/2024	0.0%
LHR-030	$ 48,000	$ -	$ 48,000	$ 48,000	$ -	12/16/2004		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-039	$ 38,704	$ 489	$ 38,215	$ 38,215	$ -	3/30/2005	3/30/2025	Paid Off	3/30/2025	0.0%
LHR-027	$ 47,838	$ -	$ 47,838	$ 47,838	$ -	4/2/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-019B	$ 19,500	$ 214	$ 19,286	$ -	$ 19,286	4/29/2005	4/29/2025		12/27/2026	0.0%
LHR-041	$ 43,315	$ -	$ 43,315	$ 43,315	$ -	5/22/2007		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-028	$ 48,000	$ 117	$ 47,883	$ -	$ 47,883	6/6/2005	6/6/2025		6/6/2025	0.0%
Year 2005										
7 = Total # Loans	**$ 286,313**	**$ 248**	**$ 286,065**	**$ 170,696**	**$ 115,369**					
LHR-043	$ 41,480	$ -	$ 41,480	$ 41,480	$ -	11/8/2007		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-033	$ 33,752	$ -	$ 33,752	$ 33,752	$ -	8/29/2005		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-034	$ 52,577	$ 109	$ 52,468	$ 27,599	$ 24,869	8/23/2005	8/23/2025		8/23/2025	0.0%
LHR-038	$ 26,504	$ -	$ 26,504	$ 26,504	$ -	2/14/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-049	$ 65,000	$ -	$ 65,000	$ -	$ 65,000	6/1/2006	6/1/2026		6/1/2026	0.0%
LHR-047	$ 25,500	$ -	$ 25,500	$ -	$ 25,500	6/8/2006	6/8/2026		6/8/2026	0.0%
LHR-052	$ 41,500	$ 139	$ 41,361	$ 41,361	$ -	6/23/2006	6/23/2026	Paid Off	6/23/2026	0.0%
Year 2006										
7 = Total # Loans	**$ 379,452**	**$ 256**	**$ 379,196**	**$ 245,302**	**$ 133,894**					
LHR-050	$ 52,000	$ -	$ 52,000	$ 52,000	$ -	8/23/2006	1/1/2013	Paid Off	8/23/2026	0.0%
LHR-040	$ 42,420	$ -	$ 42,420	$ 42,420	$ -	10/4/2006		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-053	$ 73,910	$ -	$ 73,910	$ 73,910	$ -	10/24/2006		Written Off		0.0%
LHR-054	$ 47,570	$ -	$ 47,570	$ 47,570	$ -	1/31/2007	8/1/2017	Paid Off	1/31/2027	0.0%
LHR-055	$ 69,150	$ 17	$ 69,133	$ -	$ 69,133	1/31/2007	1/31/2026		1/31/2027	0.0%
LHR-057	$ 65,000	$ 239	$ 64,761	$ -	$ 64,761	3/29/2007	3/29/2027		3/29/2027	0.0%
LHR-060	$ 29,402	$ -	$ 29,402	$ 29,402	$ -	2/12/2009		Written Off		0.0%

Return to Agenda

HOME Housing Rehabilitation Loans

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan Amount	Loan Reduction	Net Loan Amount	Principal Paid & Write Offs	Loans Receivable	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Status	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2007										
3 = Total # Loans	**$ 179,627**	**$ 100**	**$ 179,527**	**$ 57,060**	**$ 122,467**					
LHR-062	$ 57,060	$ -	$ 57,060	$ 57,060	$ -	12/23/2009		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-058/087	$ 56,967		$ 56,967	$ -	$ 56,967	8/17/2007	8/17/2018		8/17/2027	0.0%
LHR-063	$ 65,600	$ 100	$ 65,500	$ -	$ 65,500	1/31/2008	2/1/2028		1/31/2028	0.0%
Year 2008										
7 = Total # Loans	**$ 289,765**	**$ 1,409**	**$ 288,356**	**$ 199,910**	**$ 88,446**					
LHR-066	$ 36,915	$ -	$ 36,915	$ 36,915	$ -	7/2/2010		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-068	$ 49,085	$ 248	$ 48,837	$ 48,837	$ -	10/10/2008	10/10/2028	Paid Off	10/10/2028	0.0%
LHR-071	$ 62,845	$ 668	$ 62,177	$ -	$ 62,177	10/10/2008	10/10/2028		10/10/2028	0.0%
LHR-070	$ 38,050	$ -	$ 38,050	$ 38,050	$ -	10/10/2008		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-072	$ 50,070	$ -	$ 50,070	$ 50,070	$ -	9/30/2010		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-069	$ 26,450	$ 181	$ 26,269	$ -	$ 26,269	2/24/2009	12/19/2028		2/24/2029	0.0%
LHR-073	$ 26,350	$ 312	$ 26,038	$ 26,038	$ -	4/10/2009	4/10/2029	Paid Off	4/10/2029	0.0%
Year 2009										
6 = Total # Loans	**$ 412,750**	**$ 6,127**	**$ 406,623**	**$ 225,857**	**$ 180,766**					
LHR-078	$ 65,000	$ 1,383	$ 63,617	$ 63,617	$ -	9/15/2009	9/15/2029	Paid Off	9/15/2029	0.0%
LHR-074	$ 59,525	$ 3,243	$ 56,282	$ -	$ 56,282	10/2/2009	10/2/2029		10/2/2029	0.0%
LHR-077	$ 83,100	$ -	$ 83,100	$ 83,100	$ -	11/9/2011		Paid Off		0.0%
LHR-076	$ 64,200	$ 307	$ 63,893	$ -	$ 63,893	11/6/2009	11/1/2029		11/6/2029	0.0%
LHR-080	$ 61,685	$ 1,094	$ 60,591	$ -	$ 60,591	12/17/2009	12/31/2029		12/17/2029	0.0%
LHR-082	$ 79,240	$ 100	$ 79,140	$ 79,140	$ -	2/16/2010	2/16/2030	Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2010										
3 = Total # Loans	**$ 178,130**	**$ 4,873**	**$ 173,257**	**$ 64,519**	**$ 108,738**					
LHR-081	$ 59,150	$ 1,631	$ 57,519	$ 57,519	$ -	1/31/2011	12/28/2030	Paid Off	1/31/2031	0.0%
LHR-085	$ 52,200	$ 3,242	$ 48,958	$ 7,000	$ 41,958	2/2/2011	2/18/2031		2/2/2031	0.0%
LHR-086	$ 66,780	$ -	$ 66,780	$ -	$ 66,780	5/5/2011	5/5/2031		5/5/2031	0.0%
Year 2011										
2 = Total # Loans	**$ 131,300**	**$ 3,854**	**$ 127,446**	**$ 2,200**	**$ 125,246**					
LHR-090	$ 47,500	$ 3,617	$ 43,883	$ 2,200	$ 41,683	4/5/2012	4/5/2032		4/5/2032	0.0%
LHR-091	$ 83,800	$ 237	$ 83,563	$ -	$ 83,563	5/8/2012	5/8/2032		5/8/2032	0.0%
Year 2012										
4 = Total # Loans	**$ 201,175**	**$ 3,693**	**$ 197,484**	**$ 72,542**	**$ 124,940**					
LHR-094	$ 34,500	$ 3,133	$ 31,367	$ 31,367	$ -	9/28/2012	9/28/2032	Paid Off	9/28/2032	0.0%
LHR-096	$ 50,000	$ 560	$ 49,442	$ -	$ 49,440	1/23/2013	1/29/2018		1/23/2033	0.0%
LHR-097	$ 75,500	$ -	$ 75,500	$ -	$ 75,500	2/20/2013	2/20/2033		4/20/2033	0.0%
LHR-095	$ 41,175	$ -	$ 41,175	$ 41,175	$ -	12/30/2014		Paid Off		0.0%
Year 2013										
1 = Total # Loans	**$ 36,258**	**$ -**	**$ 36,258**	**$ 20,584**	**$ 15,674**					
LHR-066R	$ 36,258	$ -	$ 36,258	$ 20,584	$ 15,674	8/27/2013	10/1/2013		8/27/2033	0.0%
Year 2015										
2 = Total # Loans	**$ 88,697**	**$ -**	**$ 88,697**	**$ 40,297**	**$ 48,400**					
LHR-099X/018	$ 15,947	$ -	$ 15,947	$ 15,947	$ -	12/29/2015	1/1/2016		12/29/2035	0.0%
LHR-100	$ 72,750	$ -	$ 72,750	$ 24,350	$ 48,400	9/28/2015	11/1/2015		9/28/2035	0.0%
Year 2016										
1 = Total # Loans	**$ 74,611**	**$ -**	**$ 74,611**	**$ 74,611**	**$ -**					
LHR-101	$ 74,611	$ -	$ 74,611	$ 74,611	$ -	8/26/2016	8/26/2036	Paid Off	7/1/2036	0.0%
Year 2017										
1 = Total # Loans	**$ 37,432**	**$ -**	**$ 37,432**	**$ 37,432**	**$ -**					
LHR-103	$ 37,432	$ -	$ 37,432	$ 37,432	$ -	1/3/2018	3/1/2018		2/1/2038	0.0%
Year 2018										
1 = Total # Loans	**$ 82,718**	**$ 7,718**	**$ 75,000**	**$ -**	**$ 75,000**					
LHR-104	$ 82,718	$ 7,718	$ 75,000	$ -	$ 75,000	7/28/2018	8/1/2038		8/1/2038	0.0%
Year 2021										
0 = Total # Loans	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**					
Life-to-Date Total										
75 = Total # Loans	**$ 3,454,394**	**$ 37,294**	**$ 3,417,102**	**$ 2,030,697**	**$ 1,386,403**					

Return to Agenda

Section 108:

The Section 108 program funds are used to fund large-scale, capital intensive economic development, housing, public facilities, and infrastructure and community development projects throughout Lakewood. This funding source most closely mirrors CDBG program regulations and requirements, in that, it must meet the national objective of serving low and moderate income individuals (primarily through the creation or retention of jobs for low and moderate income persons). Funding is to be awarded to qualifying projects as "gap funding" and is typically the final piece of the financing puzzle required to complete a project's budget. Funds are to be provided as loans with terms up to 20 years and carry standard underwriting and collateralization requirements. Section 108 loans require borrower (jurisdiction) to pledge current and future CDBG allocations as principal security for the loan guarantee with additional collateral security being provided to the City by the final borrower (business or end use).

In 2012, the City of Lakewood applied for and was allocated $2,888,000 in Section 108 Loan Guarantee funding from HUD. To be eligible for continuation of this loan program, the City must reapply every five years, which the City did not. If the City were to reapply, the City may be eligible for $2.03M as of August 1, 2022 (maximum loan amount is five times the current allocation of $553,819, less outstanding principal balances of $739,000). Changes in underwriting requirements and complexity, along with additional HUD charges and lower commercial borrowing rates were some of the determining factors to not reapply and pursue this financing source only as last resort.

Section 108 Loans

As of June 30, 2022

Loan ID #	Original Loan/Grant Amount	Total Principal Paid	Total Interest Paid	Loan Balance	Closing Date	First Payment Date	Maturity Date	Interest Rate
Year 2014								
1 = Total # Loans								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 700,000**	**$ 191,000**	**$ 142,351**	**$ 509,000**				
Curbside Motors	$ 700,000	$ 191,000	$ 142,351	$ 509,000	12/5/2014	8/1/2015	8/1/2034	4.25%
Year 2015								
1 = Total # Loans								
1 = Total Outstanding	**$ 310,000**	**$ 31,000**	**$ 75,065**	**$ 279,000**				
Living Access Support Alliance (LASA)	$ 310,000	$ 31,000	$ 75,065	$ 279,000	8/1/2015	8/1/2020	8/1/2034	4.25%
Year 2017								
1 = Total # Loans								
0 = Total Outstanding	**$ 141,000**	**$ 141,000**	**$ 6,349**	**$ -**				
City of Lakewood 108th Street	$ 141,000	$ 141,000	$ 6,349	$ -	8/31/2017	8/1/2018	8/31/2020	1.5% variable
Life-to-Date Total								
3 = Total # Loans								
2 = Total Outstanding	**$ 1,151,000**	**$ 363,000**	**$ 223,765**	**$ 788,000**				

On August 31, 2017, the City entered into a Contract Loan Guarantee with Housing Urban Development for the overlay project 108th Street. The loan amount is $141,000 to be paid with three years of CDBG entitlement funds. This was approved in the annual action plan and the note application. The security pledge is the City's full faith and credit. The interest rate is variable and is set by LIBOR. As of 9/30/2020 the outstanding principal balance for this loan is zero.

A Section 108 Loan in the amount of $700,000 was issued in 2014 for Curbside Motors Incorporated and another for $310,000 in 2015 for Living Access Support Alliance by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to the City. The outstanding combined principal balance as of June 30, 2022 of $788,000 is being repaid by a third party and, therefore, is not recognizable as debt on the City's long-term debt schedule or City's financials.

Return to Agenda

Loan Repayment by Program

The following table provides a schedule of loan repayments by program.

Loan Repayment by Program	2022	2023	2024	2025-2029	2030-2060
Major Home Repairs & Sewers	$ 10,900	$ 19,063	$ 19,383	$ 105,996	$ 1,296,026
Down Payment Assistance	1,053	1,404	1,404	2,076	35,994
CDBG LASA Entitlement Loan	-	-	-	-	250,000
Home Housing Rehab Loans	7,689	13,675	18,128	176,903	1,170,004
Section 108	49,000	50,000	53,000	300,000	336,000
Total	**$ 68,642**	**$ 84,142**	**$ 91,915**	**$ 584,975**	**$ 3,088,024**
	Average Annual Years 2025-2029			$ 97,496	
	Average Annual Years 2030-2060				$ 102,934

CDBG Fund Summary

The following tables provide the fund's financial information.

Fund 190 CDBG Balance Sheet As of June 30, 2022	
Assets:	
Cash	$ (74,095)
Due From Other Governments	100,156
Notes/Loan Receivable - CDBG Down Payment Assistance	41,931
Notes/Loan Receivable - CDBG Major Home & Sewer Repairs	1,451,368
Notes/Loan Receivable - CDBG LASA	250,000
Notes/Loan Receivable - Nisqually Tribe Contribution	-
Total Assets	**$ 1,769,360**
Liabilities:	
Accounts Payable	$ -
Retainage Payable	28,089
Payroll Payable	11,830
Interfund Loan Payable	-
HUD DPA Checking Interest	159
Total Liabilities	**$ 40,078**
Fund Balance (Restricted)	**$ 1,729,282**
Total Liabilities & Fund Balance	**$ 1,769,360**

Fund 190 CDBG Summary	Year-to-date through June 30, 2022			
	Beginning Balance	Revenue	Expenditure	Fund Balance
CDBG	$ 1,506,761	$ 494,403	$ 279,131	$ 1,722,034
Nisqually Tribal	6,733	515	-	7,248
Total	**$ 1,513,494**	**$ 494,918**	**$ 279,131**	**$ 1,729,282**
CDBG	**$ 1,506,761**	**$ 494,403**	**$ 279,131**	**$ 1,722,034**
Administration	**-**	**82,954**	**87,024**	**(4,070)**
Administration - FFY 2021	-	82,954	82,954	-
Administration - Revolving Program Income		-	4,070	(4,070)
Physical Improvements	**-**	**26,581**	**26,581**	**-**
Phillips Rd. Sidewalks	-	26,581	26,581	-
Housing Programs	**1,256,761**	**225,110**	**5,768**	**1,476,104**
Major Home Repair/Sewer *(1)*	1,256,761	217,097	229,113	1,244,745
Emergency Assistance Displaced Resident	-	5,076	5,076	-
Admin of HOME Programs	-	321	321	-
Major/DPA Revolving Loans, Interest, Fees		2,616	(228,742)	231,359
Affordable Housing	**250,000**	**-**	**-**	**250,000**
CDBG Loan	250,000	-	-	250,000
CARES - CVD 1 & CVD 3 Programs	**-**	**159,421**	**159,421**	**-**
Program - Mortgage Assistance	-	159,421	159,421	-
CDBG Department of Commerce - LASA CVD 2	**$ -**	**337.00**	**337**	**$ -**
Administration	-	-	-	-
Affordable Housing	-	337	337	-
HOME	**$ -**	**-**	**-**	**$ -**
Administration	-	-	-	-
Housing Rehabilitation	-	-	-	-
Affordable Housing - TBRA & Other	-	-	-	-
NISQUALLY & OTHER	**$ 6,733**	**$ 515**	**$ -**	**$ 7,248**
Emergency Assist Displaced Residents	**441**	**-**	**-**	**441**
Emergency Assist Displaced Residents	441	-	-	441
Minor Home Repairs	**6,292**	**515**	**-**	**6,807**
Minor Home Repairs	6,292	515	-	6,807
Total	**$ 1,513,494**	**$ 494,918**	**$ 279,131**	**$ 1,729,282**

(1) Rev/Exp Difference $12,016 Retainage Not Billed

Fund 191 Neighborhood Stabilization Program

The purpose of this fund is to account for the revenues and expenditures associated with the Federal Neighborhood Stabilization Program. The NSP was established for the purpose of stabilizing communities that have suffered from foreclosures and abandonment. The NSP1 program provides funds to purchase and redevelop foreclosed and abandoned residential properties and/or structures. The NSP3 program provides a third round of neighborhood stabilization grants to all states and select governments on a formula basis. Revolving funds are used to pay for program costs.

In January 2020, the City met with the Washington State Department of Commerce to close out NSP1 funds. If the City has any NSP1 funds after five years of close out date, the City may reprogram unspent funds with no restrictions. This means, the City could use the funds for abatements, set up a housing loan program similar to CDBB/HOME without all the federal requirements, or even put funds back to the General Fund.

Neighborhood Stabilization Program	Year-to-date through June 30, 2022			
	Beginning Balance	Revenue	Expenditure	Ending Balance
Neighborhood Stabilization Program 1	$ 240,528	$ 35,907	$ 2,743	$ 273,692
Neighborhood Stabilization Program 3	14,148	-	-	14,148
Total	**$ 254,676**	**$ 35,907**	**$ 2,743**	**$ 287,840**

Return to Agenda

Fund 192 South Sound Military Communities Partnership

The purpose of this fund is to account for the revenues and expenditures associated with the Federal Office of Economic Adjustment Grant Program, which provides grants to assist communities with the alleviation of socioeconomic effects that may result from military base closures and realignments. This fund also accounts for all activity associated with the South Sound Military Communities Partnership (SSMCP). The following table provides a financial summary of the SSMCP and associated programs (OLDCC Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation, formerly Office of Economic Adjustment).

South Sound Military Communities Partnership	2022	
	Annual Budget	Actual YTD June
Operating Revenues:		
SSMCP Participation - City of Lakewood	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
SSMCP Participation - Others	177,500	168,500
Contributions & Donations	-	2,500
Total Operating Revenues	**$ 227,500**	**$ 221,000**
Operating Expenditures:		
Personnel	244,799	118,237
Supplies	-	2,857
Other Services & Charges	15,000	18,290
Total Operating Expenditures	**$ 259,799**	**$ 139,384**
Subtotal Operating Revenues Over/(Under) Uses	**$ (32,299)**	**$ 81,616**
Other Sources:		
Tactical Tailor Building Acquisition:		
Local Grant - Pierce County	530,000	530,000
State Grant - Department of Commerce	768,133	768,133
State Grant - Department of Commerce (State Capital Budget)	490,000	490,000
Federal Grant - Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment Grant [1]	5,100,000	4,989,837
Tactical Tailor Lease & Other Reimbursements[2]	593,802	58,938
Subtotal	**7,481,935**	**6,836,908**
For Future NCZ Purchases		
State Grant - Department of Commerce (Legislative)	1,400,000	-
Subtotal	**1,400,000**	**-**
OLDCC Grant - JBLM Growth Management		
Federal Grant - Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation (OLDCC)[3]	139,907	125,082
Subtotal	**139,907**	**125,082**
Total Other Sources	**$ 9,021,842**	**$ 6,961,990**
Other Uses:		
Tactical Tailor Building Acquisition:		
Local Grant - Pierce County	530,000	530,000
State Grant - Department of Commerce	768,133	768,133
State Grant - Department of Commerce (State Capital Budget)	490,000	490,000
Federal Grant - Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment Grant [1]	5,100,000	5,069,089
Tactical Tailor Lease & Other Reimbursements[2]	593,802	527,662
Subtotal	**7,481,935**	**7,384,883**
For Future NCZ Purchases		
State Grant - Department of Commerce	1,400,000	-
Subtotal	**1,400,000**	**-**
OLDCC Grant - JBLM Growth Management		
Federal Grant - Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation (OLDCC) [3]	139,907	125,082
Subtotal	**139,907**	**125,082**
Total Other Uses	**$ 9,021,842**	**$ 7,509,965**
Subtotal Other - Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ -**	**$ (547,975)**
TOTAL SOURCES	**$ 9,249,342**	**$ 7,182,990**
TOTAL USES	**$ 9,281,641**	**$ 7,649,349**
Total - Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ (32,299)**	**$ (466,359)**
Beginning Balance	**$ 32,299**	**$ 32,299**
Ending Balance	**$ -**	**$ (434,060)**

(1) Source: $30,911 Due Diligence is prior year revenue and $79,251 Attorney Fees Non-reimbursable.
Uses: $30,911 Due Diligence is prior year expenditure.
(2) The total interfund loan is $593,801 and will be repaid by Tactical Tailor lease payments.
(3) A bid award came in less than anticipated.

Fund 196 American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA)

On March 12, 2021, President Biden signed the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA). Per Title IX Part 8 Subtitle M of the act, ARPA allocates funds to states, counties and cities for their use to mitigate the effects of COVID-19 has had on their government's revenue and operations as well as their citizens

ARPA funds total $1.9 trillion, of which $350 billion is allocate to states and local governments. The State portion of the funding is $195 billion of which $1.25 billion minimum is distributed equally among the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The remaining state portion is distributed according to a formula that takes into account each state's share of unemployed individuals.

The local portion of the funding totals $130 billion, which is equally divided between cities and counties. For cities, $45.5 billion of the $65 billion will be allocated to metropolitan cities (population over 50,000) utilizing a modified formula and the remaining amounts for smaller jurisdictions (population under 50,000) will be allocated according to population share but will not exceed 75% of their most recent budget. For counties, the $65 billion is allocated based on the county share of population. Counties that are CDBG recipients will receive the larger share between the population based on CDBG formula.

As a metropolitan city, Lakewood was allocated $13.77 million in ARPA funds. Funds will be disbursed in two traunches, each 50% ($6.88M). The City received the first disbursement in August 2021 and the second disbursement in August 2022 (second distribution cannot occur earlier than 12 months after the first distribution).

Eligible uses include:

- (A) to respond to the public health emergency with respect to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) or its negative impacts, including assistance to households, small businesses, and nonprofits, or aid to impacted industries such as tourism, travel, and hospitality;
- (B) to responds to workers performing essential work during the COVID-19 public health emergency by providing premium pay to eligible workers of the State, territory, or Tribal / local government that are performing such essential work, or by providing grants to eligible employers that have eligible workers who perform essential work;
- (C) for the provision of government services to the extent of the reduction in revenues of such State, territory, or Tribal/local government due to the COVID-19 public health emergency relative to revenues collected in the most recent full year of the State, territory, or Tribal / local government prior to the emergency; or
- (D) to make necessary investments in water, sewer, or broadband infrastructure.

ARPA funds are one-time monies, and commensurate with City financial policies, should only be used for one-time purposes versus ongoing operations. The additional administrative support needed to administer ARPA funds will depend on the scope and number of grants or programs the City Council directs to be established.

The entire program funds are budgeted in the year the City Council approved the program even though the program may span over multiple years. The rationale for this is to account for the programs on a project length basis. Unspent funds will be carried over to the following year and unspent funds after that will roll over into the next year through 2026, which is the year in which all ARPA funds must be spent or returned to Treasury.

Per Treasury, the funds may accumulate interest, which the City may keep and use at its discretion. The plan is to bring forward the accumulated interest earned for City Council consideration (for example, to use on other ARPA related programs or transfer to the General Fund) at a later date. Life-to-date interest earnings as of June 30, 2022 totals $9,595.

Life-to-date ARPA activity and budgeted program details are provided in the sections that follow.

Return to Agenda

Program	Recipient/Subaward	Budget			Actual		
		Program Cost	5% Direct Admin	Total	2021	2022	Total
Total - Category 1 Public Health		**$ 30,360**	**$ -**	**$ 30,360**	**$ 1,098**	**$ 2,035**	**$ 3,133**
HR Temporary Staffing for COVID Tracing 12/1/2021-06/30/2022	City of Lakewood	30,360	-	30,360	1,098	2,035	3,133
Total - Category 3 Services to Disproportionately Impacted Communities:		**1,273,112**	**63,656**	**1,336,768**	**133,420**	**130**	**133,551**
Pierce County BIPOC Business Accelerator Contribution	Pierce County Economic Dev	500,000	25,000	525,000	99,250	-	99,250
Lakewood Community Services Advisory Board (CSAB) 1% Funds Career Team Workforce Training (2 years)	Clover Park School District	137,662	6,883	144,545	-	130	130
Warriors of Change	CPSD Communities in Schools	68,450	3,423	71,873	34,170	-	34,170
Habitat for Humanity Boat Street Project	Habitat for Humanity	242,000	12,100	254,100	-	-	-
Rebuilding Together South Sound	Rebuilding Together South Sound	325,000	16,250	341,250	-	-	-
Total - Category 6 Revenue Replacement:		**5,573,802**	**244,273**	**5,818,075**	**1,164,756**	**957,620**	**2,122,376**
Aspen Court (Purchase & Emergency Shelter Operation for 2 Yrs)	Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)	1,000,000	50,000	1,050,000	1,000,000	-	1,000,000
LPD Body Cameras Purchase of Cameras & Video Storage	City of Lakewood	98,044	4,900	102,944	98,044	-	98,044
LPD Body Cameras Operations	City of Lakewood	284,045	14,202	298,247	15,815	94,002	109,817
Emergency Services Alert & Warning System	Emergency Management	13,331	667	13,998	1,065	9,836	10,901
West Pierce Fire & Rescue	West Pierce Fire & Rescue	230,000	11,500	241,500	-	94,658	94,658
City Website and Multilingual Services	City of Lakewood	35,000	1,750	36,750	1,046	5,000	6,046
Youth Employment Program	Northwest Youth Corp	84,000	4,200	88,200	-	316	316
City Reader Boards	City of Lakewood	320,000	16,000	336,000	-	-	-
Tacomaprobono Housing Justice (2022-2023)	Tacomaprobono	450,000	22,500	472,500	-	34,675	34,675
Boys & Girls Club (2002-2026)	Boys & Girls Club	226,070	11,304	237,374	-	-	-
YMCA Child & Teen Services Programs (2002-2026) Child Care, Summer Day Camp, Afterschool Club	YMCA	390,000	19,500	409,500	-	-	-
YMCA Child & Teen Services Programs (2002-2026) Summer Learning Academies	YMCA	157,500	7,875	165,375	-	-	-
YMCA Child and Teen Services Programs (2002-2026) Water Safety/Swimming Lessons, Youth Sports, Art Classes, Gymnastics	YMCA	150,000	7,500	157,500	-	-	-
Municipal Court Technology Improvements	City of Lakewood	135,000	6,750	141,750	-	54,976	54,976
City Hall HVAC Air Handlers & Bipolar Ionization	City of Lakewood	500,000	25,000	525,000	-	5,146	5,146
Handwashing Stations at Parks without Restrooms	City of Lakewood	75,000	3,750	78,750	-	-	-
City Hall Space Evaluation	City of Lakewood	100,000	5,000	105,000	-	6,281	6,281
LPD Retention Bonus	City of Lakewood	637,500	31,875	669,375	-	607,864	607,864
Indirect Administrative Cost (Including ARPA Coordinator & Finance)	City of Lakewood	688,312	-	688,312	48,786	44,868	93,654
Grand Total		**$6,877,274**	**$307,929**	**$7,185,200**	**$1,299,275**	**$ 959,785**	**$2,259,061**

Note:

- The entire program funds are budgeted in the year the City Council approved the program even through the program may span over multiple years. The rationale for this is to account for the programs on a project length basis. Unspent funds will be carried over to the following year (2022) and unspent funds after that will roll over into the next year through 2026, which is the year in which all ARPA funds must be spent or returned to Treasury.
- Per Treasury, the funds may accumulate interest, which the City may keep and use at its discretion. The plan is to bring forward the accumulated interest earned for City Council consideration (for example, to use on other ARPA related programs or transfer to General Fund) at a later date. Life-to-date interest earnings as of June 30, 2022 totals $9,595.
- Fiscal Recovery Funds must be used in eligible use categories specified in the American Rescue Plan Act and implemented in the Interim Final Rule. Over the past year these have been adjusted to provide substantial flexibility for each jurisdiction to meet local needs.

Program Details

Category 1 – Public Health

HR Temporary Staffing for COVID Tracing – Total Budget $30,360
(Program Cost $30,360 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $0)
Human Resources is responsible for tracking employees who test positive and/or are exposed to COVID-19 and working with affected employees to comply with state COVID protocols. The administrative requirements have resulted in an unanticipated increased workload. This funding would cover the costs for a temporary HR Assistant who would handle the COVID-19 related work between December 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $3,133:
For City of Lakewood personnel performing COVID tracing.

Category 3 – Services to Disproportionately Impacted Communities

Pierce County BIPOC Business Accelerator Contribution – Total Budget $525,000
(Program Cost $500,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $25,000)
Partnership opportunity -- Entrepreneurial & Technical Assistance with focus Opportunities. The County Council has set aside $5M of their ARPA funds toward this initiative with the caveat that they receive matching funds from cities, non-profits and the business community. During the CARES process the County with thousands of businesses and saw some gaps and opportunities to grow entrepreneurism and help Black, Indigenous and People of color (BIPOC) communities and small and micro businesses grow their companies. Programs will have a county-wide focus to include: growing entrepreneurism; BIPOC; structured cohort opportunities; and tailored individual opportunities. Resources will go to training, technical resources needed by businesses, innovation grants to help with seed money funding, financial reporting programs and mentors/navigators to help the businesses learn to use the tools. Success measures include the number of businesses launched and growing wealth in our communities.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $99,250
$90,000 for Cohort Training for City of Lakewood Businesses – Completion of 6 weeks of in class training for 9 businesses:

- In Focus Productions (Veteran, Women & Minority Owned)
- Undeniable Bajinya (Women & Minority Owned)
- Chaskas LLC (Women & Minority Owned)
- Naked Face Cosmetics (Veteran, Women & Minority Owned)
- Imperial Cleaners (Women & Minority Owned)
- Kyoto Japanese Restaurant (Minority Owned)
- Lakewood Bubble Island Inc (Women & Minority Owned)
- Vihaco Inc USA (Minority Owned)
- Yes Nails Enterprise LLC (Minority Owned)

$9,250 for Matching Grant Award for Small Business Economic Assistance:

- Naked Face Cosmetics

Lakewood Community Services Advisory Board (CSAB) 1% Funds – Total Budget $144,545
(Program Cost $137,662 + 5% Direct Admin Fee $6,883)
Allocate 1% per year in 2022 and 2023 to support human service needs. CASB members concur with the Lakewood's Promise Advisory Board that the two human services strategic initiatives (workforce development and youth mental health) are critical investments to address changes that have been exacerbated by COVID-19 pandemic. CASB recommends allocating half of the 1% allocation to the Lakewood Thrives workforce development initiative that is now being managed by Career TEAM, and half towards youth mental health. The CSAB board will need additional time working with partners to form a recommendation for a youth mental health investment. The City will work with the Clover Park School District, Communities in Schools, Lakewood's Promise, and the Lakewood Youth Council.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $130

Warriors of Change – Total Budget $71,873
(Program Cost $68,450 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $3,423)
The Clover Park School District (CPSD) is providing funding for school – staff and teachers, facilitator costs, and the contract with Quantum Learning. CPSD requesting funding from the City of Lakewood for Communities in Schools of Lakewood portion of the Warriors Change Program and cash incentives for student participants.

ARPA program funds total $68,450 and will provide:

$40,000 Student end-of-program incentives (80 students @ $500/each)
$8,000 Cohort-Mentor stipends (8 college age students @ $1,000/each)
$4,800 Administration costs for managing students and mentors (10%)
$9,150 Summer Program Coordinator costs (2 months -> 2 weeks planning + 6 week program)
$6,500 Summer Site Coordinator costs (2 months)
$68,450 Total Program Costs

Note: The Warriors of Change 2021 is the pilot program of a 6-week leadership development project-based learning experience for Clover Park High School rising seniors, with the hope that the program can grow to expand and serve more students for futures year.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $34,170
$34,170 to Communities in Schools of Lakewood

- $14,090 for Program personnel costs
- $14,520 for Students and alumni stipend/incentives
- $4,800 for Administration
- $760 for Other/supplies

Habitat for Humanity Boat Street Project – Total Budget $254,100
(Program Cost $242,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $12,100)
Provide for off-site construction costs including sanitary sewer extension, water main extension and hydrants, storm drainage, joint utility trench, and public street work (paving sidewalk, traffic control, etc.)

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $0

Rebuilding Together South Sound - Total Budget $341,250
(Program Cost $325,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $16,250)
Provide funds to operate a Rebuilding a Healthy Neighborhood (RaHN) Program for 1 to 2 years in each of the 4 neighborhoods that the City of Lakewood has identified as specific neighborhoods in need of attention with regards to safe and healthy housing (Tillicum/Woodbrook, Springbrook, Lakeview, and Monte Vista areas). Some Rebuilding Together Affiliates have had a much better success rate when they focus on one neighborhood for two consecutive years. Other affiliates have had good results with a single year focus in neighborhoods. The cost per neighborhood is $65,000. The $325,000 would provide for $65,000/year for 5 years. A 5-year span would allow for a RaHN event in either each of the 4 neighborhoods plus an additional neighborhood or select 2 neighborhoods for 2-year programs and 1 neighborhood for a single year program.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $0

Category 6 – Revenue Replacement

Aspen Court – Total Budget $1,050,000
(Program Cost $1,000,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $50,000)
This provides for the City's conditional funding of $1 million in capital needs to be used in combination with funds from the City of Tacoma and Pierce County, by Low Income housing Institute (LIHI) to purchase the building and pay associated costs of closing. $700,000 will be conditionally committed as an acquisition bridge loan, and $300,000 will be committed as a deferred loan as permanent financing. The City understands that LIHI is seeking to leverage State Department of Commerce Funding through their Rapid Capital Housing Acquisition program in the amount of $7,000,000. A portion of these funds will be used to repay the City's bridge loan. The City's funding amount is subject to change based on final project capital and operating costs. If there are decreases in development costs or increases in other projected capital revenue sources, the City

and other public funders explicitly reserve the right to decrease the final subsidy award to the minimum level needed. The conditional funding is subject to: the reservation of 12 emergency shelter beds for Lakewood individuals; approval of the final project development and operations budget; consistency with the City of Lakewood 5-Year 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and FY2021 Consolidated Annual Action Plan (approved); Income and Affordability levels of the Multi-Family Lending term sheet; and additional City of Lakewood requirements will be identified as further details become available regarding the project's construction costs, operational costs, and timelines for conversion from an enhanced shelter to permanent supportive housing. The conditional commitment does not cover all federal, state, and local requirements, nor all the terms that will be included in loan documents including legal rights and obligations.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $1,000,000
For City of Lakewood's contribution to capital needs.

LPD Body Cameras Purchase of Cameras & Video Storage – Total Budget $102,944
(Program Cost $98,044 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $4,900)
Purchase of 80 body cameras (includes cameras, docking stations, software with training and 5-year service plan). Total estimated 1-time cost for cameras and video storage of $336,304 is funded in part with State police reform funding of $238,260.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $98,044
Total cost is $354,805 funded by:

$98,044 ARPA
$238,260 State Legislative Funding for Police Reform
$18,501 Federal Seizure

For purchase of 82 body cameras, 68 docks and remote storage and support.

LPD Body Cameras Operations – Total Budget $298,247
(Program Cost $284,045+ 5% Direct Admin Cost $14,202)
Funds to support Year 2021 and 2022 operations. Includes Records Specialist 1.0 FTE beginning August 2021 and Associate Attorney 1.0 FTE beginning in January 2022.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $109,817
For City of Lakewood personnel costs.

Emergency Services Alert & Warning System – Total Budget $13,998
(Program Cost $13,331 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $667)
Funds for annual subscription. Lakewood is a part of a coalition that provides emergency management services to Lakewood, University place, West Pierce Fire and Rescue and Steilacoom (joining coalition in January 2022). The coalition is evaluating its own alert and warning system. The system would allow the coalition to send emergency messages via reverse 911 to landlines and/or to any cell phone within the alert boundary. It would also allow for residents to subscribe for routine messages from the City.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $10,901

- $1,065 for Program personnel costs
- $9,836 for Professional services

West Pierce Fire & Rescue - Total Budget $241,500
(Program Cost $230,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $11,500)
Funds to improve 2 items of the emergency management program. They are: 1) update WPFR's Department Operations Center (DOC) and backup DOCS to better communicate with the City and stakeholders during times of emergency or disaster, including technology to hold virtual meetings. Cost of technology upgrades at 4 fire stations total $200,000. Also, $10,000 for HAM radios for similar level of capabilities as the City to be able to communicate seamlessly if phone and internet fail during an emergency; and 2) Translation of basic emergency messages into additional languages to better serve the community. WPFR would serve as lead on this project for the Emergency Management Coalition. Cost to translate emergency messages into the top 4 languages utilized in the fire district is approximately $20,000.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $94,658

- Professional Services to West Pierce Fire & Rescue

City Website and Multilingual Services – Total Budget $36,750
(Program Cost $35,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $1,750)
Implementation of transition software and comprehensive overhaul of the City's website for usability improvements.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $6 046

- $5,409 For City of Lakewood personnel costs
- $198 for Website translation services
- $439 For Multimedia software.

Youth Employment Program – Total Budget $88,200
(Program Cost $84,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $4,200)
To provide a more traditional Youth Corp work crew program for the 2022 summer season. The 12-week program would include hands on work throughout the City as well as leadership and employment readiness training. The program including estimated costs involves: 2 recreation leaders $25,000; 8 youth workers $57,000; and fuel and program supplies $1,000.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $316
For City of Lakewood personnel costs.

City Reader Boards – Total Budget $336,000
(Program Cost $320,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $16,000)
Funds to purchase 2 reader boards at $160,000 each. Considerations for locations of the reader boards include: average daily traffic count; whether location is at a stop light; competition for attention (are there too many other signs in the area?); access to right-of-way for installation; and zoning.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $0

Tacomaprobona Housing Justice (2022-2023) – Total Budget $472,500
(Program Cost $450,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $22,500)
Funds to provide personnel (staff attorney 1.0 FTE / Paralegal 1.0 FTE) and support for expanded outreach materials (paper publications, videos, increased targeting of vulnerable populations, translation). Their goals are: 1) provide direct representation to clients prior to eviction matters being filed in court; 2: provide legal services in other areas that directly impact housing security, such as legal financial obligation reconsideration, criminal records sealing and relicensing; and 3) provide additional resources to increase general community outreach and education, focusing on communities of color. Tacomaprobono's Housing Justice Project can do the essential work of keeping evictions off records with funding for additional staff attorneys to represent Lakewood residents prior to cases being filed. Previously, the organization was able to use other funds to support this work for Lakewood residents. Pierce County has funded their staff to handle pre-eviction filing cases in rural areas of the county, excluding the City of Tacoma, City of Lakewood, and other more urban municipalities. In late 2021, when Right to Counsel was certified in Pierce County, Tacomaprobono's Housing Justice Project will not have the funding or staff to assist Lakewood renters who receive an eviction notice. With additional staff, Tacomaprobono would be able to assist City of Lakewood residents and prevent evictions from ever being filed by responding to the case immediately. Their attorneys would negotiate with landlords to remedy the underlying issue, leading to a complete resolution or additional time to move out – both of which eliminate the need for a landlord to proceed with litigation. This is crucial to keep evictions off records, preventing homelessness and promoting long term housing security. American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds would fill the gap in services that, if left unfunded, will detrimentally impact the City's residents and communities of color by displacing thousands of renters and increasing the homelessness crisis.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $34,675

- Contract to Tacomaprobona for personnel costs, lease, telephone and internet services, office and computer supplies, advertising/marketing, outreach, insurance, travel, and litigation expenses

Boys & Girls Club Teen Service Programs (2022-2026) – Total Budget $237,374
(Program Cost $226,070 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $11,304)
Funds to provide Teen Service Programs ("Teen Late Nights", "Teen Mental Health First Aid", "Talk Saves Lives") (5 years)

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $0

2021-105 YMCA Child and Teen Care Service Programs (2022-2026) – Total Budget $732,375
(Program Cost $697,500 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $34,875)
Note – YMCA budget is overstated by $37,000. For correct allocation is used for this reporting.

Funds to provide Child and Teen Service Programs as follows:

- Child Care, Summer Day Camp, Afterschool Club – Total $409,500
  (Program Cost $390,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $19,500)
- Summer Learning Academies – Total $165,375
  (Program Cost $157,500 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $7,875)
- Water Safety/Swimming Lessons, Youth Sports, Art Classes, Gymnastics – Total $157,500
  (Program Cost $150,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $7,500)

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $0

Municipal Court Technology Improvements –Total Budget $141,750
(Program Cost $135,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $6,750)
The funds provide for the following: replace existing audio solution with technology to include wireless microphones, handheld and lapel microphones; implement wireless content sharing providing real time collaboration during court proceedings; replace existing overhead speakers with new units to eliminate any overhead feedback or squeal; replace existing amplifiers, signal processors and mixing hardware; build the system around digital audio recordings software; implement new video solution to include cameras, digital display screens; remote streaming capacity along with local recording options; implement new video solution which provides enhanced streaming capability, numerous recording and archival options for long term storage of court proceedings and provide online; remove services and court proceedings for the public; add assisted listing technology; and comply with all state and federal guidelines pertaining to COVID-19.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $54.976
- $54,976 Computer hardware

City Hall HVAC Air Handlers and Bipolar Ionization – Total Budget $525,000
(Program Cost $500,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $25,000)
Funds to provide for the replacement City Hall air handlers that are near their end of life resulting in a more energy efficient HVAC system. In addition, an air cleaning bipolar ionization system to reduce exposure risks would be installed similar to that funded for West Pierce Fire and Rescue with CARES funding in 2020. The system would reduce or eliminate recirculating pathogens throughout City Hall in public and employee spaces. Upgrading the HVAC system at City Hall would be a first step to meet the WA state clean building energy efficiency legislation requirements, as outlined in the following webpage link https://apps.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=194-50. This legislation is required on all government buildings over 50,000 sq. ft. and work needs to be done by 2028. City Hall is the only City of Lakewood building that qualifies. By doing this assessment work early (by July 2022), Lakewood could apply for a $100,000 grant to help offset our actual upgrade work to meet code compliance. Cost savings will be calculated during the City Hall assessment regarding what needs to be done (HVAC, lighting, etc.) The City has established an energy efficient portfolio manager that connects our facility to our various utility companies; the City will contract with its current HVAC service provider, McDonald Miller, to help create the entire energy efficiency plan. Any new equipment and upgrades will be more energy efficient than what we have now and will help us reduce energy costs. More detailed costs, anticipated energy savings and information will be available once the City proceeds with the project. The City Council will be provided status updates.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $5,146
For City of Lakewood personnel costs.

Handwashing Stations at City Parks without Restrooms – Total Budget $78,750
(Program Cost $75,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $3,750)
Funds to install hand washing stations at five City parks (Oakbrook, Active, Washington, Edgewater, and Wards Lake) without bathrooms to reduce the spread of COVID-19.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $0

City Hall Space Reconfiguration Study – Total Budget $105,000

(Program Cost $100,000 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $5,000)

The City is looking to reconfigure the City's operations in City Hall to just the 1st and 2nd floors in order to open up the 3rd floor for other uses. This recommended ARPA funding would be for the first phase, hiring a space expert to analyze how to organize the first two floors. Actual remodeling and relocation would be handled in future phases with as-yet unidentified funds. The proposed phase 1 plan does not include anticipating the creation of a vet center in City Hall; however, the idea is to consolidate space needed for City services (to one or two floors) to allow "other" types of businesses / agencies to use or lease space. Note - There is an additional $30,000 budgeted for this study in the Property Management Fund, for a total of $135,000 ($130,000 Project Cost + $5,000 Direct Admin Fee).

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $6,281

For City of Lakewood personnel costs.

Lakewood Police Department Retention Bonus – Total Budget $669,375

(Program Cost $637,500 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $31,875)

Funds to create a one-time retention bonus funded with ARPA funds. The offer to existing officers would be a $7,500 lump sum payment (current 85 officers equates to $637,500) in exchange for a commitment to remain with the department for three years. That amount of time should allow LPD to hire enough people to get staffing back up to a level commensurate with the services we are expected to provide. The City is expecting a large number of police officer retirements to occur in the near future. When the Police Department was established in 2004, many of the officers who were hired from other agencies with approximately the same number of years' experience; early to mid-career. Since then, LPD is now expecting earlier than originally planned retirements, and others looking to leave the state altogether. New impacts from COVID-19, such as when we have to periodically quarantine an employee due to potential exposure to the disease (e.g., prisoner transport, family exposure) has exacerbated the need to find new officers quickly. LPD has been maintaining shift coverage with the use of overtime; however, that is not an optimal solution. Most members of the special operations unit have been reassigned to patrol and the remaining to conducting background checks on applicants. This has not been enough to maintain full staffing levels in patrol and LPD projects overtime will continue to rise. This not only has a budgetary impact, it also puts significant stress on officers, leading to burnout and exasperating the issue. In addition, LPD may need to pull officers from ancillary units like neighborhood policing and property crimes unit to help support basic staffing in patrol. This could require the termination of the Western State Hospital Community Partnership contract and the Behavioral Health Contact Team in order to reassign the affiliated neighborhood police officers (NPOs). LPD also continues to aggressively recruit both new police officers and laterals as quickly as the state civil service process allows. We recently implemented incentives to attract lateral applications; however, we also need to provide incentives to entice current officers from not leaving and/or retiring early.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $607,864

For 81 police officers retention bonuses.

Indirect Administration – Finance 1.0 FTE and ARPA Coordinator 1.0 FTE – Total Budget - $688,312

(Program Cost $688,312 + 5% Direct Admin Cost $0)

Limited Term Positions ending 12/31/2026 or sooner – TBD

Positions in support of ARPA Program. Add grant accountant position to ensure compliance with financial accounting, auditing and interim/annual reporting. Grant requirements, including accounting and reporting, have become increasing complex, as well as accessing/utilizing the various specific granting agency systems and portals. Add ARPA coordinator position to assist ARPA Program Manager in various ARPA program requirements, serve as Lakewood ARPA Resident Navigator and point of contact for Lakewood businesses seeking ARPA assistance available from County, State and Federal levels. The City's Resident Navigator program referral assistance to city residents seeking ARPA rent/mortgage and utility funds, child care services, workforce training, medical and behavioral health services, and/or emergency shelter.

Expenditure Status – Total LTD $93,654

For personnel costs not associated specifically with a program, specifically ARPA Coordinator and ARPA Manager (Long Range/Strategic Planning Manager) and Finance support (Deputy City Manager & Assistant Finance Director).

Return to Agenda

PARKS, RECREATION & COMMUNITY SERVICES

Parks Sales Tax

On September 19, 2000, Pierce County voters approved the ballot measure to increase local sales taxes by one-tenth of 1 percent. A sales and use tax equal to one-tenth of one percent (0.001%) within Pierce County provides funds to acquire, improve, rehabilitate, maintain, or develop regional and local parks; to improve, rehabilitate, maintain or expand accredited zoo, aquarium and wildlife preserves pursuant to RCW 82.14.400(6); for community-based housing; and to implement the creation of a zoo and aquarium advisory authority.

The tax was proposed as a funding mechanism for Tacoma Metro Park District (the zoo). The money collected is shared 50-50 between the Parks District and the cities not contained in the District and the county.

Parks Sales Tax

Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 60,456	$ 69,579	$ 69,278	$ 74,948	$ 5,369	7.7%	$ 5,670	8.2%
Feb	50,467	56,065	54,565	62,429	6,364	11.4%	7,864	14.4%
Mar	44,623	55,579	52,039	62,902	7,323	13.2%	10,863	20.9%
Apr	45,035	71,262	62,828	74,138	2,876	4.0%	11,310	18.0%
May	47,381	61,925	57,486	71,104	9,179	14.8%	13,618	23.7%
Jun	59,234	68,116	63,481	69,193	1,077	1.6%	5,712	9.0%
Jul	62,205	71,499	68,036	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	61,563	68,146	65,225	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	59,547	65,867	64,718	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	62,021	68,303	66,568	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	59,711	65,083	62,854	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	58,837	68,037	62,923	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 307,196**	**$ 382,526**	**$ 359,676**	**$ 414,714**	**$ 32,188**	**8.4%**	**$ 55,038**	**15.3%**
Total Annual	**$ 671,080**	**$ 789,461**	**$ 750,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021):		7.0%						

Return to Agenda

Cost Recovery – Parks, Recreation & Community Services

In May 2016, the City Council adopted a set of revised financial policies to include cost recovery. The following is an excerpt of the cost recovery policy as it relates specifically to target cost recovery for parks programs/services:

> *Target Cost Recovery Level for Parks Programs/Services.* The cost recovery policy applies to the following parks and recreation programs/services: recreation services; special events and community gathering; senior services; and all parks. The following should be considered when determining pricing levels: The higher the community benefit, the higher the General Fund subsidy level and the higher the individual benefit, the lower the General Fund subsidy level. The overall cost recovery goal for all parks programs and services should be 45%.

Included in the revenues is the parks sales tax, which is allocated to the various parks programs/functions based on prorated share of expenditures. The growth in parks sales tax has helped reduce the general fund subsidy amount.

The table below provides historical annual and current budgeted annual and actual subsidy and recovery ratio by program.

Parks, Recreation & Community Services *Year-to-Date through June*							
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	
Program	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Recreation:							
Revenues	$ 261,919	$ 259,786	$ 273,458	$ 152,314	$ 221,709	$ 383,841	$ 136,432
Expenditures	$ 465,267	$ 405,448	$ 467,173	$ 297,314	$ 359,860	$ 530,236	$ 190,503
General Fund Subsidy	$ 203,347	$ 145,662	$ 193,715	$ 145,000	$ 138,151	$ 146,395	$ 54,071
Recovery Ratio	56%	64%	59%	51%	62%	72%	72%
Senior Services:							
Revenues	$ 146,667	$ 135,302	$ 164,863	$ 120,842	$ 80,541	$ 142,766	$ 44,680
Expenditures	$ 222,371	$ 236,627	$ 246,535	$ 180,325	$ 153,114	$ 262,737	$ 82,773
General Fund Subsidy	$ 75,703	$ 101,325	$ 81,672	$ 59,483	$ 72,573	$ 119,971	$ 38,093
Recovery Ratio	66%	57%	67%	67%	53%	54%	54%
Parks Facilities:							
Revenues	$ 196,875	$ 207,559	$ 216,183	$ 211,344	$ 249,287	$ 223,792	$ 146,294
Expenditures	$ 465,075	$ 500,484	$ 544,466	$ 424,886	$ 499,351	$ 607,936	$ 327,754
General Fund Subsidy	$ 268,200	$ 292,925	$ 328,283	$ 213,542	$ 250,064	$ 384,144	$ 181,460
Recovery Ratio	42%	41%	40%	50%	50%	37%	45%
Fort Steilacoom Park:							
Revenues	$ 229,551	$ 282,142	$ 298,997	$ 245,841	$ 329,182	$ 332,475	$ 149,517
Expenditures	$ 588,850	$ 672,444	$ 733,560	$ 619,238	$ 715,634	$ 903,888	$ 283,964
General Fund Subsidy	$ 359,299	$ 390,302	$ 434,563	$ 373,397	$ 386,452	$ 571,413	$ 134,447
Recovery Ratio	39%	42%	41%	40%	46%	37%	53%
Subtotal Direct Cost:							
Revenues	$ 835,013	$ 884,789	$ 953,501	$ 730,341	$ 880,719	$ 1,082,874	$ 476,923
Expenditures	$ 1,741,562	$ 1,815,003	$ 1,991,734	$ 1,521,763	$ 1,727,959	$ 2,304,797	$ 884,994
General Fund Subsidy	$ 906,549	$ 930,214	$ 1,038,233	$ 791,422	$ 847,240	$ 1,221,923	$ 408,071
Recovery Ratio	48%	49%	48%	48%	51%	47%	54%
Administration (Indirect Cost):							
Revenues	$ 87,032	$ 89,860	$ 94,133	$ 122,958	$ 154,319	$ 113,871	$ 86,435
Expenditures	$ 304,327	$ 301,174	$ 329,201	$ 341,371	$ 419,838	$ 412,571	$ 233,016
General Fund Subsidy	$ 217,295	$ 211,314	$ 235,068	$ 218,413	$ 265,519	$ 298,700	$ 146,581
Recovery Ratio	29%	30%	29%	36%	37%	28%	37%
Total Direct & Indirect Cost:							
Revenues	$ 922,045	$ 974,649	$ 1,047,634	$ 853,299	$ 1,035,038	$ 1,196,745	$ 563,358
Expenditures	$ 2,045,889	$ 2,116,177	$ 2,320,935	$ 1,863,134	$ 2,147,797	$ 2,717,368	$ 1,118,010
General Fund Subsidy	$ 1,123,844	$ 1,141,528	$ 1,273,301	$ 1,009,835	$ 1,112,759	$ 1,520,623	$ 554,652
Recovery Ratio	45%	46%	45%	46%	48%	44%	50%
					5-Year Average General Fund Subsidy (2017 - 2021)		$ 1,132,253
					5-Year Average Recovery Ratio (2017 - 2021)		46%

COVID-19 caused closure/event cancellation and participant capacity limitations in 2020 and 2021.

Note:
- Revenues includes Parks Sales
- Revenues for Administration (Indirect Cost) is the program's prorated share of Parks Sales Tax.
- Expenditures do not include Indirect overhead Cost allocation for finance, human resources, legal, legislative and executive functions.

Return to Agenda

Farmers Market

In 2020, State pandemic restrictions forced the City to move its traditional "Night Market" to Fort Steilacoom Park, which is more wide-open and suitable to social distancing guidelines. With this move, the event experienced increased vendor sales as local demand for fresh produce in a safe environment was stimulated during the lockdown. The market is open on Tuesdays, June 7 through August 30, from 2:00pm -7:00pm. The market features food trucks and local wine and beer in addition to local produce and handcraft. For the first time, this year the market will accept SNAP/EBT benefits.

Farmers Market Activity Year-to-date through March				
	2020	2021	2022	
Financial Information	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Revised Budget	YTD Actual
Sources:				
Vendor Fees	$ 15,896	$ 23,176	$ 15,000	$ 5,067
Grants	-	20,000	17,350	$ -
Sponsorships & Donations	9,025	11,000	31,000	$ 15,618
Lodging Tax	2,958	5,974	35,000	$ 31,825
Total Sources	**27,879**	**60,150**	**98,350**	**52,510**
Uses:				
Temporary Personnel	2,598	-	19,580	-
Office & Operating Supplies	-	7,814	4,100	4,886
Professional Services	-	12,047	34,000	16,591
Advertising	2,863	8,117	15,400	17,067
Printing & Binding	-	118	-	-
Travel & Training	-	-	570	300
Memberships & Dues	450	-	350	
Tourism & Promotion	2,958	3,477	-	-
Total Uses *	**8,869**	**31,573**	**74,000**	**38,843**
Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ 19,010**	**$ 28,577**	**$ 24,350**	**$ 13,667**

* Uses does not include regular employees personnel costs.

Market Sales and Attendance							
		Market Sales*			Estimated Attendance**		
Week/Month		2020	2021	2022	2021	2021	2022
1	May	$ 23,197	$ 48,184	$ -	1,988	4,130	-
2	May	26,116	50,352	-	2,239	4,316	-
3	Jun	29,549	46,726	59,144	2,533	4,005	5,069
4	Jun	32,649	23,439	53,967	2,798	2,009	4,625
5	Jun	33,475	47,606	61,935	2,869	4,081	5,308
6	Jun	31,958	28,545	43,761	2,739	2,447	3,750
7	Jul	31,751	37,982		2,721	3,256	
8	Jul	26,400	35,570		2,263	3,049	
9	Jul	19,983	39,248		1,713	3,364	
10	Jul	30,577	37,170		2,621	3,186	
11	Jul	-	-		-	-	
12	Aug	31,750	25,977		2,721	2,227	
13	Aug	26,399	30,983		2,263	2,656	
14	Aug	19,983	27,000		1,713	2,314	
15	Aug	30,577	25,000		2,621	2,143	
16	Sep	31,667	33,432		2,714	2,866	
17	Sep	30,444	34,275		2,609	2,938	
18	Sep	29,740	35,653		2,549	3,056	
19	Sep	29,150	38,721		2,499	3,319	
Total - YTD Jun		**$ 176,944**	**$ 244,852**	**$ 218,807**	**15,167**	**20,987**	**18,752**
Season Total		**$ 515,364**	**$ 645,864**	**$ 218,807**	**44,174**	**55,360**	**18,752**

** No market week of July 11 in 2020, 2021, and 2022.*

*** Estimated attendance assumes average sales of $35 per person and each person is accompanied by two other people, for a total family or group of three.*

Return to Agenda

Human Services Program

Since incorporation, the City has dedicated 1% of General Fund in for human services programs that support our most vulnerable populations and create conditions that enable people in need to access resources and support services which foster healthy and functional individuals and families where children thrive and achieve their full potential.

Agency	Program	2018 Actual	2019 Actual	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Allocation
	Total	**$ 344,707**	**$ 353,356**	**$ 329,605**	**$ 354,224**	**$ 390,000**
Access to Health & Behavior Health		**$ 42,500**	**$ 59,000**	**$ 54,005**	**$ 39,054**	**$ 41,500**
Community Healthcare	Primary Medical Care	-	20,000	15,000	14,000	14,000
Lindquist Dental Clinic for Children	Dental Care for Children	17,000	14,000	14,005	15,000	15,000
Pierce County Aids Foundation	Case Management	8,500	12,500	12,500	-	-
Pierce County Project Access	Donated Care Program	17,000	12,500	12,500	10,054	12,500
Emotional Supports and Youth Programming		**$ 88,923**	**$ 86,903**	**$ 85,973**	**$ 101,670**	**$ 135,000**
Asian Pacific Cultural Center	Promised Leaders of Tomorrow	-	-	-	20,000	20,000
Centerforce	Inclusion for Adult with Disabilities	-	10,000	10,000	-	-
Communities In Schools	After School Program	24,000	17,500	17,500	25,000	27,500
Lakewood Boys & Girls Club	After School Program	12,500	20,000	20,000	20,000	22,500
Pierce College	Computer Clubhouse	14,000	-	-	-	-
Pierce College / City of Lakewood (*)	Lakewood's Promise	19,923	21,403	25,664	17,964	25,000
Pierce County Aids Foundation	Oasis Youth Center	8,500	10,000	10,000	10,588	17,500
YMCA of Pierce & Kitsap Counties	Late Night Youth Programs	10,000	8,000	2,809	8,117	-
YMCA	Y on the Fly	-	-	-	-	22,500
Housing Assistance and Homelessness Prevention		**$ 41,000**	**$ 25,953**	**$ 29,000**	**$ 40,000**	**$ 40,000**
Catholic Community Services	Family Housing Network	16,000	11,953	15,000	14,000	14,000
Rebuilding Together South	Rebuilding Day & Year-Round Services	10,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Tacoma Rescue Mission	Adams Street Family Shelter	15,000	-	-	12,000	12,000
Crisis Stabilization and Advocacy		**$ 107,284**	**$ 106,500**	**$ 85,627**	**$ 68,000**	**$ 68,000**
Caring for Kids	Ready to Learn Fair & School Supplies	4,997	-	-	-	-
Greater Lakes Mental Health	Emergency Assistance	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Lakewood Area Shelter Association (LASA)	Client Services Center	22,500	18,750	3,555	-	-
Rebuilding Hope Sexual Assault Center	Therapy & Advocacy Programs	16,000	14,000	14,000	12,500	12,500
South Sound Outreach Services	Connection Center Utility Assistance	1,287	-	-	-	-
Springbrook Connections	Direct Services & Resouce Connections	-	-	-	12,500	12,500
Tacoma Community House	Victims of Crime Advocacy Program	12,500	18,750	13,072	-	-
YWCA Pierce County	Domestic Violence Services	25,000	30,000	30,000	18,000	18,000
Access to Food		**$ 65,000**	**$ 75,000**	**$ 75,000**	**$ 105,500**	**$ 105,500**
Emergency Food Network	Food Distribution	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Making a Difference Foundation	Eloise's Cooking Pot Food Delivery	-	-	-	15,500	-
Making a Difference Foundation	Lakewood Food Delivery Program	-	-	-	-	15,500
Nourish Pierce Co (Fish Food Banks)	Food Bank	25,000	20,000	20,000	25,000	-
Nourish Pierce Co	Nutritious Food for Families	-	-	-	-	25,000
St. Leo Food Connection	Children's Feeding Program	6,000	-	-	-	-
St. Leo Food Connection	Springbrook Mobile Food Bank	9,000	30,000	30,000	25,000	25,000
Tillicum Community Center	Emergency Services - Food	-	-	-	15,000	15,000

Return to Agenda

Fund 502 Property Management

The table below provides the operating costs of maintaining City Hall, Police Station and Sounder Station and 1-time property management expenditures.

Property Management Operating Expenditures *Year-to-date through June*				
			2022	
	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Sources:				
M&O Revenue	$ 702,611	$ 769,605	$ 748,917	$ 303,707
Interest Earnings/Misc	2,278	549	-	1,094
Replacement Reserves Collections	100,000	-	100,000	50,000
1-Time M&O/Capital Contributions	56,178	26,782	98,142	-
Total Sources	**$ 861,067**	**$ 796,936**	**$ 947,059**	**$ 354,801**
Operating Exp:				
City Hall Facility	**$ 374,899**	**$ 415,462**	**$ 406,354**	**$ 165,671**
Personnel	122,649	118,484	150,854	65,016
Supplies	21,762	27,064	35,810	14,163
Services	127,510	159,622	80,400	36,804
Utilities	102,978	110,292	139,290	49,688
Police Station	**$ 275,468**	**$ 294,848**	**$ 268,881**	**$ 119,821**
Personnel	66,397	56,654	85,661	33,318
Supplies	12,654	24,205	25,700	11,418
Services	82,857	97,543	66,390	26,481
Utilities	113,561	116,446	91,130	48,605
Sounder Station *	**$ 54,521**	**$ 59,844**	**$ 73,682**	**$ 19,309**
Personnel	13,279	11,769	16,532	6,126
Supplies	2,085	2,263	5,000	1,980
Services	33,156	42,276	52,150	9,609
Utilities	6,001	3,536	-	1,595
Subtotal - Operating Exp	**$ 704,889**	**$ 770,153**	**$ 748,917**	**$ 304,801**
Capital & Other 1-Time:				
City Hall Exterior Beam Painting	-	-	75,000	-
City Hall Parking Lot Improvements	-	-	10,000	-
City Hall Space Evaluation	-	-	30,000	-
City Wide Light Bulb & Battery Replacement Program	757	-	-	-
Police Firearms Range Equipment	-	9,822	35,178	-
Police Fuel System Modernization	-	-	30,000	-
Police Station Parking Lot Improvements	-	-	20,000	-
Police Station Window Security Film	7,178	-	-	-
PRCS Caretaker House Repairs	-	11,858	38,142	-
PRCS Front Street O& M Shop Security System Repairs	-	-	30,000	-
PRCS Front Street O&M New Fuel Tank and Paving of Washdown Station	-	-	160,000	-
Sound Transit Elevator Repair	-	14,924	-	-
Subtotal 1-Time/Capital	**$ 7,934**	**$ 36,604**	**$ 428,320**	**$ -**
Total Uses	**$ 712,823**	**$ 806,757**	**$ 1,177,237**	**$ 304,801**
Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ 148,244**	**$ (9,821)**	**$ (230,178)**	**$ 50,000**
Beginning Balance	**$ 436,058**	**$ 584,300**	**$ 574,478**	**$ 574,478**
Ending Balance	**$ 584,302**	**$ 574,479**	**$ 344,300**	**$ 624,478**

** Reflects Sounder Station operating expenditures accounted for in Fund 502 Property Management.*

Return to Agenda

Fund 301 – Parks CIP

The Parks Capital Project Fund accounts for the receipts and disbursements related to the acquisition or construction of major park capital facilities with the exception of those facilities financed by proprietary and trust funds.

Fund 301 Parks CIP - As of June 30, 2022		2022 Budget	2022 Actual
Revenues:			
Grants		$ 9,796,355	$ 30,350
MVET		-	2,369
Interest/Other		-	7,119
Transfer In - Fund 001 General		647,500	647,500
Transfer In - Fund 104 LTAC		72,892	-
Transfer In - Fund 303 REET		624,500	624,500
Transfer In - Fund 401 SWM		206,277	-
	Total Revenues	**$ 11,347,524**	**$ 1,311,838**
Expenditures:			
301.0000	Unallocated	-	688
301.0003	Harry Todd Playground Replacement	204,281	5,700
301.0005	Chambers Creek Trail Planning	664,582	-
301.0006	Gateways	154,063	-
301.0014	Ft Steilacoom Park/South Angle Lane Parking & Elwood Fencin	93,569	41,773
301.0016	Park Equipment Replacement	72,625	8,039
301.0017	Park Playground Resurfacing	19,264	3,520
301.0018	Project Support	120,000	59,679
301.0019	Edgewater Dock	51,556	-
301.0020	Wards Lake Improvements	2,541,005	123,217
301.0022	Street Banners & Brackets Phase II	8,789	931
301.0027	American Lake Improvement (ADA, Playground)	2,235,182	3,650
301.0028	Oakbrook Park Improvements	50,000	-
301.0031	Fort Steailacoom Park Turf Infields	6,020,923	15,296
301.0032	Springbrook Park Expansion V	1,402,651	40,269
301.0034	Park Sign Replacement	210,000	-
301.0037	Seeley Lake Improvement Project	90,644	4,553
301.0038	Property Acquisition & Demolition (Near Washington Park)	55,000	-
301.0039	American Lake Park - North Parking Lot	314,777	85,079
301.0041	Parks Sign Design	20,000	-
301.0042	Downtown Park	100,000	-
301.0043	FSP - H-Barn Complex Restoration and Renovation	150,000	50,000
301.0044	Ward Lakes Building Demolition	50,000	2,721
301.0045	Colonial Plaza Up Lighting & Garry Oaks	15,000	-
	Total Expenditures	**$ 14,643,911**	**$ 445,114**
	Beginning Fund Balance	**$ 3,388,223**	**$ 3,388,223**
	Ending Fund Balance	**$ 91,834**	**$ 4,254,947**

Return to Agenda

Fund 303 Real Estate Excise Tax

Prior to January 1, 2020, the State of Washington levied a flat 1.28% real estate excise tax (REET) upon all sales of real estate under chapter 82.45 RCW. Beginning January 1, 2020 the state implemented a graduated tax scale based on the selling price ranging from 1.1% for the portion of sale that is $500,000 and less to 3.0% on the portion that is greater than $3M. The selling price thresholds listed above will be reviewed and adjusted every fourth year beginning July 1, 2022 based on the growth of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for shelter of 5.0%, whichever is less, rounded to the nearest $1,000. If the CPI growth is negative, the thresholds will remain unchanged.

This graduated scale applies only to the state portion of real estate excise tax. The locally imposed REET remains unchanged.

Chapter 82.46 RCW authorizes cities and towns to impose local real estate excise taxes on top of the state rate. The tax is calculated based on the full selling price, including the amount of any liens, mortgages and other debts given to secure the purchase. The City of Lakewood is planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) and enacted both the first ¼% and second ¼% tax, for a total of 0.50%.

Real estate excise taxes are typically the responsibility of the seller of the property, not the buyer, although the buyer is liable if the tax is not paid. However, sometimes the buyer pays some or all of the tax as part of the negotiated sale agreement. The Pierce County Treasurer collects the real estate excise tax and remits to the City on a monthly basis.

Real Estate Excise Tax
Year-to-date through June

Month	2020	2021	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 170,333	$ 219,089	115,632	$ 262,570	$ 43,481	19.8%	$ 146,938	127.1%
Feb	187,573	176,802	101,666	162,001	(14,801)	-8.4%	60,335	59.3%
Mar	166,651	231,280	114,924	1,250,177	1,018,897	440.5%	1,135,253	987.8%
Apr	169,105	314,889	146,504	266,777	(48,112)	-15.3%	120,273	82.1%
May	133,477	286,068	130,579	387,669	101,601	35.5%	257,090	196.9%
Jun	206,539	364,377	143,200	298,316	(66,061)	-18.1%	155,116	108.3%
Jul	254,238	265,602	146,207	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	201,397	315,485	132,876	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	243,682	698,559	180,804	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	454,960	828,032	244,349	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	814,336	524,688	218,084	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	640,825	332,161	256,729	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 1,033,678**	**$ 1,592,505**	**$ 752,505**	**$ 2,627,510**	**$ 1,035,005**	**65.0%**	**$ 1,875,005**	**249.2%**
Total Annual	**$ 3,643,117**	**$ 4,557,032**	**$ 1,931,554**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021):		17.1%						

Return to Agenda

The following tables summarize by month, the number of taxable and exempt real estate transactions, and lists major transactions (sales price of $1M and greater).

Transactions that are exempt from REET include (WAC 458-61A):

- Gifts;
- Inheritance of devise;
- Community property, dissolution of marriage or domestic partnership, legal separation, decree of invalidity;
- Tenants in common and joint tenants;
- Governmental transfers*;
- Condemnation proceedings;
- Bankruptcy;
- Transfers pursuant to deeds of trusts, foreclosure proceedings, executions of judgment, deeds in lieu of foreclosure, and contract forfeiture;
- Rescission of sale;
- Irrevocable trusts;
- Mere change in identity or form – family corporations and partnerships;
- Transfers where gain is not recognized under the Internal Revenue Code;
- IRS "tax deferred" exchange;
- Nominee;
- Clearing or exiting title, and additions to title;
- Mortgage insurers;
- Rerecord;
- Low income housing; and
- Developmentally disabled person-Housing-Transfers and Improvements.

** The transfer from a governmental is not subject to the tax. However, transfers to a governmental entity is generally subject to the tax, unless otherwise exempted (condemnation not subject to tax). Transfers to a governmental entity for a public purpose in connection with the development of real property by a developer when the transfer is required for plat approval are not subject to the real estate excise tax (example – a developer who deeds property to the city for streets and utilities).*

	Transaction Type			# of	Major Transactions - 2022		
Month	Exempt	Taxable	Total	Parcels	Description	Sales Price	Net Tax
Jan	55	84	139	148	General Merchandise Retail Trade 11626 TO 11634 Pacific Hwy So	$1,000,000	$4,950
					Midas Muffler Shop 9140 Gravelly Lake Drive	$1,075,000	$5,321
					Single Family Residence 7711 Bernese Road SW	$1,250,000	$6,188
					Lou's Automotive 8920 Gravelly Lake Dr SW	$1,350,000	$6,683
					Flett Creek Plaza Condo 7602 Bridgeport Way W Unit 1A	$1,400,000	$6,930
					Commercial Professional Services 4928 109th St SW	$1,400,000	$6,930
					Duplex Condo 22 Country Club Drive SW Unit E	$1,516,000	$7,504
					Single Family Residence 10213 Green Lane SW	$1,700,000	$8,415
					Multi Family Complex 12413 Bridgeport Way SW	$1,897,500	$9,393
					Tactical Tailor 2916 107th St S	$7,360,000	$36,432
Feb	43	70	113	119	Single Family Residence 11621 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$2,250,000	$11,138
Mar	58	92	150	161	Single Family Residence 12418 Harwood Cove Lane SW	$1,010,000	$5,000
					Land & Improvements Perkins II Building XXX 36th Ave Ct SW	$3,200,000	$15,840
					Vacant Land Use Sec Schools 7802 150th St SW	$9,700,000	$45,977
					Vacant Undeveloped Commercial Land 15102 WOODBROOK DR SW	$33,900,000	$160,681
					General Warehousing Storage 7530 150TH ST SW	$54,400,000	$257,848
					General Warehousing Storage 14802 Spring Street	$114,600,000	$543,188
Apr	66	95	161	178	Vacant Industrial Land xxx Sales Road S	$1,247,500	$6,175
					Single Family Residence 10837 Evergreen Terrace SW	$1,375,000	$6,806
					Single Family Condo 7201 Holly Hedge Lane SW	$1,570,000	$7,772
					Single Family Residence 11615 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,700,000	$8,415
					Brentwood Apts 3102 92nd St S	$2,362,000	$11,692
May	48	96	144	158	Single Family Residence 6520 Flanegan Road West	$1,050,000	$5,198
					Single Family Residence 9830 Dekoven Drive SW	$1,700,000	$8,415
					Centerforce 5204 Solberg Drive SW	$2,615,000	$12,944
					Bell Garden Apts 8810 John Dower Road SW	$3,846,400	$19,040
					Cottage Lane Apts 4711 115th St Ct SW	$7,188,000	$35,581
					Retail Center (Former Costco) 11013 Pacific Highway SW	$17,720,000	$87,714
Jun	31	109	140	147	Professional Services Building 5202 100th St SW	$1,150,000	$5,693
					Single Family Residence 11320 Military Road SW	$1,560,000	$7,722
					Single Family Residence 11013 Lagoon Lane SW	$1,950,000	$9,653
					Single Family Residence 11923 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$2,100,000	$10,395
					Commercial General Merchandise Retail 14902 Union Ave SW	$3,850,000	$19,058
Total YTD June	**301**	**546**	**847**	**911**		**$291,992,400**	**$1,400,687**

Return to Agenda

Month	Transaction Type			# of	Major Transactions - 2021		
	Exempt	Taxable	Total	Parcels	Description	Sales Price	Net Tax
Jan	54	81	135	143	Single Family Residence 128 Country Club Circle SW	$1,120,000	$5,544
					Condo 13140 Country Club Drive SW Unit 403	$1,425,000	$7,054
					Vacant Commercial Land & Improvements 7907 Washington Blvd SW	$1,500,000	$7,425
					Bridgeport Plaza 11001 to 10017 Bridgeport Way	$2,500,000	$12,375
					Americas Best Value Inn 4215 Sharondale St	$4,200,000	$20,790
					Industrial Land & Land Improvements 10720 26th Ave S	$5,553,000	$27,487
Feb	65	98	163	171	Woodbrook Food Center 14421 Woodbrook SW	$1,030,000	$5,099
					Dirk's Truck Repair 2421 110th St S	$1,200,000	$5,940
					Single Family Residence 8921 North Thorne Lane SW	$1,500,000	$7,425
					New Apartment Complex 14607 - 14619 Murray Rd SW	$1,750,000	$8,663
					NewDuplexes 8113 to 8133 John Dower Road SW	$1,760,500	$8,714
					Vacant Industrial Land 7402 150th St SW	$3,390,017	$16,781
Mar	56	99	155	158	Apartments 14405 to 14417 Union Ave SW	$1,521,440	$7,531
					Single Family Residence 12785 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,680,000	$8,316
					Single Family Residence 7235 Interlaaken Drive SW	$1,999,000	$9,895
					Herfy's Texaco Minimart & Laundry 12706 Bridgeport Way SW	$2,840,000	$14,058
Apr	56	121	177	189	Single Family Residence 6803 75th St W	$1,010,000	$5,000
					Darrelyn Apartments 3409 88th St S	$1,050,000	$5,198
					Single Family Residence 7817 Walnut St SW	$1,150,000	$5,693
					Single Family Residence 12230 Gravelly Lake Dr SW	$1,200,000	$5,940
					The Fairy Store Cinema Plaza Pad "D" 2202 84th St S	$1,350,000	$6,683
					Flett Creek Plaza Condo 7602 Bridgeport Way W Unit 1A	$1,658,800	$8,211
					Foothills Family Property 3612 100th St SW	$1,700,000	$8,415
					Single Family Residence 8019 N Thorne Ln SW	$2,229,000	$11,034
					Days Inn 9325 S Tacoma Way	$5,770,000	$28,562
May	74	116	190	202	Kentucky Fried Chcken 15116 Union Ave South	$1,500,000	$7,425
					Single Family Residence 13006 Avenue DuBois SW	$1,850,000	$9,158
					Single Family Residence 108 County Club Cir SW	$2,000,000	$9,900
					Single Family Residence 8201 North Thorne Lane SW	$2,650,000	$13,118
					Monta Vista Court Apts 3407 to 3411 92nd St S	$2,750,000	$13,613
Jun	50	120	170	181	Single Family Residence 31 Country Club Drive SW	$1,130,000	$5,594
					Single Family Residence 10501 Brook Lane SW	$1,149,000	$5,688
					Single Family Residence 7420 North St SW	$1,164,795	$5,766
					Westland Apts 6124 88th St SW	$1,305,000	$6,460
					Single Family Residence 12629 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,350,000	$6,683
					Single Family Residence 10311 Interlaaken Drive SW	$1,370,000	$6,782
					Condo 13140 Country Club Drive SW Unit 304	$1,450,000	$7,178
					Heritage Bank 8801 South Tacoma Way	$1,490,000	$7,376
					Maple Creek Retirement Home 10420 Gravelly Lake Drive	$3,181,260	$15,747
					Single Family Residence 11407 Gravelly Lake Drive	$3,550,000	$17,573
					Oak Terrace Apts 42 Thunderbird Parkway SW	$10,500,000	$51,975
Jul	71	118	189	201	Commercial Retail 12314 Pacific Highway SW	$1,000,000	$4,950
					Single Family Residence 14 Beach Lane SW	$1,338,000	$6,623
					Retail, Residential & Storage Space 5503 to 5495 Steilacoom Blvd SW	$1,500,000	$7,425
					Single Family Residence 85 Country Club Circ SW	$1,699,500	$8,413
					Gas Station Mini Mart 3701 Steilacoom Blvd SW	$1,900,000	$9,405
					Ponders Collision Center 12424 Pacific Highway SW	$3,911,169	$19,360
Aug	42	112	154	161	Single Family Residence 6708 70th St SW	$1,000,000	$4,950
					Commercial Vacant Land 6145 Steilacoom Blvd SW	$1,075,000	$5,321
					Single Family Residence 8719 North Thorne Ln SW	$1,362,000	$6,742
					Black Angus Restaurant 9905 Bridgeport Way SW	$1,450,000	$7,178
					Other Residential 8902 Frances Folsom St SW	$1,600,000	$7,920
					Commercial Vacant Land Panattoni XXX 47th Ave SW	$4,500,000	$22,275
					Commercial Retail 9522 to 9537 Gravelly Lake Dr SW	$10,375,000	$51,356
Sep	43	126	169	177	Duplex 11013 to 11013 B Lagoon Lane SW	$1,025,000	$5,074
					Melody Apts 4914 115th St Ct SW	$1,577,662	$7,809
					Villa Lane Village 10102 Bridgeport Way SW	$2,430,000	$12,029
					Custer Square Commercial Retail 7402 to 7406 Custer Rd W	$2,900,000	$14,355
					Evergreen Ridge Apts 12615 to 12623 Lincoln Ave SW	$2,916,225	$14,435
					Woodspring Suites Hotel 11329 Pacific Hwy SW	$19,042,000	$94,258
					Citizen and Oak Apts 5406 82nd St SW	$59,785,000	$295,936

Return to Agenda

Month	Transaction Type			# of Parcels	Major Transactions - 2021 (continued)		
	Exempt	Taxable	Total		Description	Sales Price	Net Tax
Oct	59	109	168	175	Single Family Residence 11440 Gravelly Lake Dr SW	$1,400,000	$6,930
					Vacant Commercial Land Star Lite 8327 South Tacoma Way	$1,400,000	$6,930
					Used Car Lot 8121 South Tacoma Way	$1,700,000	$8,415
					European Square 6108 Mt Tacoma Dr SW	$2,120,000	$10,494
					Lakewood Professional Center 7502 Lakewood Dr West	$2,415,000	$11,954
					Clover Creek Apts 12502 Addison St SW	$2,700,000	$13,365
					Steilacoom Blvd Plaza 8520 Steilacoom Blvd SW	$7,500,000	$37,125
					Lakewood You Store It 12611 Pacific Highway SW	$10,950,000	$54,203
					Curbsmart Storage 12117 Pacific Highway SW	$14,500,000	$71,775
					Wellstone Bridgeport Apts 12535 Bridgeport Way SW	$71,821,212	$355,515
Nov	59	109	168	176	Single Family Residence 11409 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,325,000	$6,559
					Single Family Resience 3411 South 90th St	$1,450,000	$7,178
					Retail Trade 9315 Gravelly Lake Dr SW	$1,500,000	$7,425
					Jack In the Box 8814 South Tacoma Way	$1,540,000	$7,623
					Single Family Residence 9908 Meadow Road SW	$1,695,000	$8,390
					Single Family Residence 13006 Avenue Dubois SW	$2,115,500	$10,472
					Chandelle Apts 3408 to 3412 South 90th St	$4,984,000	$24,671
					Somerset Gardens Apts 5110 Chicago Ave SW	$5,487,400	$27,163
					Grand Central Casino 10115 to 10117 South Tacoma Way	$8,250,000	$40,838
					The James Apts 4828 123rd St SW	$32,550,000	$161,123
Dec	60	105	165	181	Single Family Residence 11406 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,085,000	$5,371
					Single Family Residence 8815 Lake Steilacoom Point Rd SW	$1,200,000	$5,940
					Commercial Vacant Land 3515 82nd Street South	$2,000,000	$9,900
					Vacant Undeveloped Land XXX Country Club Lane SW	$3,000,000	$14,850
					Lakewood Village/Towne Center Apts 10240 Bridgeport Wy SW Ste 106	$9,266,750	$45,870
Total YTD Jun	**355**	**635**	**990**	**1,044**		**$90,476,812**	**$447,860**
Total Annual	**689**	**1,314**	**2,003**	**2,115**		**$406,818,230**	**$2,013,750**

Return to Agenda

Month	Transaction Type			# of	Major Transactions - 2020		
	Exempt	Taxable	Total	Parcels	Description	Sales Price	Net Tax
Jan	60	67	127	142	Apartment Complex 14405 to 14417 Untion Ave SW	$1,198,400	$5,932
					Crest Apartments 3276 South 92nd St	$1,199,000	$5,935
					Washington Oaks Apartments 15308 Washington Ave SW	$1,700,000	$8,415
					Carlyle Apartments 12721 47th Ave SW	$1,700,000	$8,415
					Clover Creek Apartments 12502 Addison St SW	$1,750,000	$8,663
					Eden Plaza 9312 South Tacoma Way	$3,280,000	$16,236
					Steilacoom Square 3865 Steilacoom Blvd SW	$4,612,500	$22,832
Feb	42	70	112	124	Auto Repair Services 4046 100th St SW	$1,400,000	$6,930
					Entertainment Bars 8920 South Tacoma Way	$1,890,000	$9,356
					Single Family Residence 7708 Walnut Street SW	$2,000,000	$9,900
					Gas Station Mini Mart 15408 Union Ave SW	$2,500,000	$12,375
					Western Inn 9920 South Tacoma Way	$7,170,000	$35,492
Mar	53	82	135	143	Single Family Residence 12746 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,625,000	$8,044
					Malibu Apts 4120 109th St SW	$2,093,000	$10,360
					Grand Cedars Apts 5226 to 5230 Chicago Ave SW	$2,820,000	$13,959
					Amber Court Apts 12809 Lincoln Ave SW	$3,080,000	$15,246
Apr	38	73	111	174	Land & Land Improvements 5400 Chicago Ave SW	$2,472,600	$12,239
					Single Family Residences 124xx - 125xx Springbrook Lane	$7,417,400	$36,716
May	40	72	112	118	Vincent Apartments 3313 to 3317 92nd St South	$1,200,000	$5,940
					Single Family Residence 11702 Madera Drive SW	$1,236,000	$6,118
					Single Family Residence 8904 Frances Folsom St SW	$1,403,000	$6,945
Jun	43	100	143	153	Vacant Undeveloped Land 8109 North Thorne Lane SW	$1,000,000	$4,950
					Single Family Residence 8911 North Thorne Lane SW	$1,010,000	$5,000
					Medical Office 5605 100th St SW STE A-D	$1,100,000	$5,445
					Islander Apts 10417 to 10423 112th St SW	$1,175,000	$5,816
					Apt 5810 to 5816 77th St West	$1,300,000	$6,435
					Single Family Residence 11507 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,872,500	$9,269
					Residential 6922 & 6918 146th St SW & 14714, 14704, 14601 Woodbrook Dr SW	$2,514,998	$12,449
Jul	59	103	162	174	Single Family Residence 11420 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,150,000	$5,693
					Single Family Residence 8925 Lake Steilacoom Point Road SW	$1,225,000	$6,064
					Vacant Industrial Land 7301 150th Street SW	$1,300,000	$6,435
					Apt Condo High Rise 13140 Country Club Drive SW Unit 303	$1,300,000	$6,435
					Auto Parking XXX 36th Ave Court SW	$2,500,000	$12,375
					Bell Garden Apartments 8810 John Dower Road SW	$2,644,000	$13,088
					Vacant Undeveloped Residential Land XXX Moreland Ave SW	$2,700,000	$13,365
					Boral Roofing 10920 Steele St S	$6,100,000	$30,195
Aug	41	95	136	138	Single Family Residence 9705 Lake Seilacoom Drive SW	$1,000,000	$4,950
					Single Family Residence 15 Lagoon Ln N	$1,150,000	$5,693
					Single Family Residence 8812 Frances Folsom St SW	$1,334,000	$6,603
					Single Family Residence 7308 Norh St S	$1,650,000	$8,168
Sep	53	98	151	165	Single Family Residence 7233 Interlaaken Drive SW	$1,050,000	$5,198
					Retail Trade 12612 Pacific Highway SW	$1,100,000	$5,445
					Single Family Residence 10807 Evergreen Terrace SW	$1,280,000	$6,336
					Single Family Residence 10007 Lake Steilacoom Drive SW	$1,300,000	$6,435
					Single Family Residence 9104 116th St SW	$1,300,000	$6,435
					Gas Station Mini Mart 7718 Bridgeport Way W	$1,500,000	$7,425
					Multi-Family Apts 110 Country Club Lane	$2,190,000	$10,841
					Duplex 8102 Sherwood Forest St SW	$2,348,400	$11,625
					Gas Station Mini Mart 8306 Tacoma Mall Boulevard	$5,250,000	$25,988
Oct	61	98	159	164	Single Family Residence 12617 Gravelly Lake Drive SW	$1,000,000	$4,950
					General Warehousing Storange 3003 107th St South	$1,100,000	$5,445
					Multi-Family Apts 6415 Steilacom Blvd SW	$1,317,500	$6,522
					Multi-Family Apts 11216 to 11230 Kline St SW	$1,450,000	$7,178
					Single Family Residence 8420 Woodholme Rd SW	$2,038,200	$10,089
					Professional Svcs Building 5712 Main St SW	$11,350,000	$56,183
					Vacant Industrial Land 3451 84th St South	$39,500,000	$195,525
Nov	48	91	139	153	Single Family Residence 48 Loch Lane SW	$1,025,000	$5,074
					Jack In the Box 8814 South Tacoma Way	$1,400,000	$6,930
					Precision Countertops 8201 Durango St SW	$1,630,000	$8,069
					Clover Meadows Apartments 12517 47th Ave SW	$3,272,250	$16,198
					Warehouse Condo 2624 112th St S	$5,550,000	$27,473
					Village at Seeley Lake Apts 9221 57th Ave S	$119,000,000	$589,050
Dec	66	119	185	217	Single Family Residence 10313 Interlaaken Drive SW	$1,000,000	$4,950
					General Warehousing Storage 3727 112th St SW	$2,600,000	$12,870
					General Merchandise Retail Trade 8016 Durango St SW	$2,950,000	$14,603
					Governmental Services 12811 Pacific Highway SW (DHS)	$5,573,000	$27,586
					Business Park 10029 South Tacoma Way	$18,231,250	$90,245
					Beaumont Apts 8609 82nd St SW	$62,116,500	$307,477
Total YTD Jun	**276**	**464**	**740**	**854**		**$63,719,398**	**$315,411**
Total Annual	**604**	**1,068**	**1,672**	**1,865**		**$387,194,498**	**$1,916,613**

Return to Agenda

Fund 103 Transportation Benefit District

$20 Vehicle Licensing Fee *Year-to-date through June*								
					Over / (Under)			
			2022		2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual		2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget	
Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	Budget	Actual	$	%	$	%
Jan	$ 57,938	$ 70,902	$ 60,122	62,251	$ (8,651)	-12.2%	$ 2,129	3.5%
Feb	78,329	70,983	67,554	64,449	(6,534)	-9.2%	(3,105)	-4.6%
Mar	66,865	64,192	60,516	62,073	(2,119)	-3.3%	1,557	2.6%
Apr	82,118	88,760	81,562	84,665	(4,095)	-4.6%	3,103	3.8%
May	75,953	86,863	78,130	78,675	(8,188)	-9.4%	545	0.7%
Jun	73,676	73,042	74,136	77,557	4,515	6.2%	3,421	4.6%
Jul	77,463	78,742	74,378	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	66,960	79,022	67,537	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	86,194	82,114	81,520	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	79,594	68,261	66,482	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	74,686	68,100	67,898	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	62,073	61,816	55,165	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 434,878**	**$ 454,742**	**$ 422,020**	**$ 429,670**	**$ (25,073)**	**-5.5%**	**$ 7,650**	**1.8%**
Annual Total	**$ 881,849**	**$ 892,797**	**$ 835,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
5-Year Ave Chg (2017 - 2021):		1.7%						

On August 6, 2012, the Lakewood City Council adopted Ordinance #550, creating a transportation benefit district (TBD) in the City of Lakewood, referred to as the Lakewood TBD. The TBD is a quasi-municipal corporation and independent taxing district created for the sole purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving, providing and funding transportation improvement within the city limits of Lakewood. It has the authority to impose certain taxes and fees, either through the vote of the people of board action, for transportation purposes. The TBD is governed by the members of the Lakewood City Council as the District's Board of Directors and the Mayor services as Chair of the Board. The Transportation Benefit District authority automatically expires on 12:01 am on July 16, 2032, unless dissolved sooner.

On September 15, 2014, the Lakewood TBD adopted Ordinance #TBD-01, authorizing an annual $20 vehicle licensing fee for the TBD. The TBD Board found this fee is the best way to preserve, maintain, operate, construct, or reconstruct the transportation infrastructure of the City of Lakewood and fund transportation improvements within the District that are consistent with existing state, regional or local transportation plans necessitated by existing or reasonably foreseeable congestion levels.

The fees are effective for tabs due beginning April 1, 2015. The Washington State Department of Licensing (DOL) collects the fees and distributes the net proceeds to the City on a monthly basis. DOL automatically deducts one percent (1%) of the $20 fee at the time of collection for administration and collections expenses incurred. The 1% administration fee is the maximum amount permitted by RCW 82.80.140.

On July 1, 2015 the Washington State Legislature enacted Second Engrossed Substitute Bill 5987 (SESSB 5987), which authorizes the City to assume the rights, powers, functions, and obligation of the TBD. On November 22, 2016, the City Council declared its intent to conduct a public hearing to consider the proposed assumption of the rights, powers, function, and obligations of the existing City of Lakewood TBD. The City Council conducted the public hearing on December 5, 2016. On December 12, 2016, the City Council adopted the ordinance to assume the TBD.

On December 20, 2021 the City Council approved to use the Transportation Benefit District $20 vehicle license fee to leverage the issuance of bonds in support of seven transportation projects totaling $11,600,000. The estimated bond repayment period is 20 years with annual debt service of $835,000. Ordinance 767 added these seven projects the list of TBD eligible projects and extended the original sunset date from12:01 AM on July 16, 2032 unless dissolved sooner to 12:01 AM December 2, 2044 to coincide with the debt service schedule.

On December 2021, 2021, the Lakewood TBD adopted Ordinance # 767, authorizing seven additional eligible projects and identified completed TBD projects as follows:

<u>Completed Projects</u>

- Steilacoom Boulevard – Lakewood Drive to West of South Tacoma Way
- Lakewood Drive – 100th to Steilacoom Boulevard
- Main Street – Gravelly Lake Drive to 108th St
- 59th – Main Street to 100th
- 108th – Bridgeport to Pacific Highway
- 108th – Main Street to Bridgeport

<u>Current Eligible Projects</u>

- Pacific Highway – 108th to SR 512
- 100th – Lakeview to South Tacoma Way
- New LED Street Lights
- Signal Projects
- Minor Capital Projects
- Neighborhood Traffic Safety
- Personnel, Engineering, Professional Services
- Chip Seal Program – Local Access Roads
- Lakewood Drive – Flett Creek to North City Limits
- 59th – 100th to Bridgeport
- Custer – Steilacoom to John Dower
- 88th – Steilacoom to Custer
- 100th – 59th to Lakeview
- Non-Motorized Trail: Gravelly Lake Drive – Washington Blvd to Nyanza Road SW (added 5/6/2019)
- Overlay & Sidewalk Fill-In: Custer Road – John Dower to 500’ West of Bridgeport Way (added 5/6/2019)
- Nyanza Road SW: Gravelly Lake Drive to Gravelly Lake Drive (added 12/20/2021)
- Mt Tacoma Drive SW (Interlaaken to Whitman Ave SW) (added 12/20/2021)
- Ardmore/Whitman/93rd Street (added 12/20/2021)
- Hipkins Road SW from Steilacoom Boulevard to 104th Street SW (added 12/20/2021)
- Idlewild Road SW: Idlewild School to 112th Street SW (added 12/20/2021)
- 112th Street SW: Idlewild Road SW to Interlaaken Drive SW (added 12/20/2021)
- Interlaaken from 112th Street to Washington Boulevard (added 12/20/2021)

Return to Agenda

Vehicles Subject to the Vehicle Licensing Fee

The annual vehicle fee is due for each vehicle subject to license tab fees and for each vehicle subject to gross weight fees with an unladen (scale) weight of 6,000 pounds or less as described in table below. Vehicles with non-expiring registration, such as Disabled American Veteran and Collector Vehicles, are exempt from the tax. The annual vehicle licensing fee applies only when renewing a vehicle registration, and is effective upon the registration renewal date as provided by the Department of Licensing.

The following vehicles are subject to the vehicle licensing fee under RCW 82.80.140:

Vehicles Subject to the VLF		
Use Type	**Description**	**Authority**
CAB	Taxicab	RCW 46.17.350
CMB	Combination	RCW 46.17.355 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less
CMB (non-powered)	Trailers	RCW 46.16A.450(b)
COM	Commercial vehicle	RCW 46.17.350 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less
COM non powered	Commercial	RCW 46.16A.450
CYC	Motorcycle	RCW 46.17.350
FIX	Fixed Load vehicle	RCW 46.17.355 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less
FRH, 6 seats or less	For Hire	RCW 46.17.350
FRH, 7 seats or more	For Hire	RCW 46.17.355 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less
HDL	House Moving Dolly	RCW 46.17.350
LOG (powered)	Used Exclusively for hauling logs	RCW 46.17.355 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less
LOG (non-powered)	Used exclusively for hauling logs	RCW 46.17.355
MHM	Motor home	RCW 46.17.350
MOB	Mobile Home	RCW 46.17.350 (if actually licensed)
PAS	Passenger vehicle	RCW 46.17.350
STA, 6 seats or less	Stage	RCW 46.17.350
STA, 7 seats or more	Stage	RCW 46.17.355 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less
TLR	Private –use trailer (if over 2000 pounds scale weight)	RCW 46.17.350
TOW	Tow truck	RCW 46.17.350
TRK	Truck	RCW 46.17.355 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less
TVL	Travel trailer	RCW 46.17.350
NEP	Neighborhood electric passenger vehicle	RCW 46.17.350
NET	Neighborhood electric truck	RCW 46.17.355 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less
MEP	Medium-speed electric passenger vehicle	RCW 46.17.350
MET	Medium-speed electric truck	RCW 46.17.355 if scale weight is 6000 pounds or less

Return to Agenda

Vehicles Exempt from the Vehicle Licensing Fee

The following vehicles are specifically exempted from the vehicle licensing fee:

a. Campers, as defined in RCW 46.04.085;
b. Farm tractors or farm vehicles as defined in RCW 46.04.180 and 46.04.181;
c. Mopeds, as defined in RCW 46.04.304;
d. Off-road and non-highway vehicles as defined in RCW 46.04.365;
e. Private use single-axle trailer, as defined in RCW 46.04.422;
f. Snowmobiles as defined in RCW 46.04.546; and
g. Vehicles registered under chapter 46.87 RCW and the international registration plan.

The following vehicles are not subject to the vehicle fee under RCW 82.80.140:

Vehicles Exempt from VLF		
Use Type	**Description**	**Reasoning**
ATQ	Antique Vehicle (any vehicle 30 years old)	Not subject to license fees
ATV	Motorized Non highway vehicle	Not subject to RCW 82.80.140
CGR	Converter Gear	Not subject to license fees
CMP	Campers	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140
GOV	State, County, City, Tribal	Not subject to license fees
FAR	Farm	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140
FCB	Farm Combination	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140
FED	Federally Owned	Not subject to license fees
FEX	Farm Exempt	Not subject to license fees
FMC	Federal Motorcycle Trailer	Not subject to license fees
ORV	Off Road Vehicles	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140
PED	Moped	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140
ATQ	Restored and Collector Vehicles	Not subject to license fees
SCH	Private School	Not subject to license fees
SNO, SNV	Snowmobiles	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140
SNV	Vintage snowmobiles	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140
SNX	State, County, City owned snowmobiles	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140
TLR	Personal use trailers, single axle (less than 2,000 pounds scale weight)	Exempt under RCW 82.80.140

Return to Agenda

Fund 302 – Transportation CIP

The ***Transportation Capital Projects Fund*** accounts for receipts and disbursements related to acquisition, design, construction and any other related street capital project expenditures. Revenues supporting this fund's activities include motor vehicle fuel tax; direct and indirect federal grants; state grants; GO bond proceeds; transfers in from the Real Estate Excise Tax Fund; contribution from General Fund, Community Development Block Grant, and the councilmanic $20 vehicle licensing fees from the Transportation Benefit District Fund.

Fund 302 Transportation CIP - As of June 30, 2022		2022 Budget	2022 Actual
Revenues:			
Motor Vehicle Excise Tax		$ 330,560	$ 161,181
Increased Motor Vehicle Excise Tax		69,635	36,653
Multi-Modal Distribution		79,240	41,889
Grants		12,064,501	2,152,608
Contributions From Utilities/Developers/Partners		1,999,753	290,678
Pavement Degradation		-	10,717
Interest/Other		-	14,309
Transfer In - Fund 001 General		1,219,825	1,219,825
Transfer In - Fund 103 TBD		2,358,000	1,858,000
Transfer In - Fund 190 CDBG		276,823	26,581
Transfer In - Fund 303 REET		5,187,200	5,187,200
Transfer In - Fund 401 SWM		5,979,543	67,482
	Total Revenues	**$29,565,080**	**$ 11,067,123**
Expenditures:			
302.0000	Unallocated	103,505	943
302.0001	Personnel, Engineering & Professional Svcs	673,846	268,784
302.0002	New LED Streetlights	366,633	22,109
302.0003	Neighborhood Traffic Safety	76,725	791
302.0004	Minor Capital	585,587	19,555
302.0005	Chip Seal Program	627,367	8,913
302.0015	112th/111th Bridgeport Way to Kendrick	280,827	32,890
302.0024	Steilacoom Blvd - Farwest to Phillips	333,853	11,763
302.0060	Signal Projects	161,311	83,298
302.0068	Overlay: Pac Hw to 112th St SW	670,927	21,107
302.0071	Safety: SRTS - Phillips Rd Sidewalks & Bike Lanes (Steilacoom to Onyx)-Phase II	428,823	40,189
302.0072	Sidewalks: 59th Ave – 100th to Bridgeport Way	14,473	5,672
302.0074	Streets: S Tacoma Way - 88th to 80th St	477,463	39,756
302.0080	Overlay: 108th Street – Bridgeport Way to Pacific Highway	42,084	42,084
302.0083	Streets: Oakbrook: Onyx Dr SW – Garnet to Phillips Rd	-	1,203
302.0096	Streets: Union Avenue – West Thorne Lane to Spruce Street	65,000	-
302.0098	Pedestrian Crossing Signal: 84th St at Pine St S Intersection	969,000	627
302.0114	112th Sidewalks: Gravelly Lk Dr SW to Bridgeport Way SW	656,000	1,203
302.0116	Street & Sidewalks: Custer Rd. SW: BPW - Lakewood Dr. SW(East City Limits/74th St.)	65,000	-
302.0121	Streets: 112th - Farwest Dr SW to Butte Dr SW	825,340	-
302.0131	Overlay & Sidewalk Fill-In: Custer Rd - John Dower to 500' West of BW	75,000	227
302.0133	Street & Sidewalks: Steilacoom Blvd (Farwest to Weller) ROW Acquisition	1,100,000	-
302.0134	Veterans Dr - GL Dr to Amer Lake Park	418,598	999
302.0135	Building, Street & Park Improvements	15,188,310	3,646,628
302.0136	Street & Sidewalks: 100th St.: 59th Ave. to S. Tacoma Way	100,000	1,562
302.0137	Streets: Steilacoom Blvd/88th (Weller to Custer Rd.)	3,889,812	406,056
302.0138	Sidewalks: Onyx Dr SW - 89th to 97th	702,750	1,417
302.0142	Streets: Ardmore Dr SW - Custer Rd SW to Whitman Ave SW	-	227
302.0144	146th St - Woodbrook to Murray	302,489	10,882
302.0156	Elwood Dr. SW and Angle Lane SW Pedestrian Improvements	900,000	-
302.0164	Sidewalks: Farwest Dr, 112th to Lakes HS, 100th St Ct SW to STL Blvd	1,475,000	-
	Total Expenditures	**$31,575,723**	**$ 4,668,886**
	Beginning Fund Balance	**$ 6,989,573**	**$ 6,989,573**
	Ending Fund Balance	**$ 4,978,930**	**$ 13,387,810**

Return to Agenda

Sewer CIP Funds

The Sewer Capital Project CI Fund accounts for the construction and expansion of a sewer system and related costs to maintain and operate the fund. The City Council also adopted Resolution 2018-19, which supports continuing the sewer surcharge and expanding the geographical area to include the entire city and identifies that the surcharge are to be used for design, construction and other costs associated with sewer projects beyond paying for debt service. This will allow the City to use surcharge revenue to pay for sewer projects both inside and outside of Tillicum and Woodbrook.

Fund 311 Sewer Capital Project - As of June 30, 2022		2022 Budget	2022 Actual
Revenues:			
Interest/Other		$ -	$ 4,144
Grant		75,000	-
Sewer Availability charges		385,020	146,520
Sewer Collection charges		-	822
Transfer In - Fund 204 Sewer Project Debt (4.75% Surcharge)		50,000	-
	Total Revenues	**$ 510,020**	**$ 151,486**
Expenditures:			
311.0000	Unallocated	35,000	8,396
311.0002	Side Sewer CIPS	300,419	-
311.0005	Maple St Sewer Extension	360,101	32,196
311.0006	Rose Rd. & Forest Rd. Sewer Extension	45,000	8,656
311.0013	Fort Steilacoom Park Sewer Extension	227,000	-
	Total Expenditures	**$ 967,520**	**$ 49,248**
	Beginning Fund Balance	**$ 1,525,500**	**$ 1,525,500**
	Ending Fund Balance	**$ 1,068,000**	**$ 1,627,738**

Return to Agenda

Fund 401 – Surface Water Management Operations & CIP

The Surface Water Management Fund accounts for activities that provide storm water collection and disposal services to the City. Activities include administration, engineering, construction, operation, maintenance, and repairs, which are primarily supported by user fees. The fees are billed by Pierce County and are included in the semi-annual property taxes, and remitted by the County to the City.

Fund 401 Surface Water Management - As of June 30, 2022		2022 Budget	2022 Actual
Storm Drainage Fees & Charges		$ 4,516,400	$ 2,763,836
Site Development Permits		50,000	41,835
Special Assessment		33,476	11,545
Interest Earnings / Other		15,600	21,049
Grants/Contributions		-	25,968
	Total Revenues	**$ 4,615,476**	**$ 2,864,233**
Expenditures:			
401.0000	Operations & Maintenance	3,171,153	1,178,439
401.0000	Transfers to General Fund	284,700	142,350
401.0000	Transfers to Parks CIP	206,277	-
401.0000	Transfers to Transportation CIP	5,979,543	67,482
401.0000	Debt Service Payment	240,821	-
401.0008	Outfall Retrofit	124,184	-
401.0012	Outfall Retrofit Feasibility Project	60,000	-
401.0014	Water Quality Improvements	245,000	9,287
401.0015	Oakbrook Outfall Retrofits	219,577	-
401.0018	Waughop Lake Treatment	16,557	193
401.0020	2022 Drainage Pipe Repair Project	315,000	226,787
401.0021	American Lake Treatment Project	59,830	1,640
401.0023	Clover Creek Flood Risk Reduction Study	218,738	61,139
401.0025	2023 Drainage Pipe Repair Project	35,000	4,281
401.9999	Other 1-Time Programs	23,206	660
	Total Expenditures	**$ 11,199,586**	**$ 1,692,258**
	Beginning Fund Balance	**$ 10,975,878**	**$ 10,975,878**
	Ending Fund Balance	**$ 4,391,768**	**$ 12,147,853**

Return to Agenda

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Fund 104 Hotel/Motel Lodging Tax

There is an excise tax of 7% on the sale of or charge made for the furnishing of lodging by a hotel, rooming house, tourist court, motel, trailer camp and the granting of similar license to use real property. The hotel/motel taxes generated from the rental of rooms are restricted to the promotion of tourism in the City.

The City's Lodging Tax Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the City Council in regards to how the taxes are to be used.

Hotel/Motel Lodging Tax

Year-to-date through June

Month	2020 Actual	2021 Actual	2022 Budget	2022 Actual	Over / (Under) 2022 Actual vs 2021 Actual $	%	2022 Actual vs 2022 Budget $	%
Jan	$ 80,098	$ 78,567	$ 64,853	$ 84,139	$ 5,572	7.1%	$ 19,286	29.7%
Feb	58,654	61,859	63,452	86,982	25,123	40.6%	23,530	37.1%
Mar	51,444	99,524	84,896	125,151	25,627	25.7%	40,255	47.4%
Apr	53,538	88,869	72,080	112,337	23,468	26.4%	40,257	55.9%
May	72,138	111,327	87,292	113,323	1,996	1.8%	26,031	29.8%
Jun	79,755	140,640	102,098	143,017	2,378	1.7%	40,919	40.1%
Jul	87,560	144,932	109,854	-	-	-	-	-
Aug	97,783	155,248	113,897	-	-	-	-	-
Sep	81,284	108,717	92,239	-	-	-	-	-
Oct	81,553	90,941	79,168	-	-	-	-	-
Nov	63,713	81,749	68,736	-	-	-	-	-
Dec	59,791	77,448	61,433	-	-	-	-	-
Total YTD	**$ 395,627**	**$ 580,786**	**$ 474,672**	**$ 664,950**	**$ 84,163**	**14.5%**	**$ 190,277**	**40.1%**
Annual Total	**$ 867,311**	**$ 1,239,821**	**$ 1,000,000**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**

5-Year Ave Change (2017 - 2021): 12.5%

Decreases in 2020 due to COVID-19 caused closure/cancellation of events.

Return to Agenda

The following table provides details of the hotel/motel lodging tax allocations for year-to-date June 30, 2022.

	2022	
Hotel/Motel Lodging Tax Summary	**Annual Budget**	**Actual YTD Jun**
4% Revenue:		
Special Hotel/Motel Tax (2%)	$ 285,714	$ 189,985
Transient Rental Income (2%)	285,714	189,985
Subtotal	**571,428**	**379,971**
3% Revenue:		
Special Hotel/Motel Tax (3%)	428,572	284,978
Subtotal	**428,572**	**284,978**
Interest	**-**	**4,246**
Total Revenue	**1,000,000**	**669,195**
4% Expenditure:		
Asia Pacific Cultural Center	15,000	-
City of Lakewood Communications - Imaging Promotion	50,000	-
City of Lakewood - Concert Series	20,000	3,500
City of Lakewood - Love Lakewood First Saturdays	30,000	8,148
City of Lakewood - PRCS - Farmers Market	35,000	31,825
City of Lakewood - PRCS - SummerFEST	80,000	1,768
City of Lakewood - PRCS - Lakewood Film Festival - Reel 96	17,100	14,901
Historic Fort Steilacoom Association	15,000	-
Lakewold Gardens	85,000	7,752
Lakewood Arts Festival Association	20,500	5,716
Lakewood Chamber of Commerce	100,000	34,114
Lakewood Chamber of Commerce - Nights of Lights	25,000	-
Lakewood Historical Society & Museum	35,000	12,557
Lakewood Playhouse	25,000	3,263
Lakewood Sister Cities Association - Gimhae	20,550	129
Lakewood Sister Cities Association - Int'l Festival	5,500	-
Tacoma Regional Convention + Visitor Bureau & Tacoma Sound Sports Comm	100,000	43,890
Subtotal	**678,650**	**167,563**
3% Expenditure:		
City of Lakewood - PRCS - Gateways	72,893	-
CPTC McGavick Center Payment	101,850	-
Subtotal	**174,743**	**-**
		-
Total Expenditures	**$ 853,393**	**$ 167,563**
Beginning Balance	**$ 2,305,432**	**$ 2,305,432**
Ending Balance	**$ 2,452,039**	**$ 2,807,064**

Return to Agenda

Fund 501 Fleet & Equipment

The Fleet and Equipment Replacement Fund accounts for all costs associated with operating, maintaining and replacing the City's vehicles and other motorized equipment. This fund owns and depreciates all non-proprietary fund assets of this nature. Fleet and equipment user charges are allocated to the operating funds based on usage.

Fund 501 - Fleet & Equipment Fund *As of June 30*				
	2020	2021	2022	
	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Sources:				
M&O Revenue	$ 617,408	$ 609,767	$ 740,720	$ 367,684
Interest Earnings/Misc	19,472	3,932	15,000	8,346
Interfund Loan Proceeds	880,204	-	-	-
Replacement Reserves Collections	-	835,636	843,891	281,297
Capital Contributions	25,807	99,695	120,250	16,169
Proceeds from Sale of Assets	11,716	30,580	-	18,580
Transfer In from Insurance Recovery	64,851	-	-	-
Total Sources	**$ 1,619,458**	**$ 1,579,610**	**$ 1,719,861**	**$ 692,076**
Operating Exp:				
Fuel/Gasoline	255,476	323,367	424,150	192,171
Other Supplies	11,720	12,089	3,990	2,543
Repairs & Maintenance	380,884	308,472	327,580	199,424
Other Services & Charges	516	352	-	472
Subtotal - Operating Exp	**$ 648,596**	**$ 644,280**	**$ 755,720**	**$ 394,610**
Capital & Other 1-Time:				
Fleet & Equipment Replacement	490,005	585,059	560,563	132,613
Transfer to Fund 180 Narcotics Seizure	-	14,500	-	-
Subtotal - Capital & Other 1-Time Exp	**$ 490,005**	**$ 599,559**	**$ 560,563**	**$ 132,613**
Total Uses	**$ 1,138,601**	**$ 1,243,839**	**$ 1,316,283**	**$ 527,223**
Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ 480,857**	**$ 335,771**	**$ 403,578**	**$ 164,853**
Beginning Balance	**$ 3,780,451**	**$ 4,261,308**	**$ 4,597,079**	**$ 4,597,079**
Ending Balance	**$ 4,261,308**	**$ 4,597,079**	**$ 5,000,657**	**$ 4,761,933**

Return to Agenda

Fund 503 Information Technology

The Information Technology Fund accounts for all costs and services associated with the City's Information Technology needs. This fund supports all internal systems such as the City's Geographical Information Systems (GIS) needs, Internal & External Web Resources (WWW, Intranet & FTP), E-Mail Systems, business continuity needs, infrastructure resources, applications and overall support. In addition, the fund leverages emerging technologies to reduce cost, limit growth in the workforce, and improve services to citizens and employees; and to provide the most innovative and cost effective technology services for managing the City of Lakewood. Information technology costs are allocated to the operating funds based on a combination of FTEs and usage.

Fund 503 - Information Technology *As of June 30*				
	2020	2021	2022	
	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Sources:				
M&O Revenue	$ 1,337,482	$ 1,381,651	$ 2,104,333	$ 918,254
Interest Earnings/Misc	2,826	215	-	411
Replacement Reserves Collections	66,845	-	66,756	33,288
Capital Contributions/Grants	305,350	344,580	628,093	271,731
Total Sources	**$ 1,712,503**	**$ 1,726,446**	**$ 2,799,182**	**$ 1,223,685**
Operating Exp:				
Personnel	524,535	583,361	657,693	298,977
Supplies	60,796	49,704	179,520	22,032
Other Services & Charges	754,976	748,801	1,267,120	597,632
Subtotal - Operating Exp	**$ 1,340,307**	**$ 1,381,866**	**$ 2,104,333**	**$ 918,640**
Capital & Other 1-Time:				
Website Update/Redesign	520	2,421	5,078	293
Disaster Recover/Co-Location Police (MO)	-	19,957	-	-
Computer Replacement	142,264	68,808	281,058	79,375
Server/Hardware Upgrades	-	-	50,000	22,055
In Car Video System	121,333	-	-	-
CW - Co-Location Disaster Recovery Servers	-	-	103,000	136,639
1-Time Projects	-	-	30,000	-
Fiber Optic Connection FSP O&M	36,860	-	-	-
Rental Housing Project		17,836	57,164	26,754
Document Management System	3,594	194,613	101,793	6,616
CED+ / PALS Permit System	779	-	-	-
Redundant Voice/Data at Police Station	-	5,596	-	-
Replace Radio Antenna	-	24,886	-	-
Enterprise Vault	-	10,463	-	-
Subtotal - Capital & Other 1-Time Exp	**$ 305,350**	**$ 344,580**	**$ 628,093**	**$ 271,731**
Total Uses	**$ 1,645,657**	**$ 1,726,446**	**$ 2,732,426**	**$ 1,190,372**
Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ 66,846**	**$ -**	**$ 66,756**	**$ 33,313**
Beginning Balance	**$ 138,678**	**$ 205,524**	**$ 205,522**	**$ 205,522**
Ending Balance	**$ 205,524**	**$ 205,522**	**$ 272,278**	**$ 238,835**

Return to Agenda

Fund 504 Risk Management

The Risk Management Fund accounts for the financial administration of the City's comprehensive risk management program. The Fund assures that the revenues and assets of the City are protected through an established risk control and risk finance program including risk management goals and objectives, a formalized risk assessment process and methodology for reviewing and monitoring of the effectiveness of the risk management program. Risk management functions include property, casualty and general liability and similar functions. Risk management provides departments with information and assistance about recommended insurance requirements for various City contracts. Through the safety program, information and training is provided on how to reduce the risk of injury to employees, the general public and the City owned and leased property. This fund is funded primarily through user charges allocated to the operating funds based on a combination of FTEs and usage.

Fund 504 - Risk Management *As of June 30*				
	2020	2021	2022	
	Annual Actual	Annual Actual	Annual Budget	YTD Actual
Sources:				
M&O Revenue	$ 1,289,027	$ 1,273,297	$ 1,502,450	$ 156,062
AWC Retro Refund	128,938	117,286	-	-
Insurance Proceeds/3rd Party Recoveries	371,383	215,508	512,495	1,490,335
Total Sources	**$ 1,789,348**	**$ 1,606,091**	**$ 2,014,945**	**$ 1,646,397**
Uses:				
Safety Program	2,474	2,754	3,980	991
AWC Retro Program	37,356	33,944	37,500	29,923
WCIA Assessment	1,438,931	1,364,838	1,477,365	1,477,145
Claims/Judgments & Settlements	245,735	204,553	496,100	138,337
Transfer Insurance Proceeds to Fleet & Equipment	64,851	-	-	-
Total Uses	**$ 1,789,347**	**$ 1,606,090**	**$ 2,014,945**	**$ 1,646,397**
Sources Over/(Under) Uses	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**-**
Beginning Balance	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Ending Balance	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**

Return to Agenda

Debt Service

Under RCW 39.36.020(2), the public may vote to approve bond issues for general government in an amount not to exceed 2.5% of the value of all taxable property within the City. Within the 2.5% limit, the City Council may approve bond issues not to exceed 1.5% of the City's assessed valuation. Prior to the passage of new legislation in 1994, the statutory limit on councilmanic (non-voted) debt for general government purposes was 0.75% of assessed valuation. Another 0.75% of councilmanic debt was available only for lease-purchase contracts (RCW 35.43.200). These two components are combined and can be used for any municipal purpose, including using the entire 1.5% for bonds. Therefore, the City's remaining debt capacity without voter approval is $122.0M and an additional $93.9M may be accessed with voter approval. The voter-approved capacity is generally referred to as unlimited tax general obligation debt, which requires 60% voter approval and the election must have a voter turnout of at least 40% of those who voted in the last State general election. With this vote, the voter approves additional property tax be levied above and beyond the constitutional and statutory caps on property tax.

In addition to this general purpose debt capacity, RCW 39.36.030(4) also allows voter approval of park facilities and utility bond issues, each limited to 2.5% of the City's assessed valuation. Therefore, legally the City can issue up to a total of 7.5% of the City's assessed valuation in bonds for $685.4M. The tables below show the City's available debt capacity and outstanding debt as of June 30, 2022.

Computation of Limitation of Indebtedness
As of June 30, 2022

Description	General Purpose		Excess Levy	Excess Levy	Total
	Councilmanic (Limited GO)	Excess Levy (with a vote)	Open Space & Park (voted)	Utility Purposes (voted)	Debt Capacity
AV = $9,388,375,496 (A)					
1.50%	$ 140,825,632	$ (140,825,632)			$ -
2.50%		$ 234,709,387	$ 234,709,387	$ 234,709,387	$ 704,128,162
Add: Cash on Hand for Redemption (B)	$ -				$ -
Less: Bonds Outstanding	$ (18,763,807)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ (18,763,807)
Remaining Debt Capacity	**$122,061,825**	**$93,883,755**	**$234,709,387**	**$234,709,387**	**$685,364,355**
General Capacity (C)		**$215,945,580**			

(A) Certified Values for Tax Year 2022
(B) Debt Service Prefunding (the City currently does not prefund debt service)
(C) Combined Total for Councilmanic and Excess Levy Capacities

Public Works Trust Fund Loans & SWM Revenue Bonds: The City borrowed a total of $7.93M at rates between 0.50% and 1.0% for 20 years from the State's Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF) to finance sewer projects. The PWTF is a revolving loan managed by the State to provide below market rate financing for health and safety related public works improvement projects through a competitive application process. The City also issued $4.0 in SWM Revenue Bonds in 2021. These loans are backed by the rates collected from users thus are not considered as the City's general obligation debt nor are they subject to the limitation of calculation.

Return to Agenda

Summary of Outstanding Debt
As of June 30, 2022

Description	Purpose	Issue Date	Final Maturity	Interest Rate %	Amount Issued	Outstanding Debt	Average Annual Payment	Funding Source
Limited Tax General Obligation Bonds (LTGO) - 2021A	Transportation Projects	10/16/2021	12/01/2023	1.00%	$ 667,375	$ 667,375	$ 333,000	REET
Limited Tax General Obligation Bonds (LTGO) - 2021B	Transportation Projects	10/16/2021	12/01/2037	2.00%	$ 5,971,635	$ 5,971,635	$ -	REET
2020 Limited Tax General Oblgiation Bonds (LTGO)	Transportation Projects	12/9/2020	12/1/2035	2.00%	$ 3,029,885	$ 2,853,435	$ 179,000	REET
2019 Limited Tax General Oblgiation Bonds (LTGO)	Transportation Projects	5/8/2019	12/1/2038	3.0 - 5%	$ 7,460,000	$ 6,930,000	$ 285,000	REET
2016 Limited Tax General Obligation Bonds (LTGO)	Refunding 2009 LTGO	4/19/2016	12/1/2028	1.40 - 2.41%	$ 1,884,032	$ 1,355,590	$ 182,000	General Fund
LOCAL Financing	LED Streetlight Retrofit	3/24/2015	12/1/2027	2.33%	$ 1,460,000	$ 840,000	$ 125,000	General Fund
59th Avenue Promissory Note	Right-of-Way / Roadway in Lakewood Towne Center	4/30/2005	4/30/2024	3.74%	$ 1,071,000	$ 145,773	$ 69,000	General Fund
				Subtotal	**$ 21,543,927**	**$ 18,763,807**	**$ 1,173,000**	
Surface Water Management Revenue Bond - 2021	Surface Water Management Projects	10/16/2021	12/01/2030	1.50%	$ 4,028,365	$ 4,028,365	$ 438,000	SWM
					$ 4,028,365	$ 4,028,365	$ 438,000	
PWTFL 04-691-PRE-132	American Lake Gardens/ Tillicum Sewer	7/7/2005	7/7/2024	1.00%	$ 593,864	$ 59,430	$ 30,000	Assessments on all Lakewood Sewer Accounts
PWTFL 06-962-022	American Lake Gardens/ Tillicum Sewer	9/18/2006	9/18/2026	0.50%	$ 5,000,000	$ 1,177,928	$ 295,000	Assessments on all Lakewood Sewer Accounts
PWTFL 08-951-025	American Lake Gardens/ Tillicum Sewer	3/1/2008	7/1/2028	0.50%	$ 1,840,000	$ 624,157	$ 104,000	Assessments on all Lakewood Sewer Accounts
PWTFL 12-951-025	American Lake Gardens/ Tillicum Sewer	6/1/2012	6/1/2031	0.50%	$ 500,000	$ 321,429	$ 36,000	Assessments on all Lakewood Sewer Accounts
				Subtotal	**$ 7,933,864**	**$ 2,182,944**	**$ 465,000**	
Local Improvement District (LID) 1108	Street Improvements	1/1/2008	12/1/2027	4.22 - 5.3%	$ 880,000	$ 66,398	$ 56,000	Assessment on Single Business
Local Improvement District (LID) 1109	Street Improvements	3/2/2020	3/1/2033	2.76 - 3.47%	$ 922,757	$ 781,000	$ 71,000	Assessment on Single Business
				Subtotal	**$ 1,802,757**	**$ 847,398**	**$ 127,000**	
				Total	**$ 35,308,913**	**$ 25,822,514**	**$ 2,203,000**	

Compensated absences are an unfunded liability comprised of all outstanding vacation pay and accrued compensatory time that is recorded as an expenditure when paid. This occurs when an employee is paid out for unused vacation or compensatory time when an employee leaves the City. The calculation is made on an annual basis. As of December 31, 2021, this unfunded liability totals $3.0M.

Legacy Cost						
	December 31, 2019		December 31, 2020		December 31, 2021	
Group	FTE	Total Liability	FTE	Total Liability	FTE	Total Liability
Non-Rep	33.00	$ 428,358	33.00	$ 525,929	35.00	$ 600,304
AFSCME	86.25	$ 602,564	86.00	$ 664,352	90.50	$ 711,374
LPMG	4.00	$ 182,650	4.00	$ 222,861	4.00	$ 215,585
LPIG	93.00	$ 1,727,578	92.00	$ 1,845,670	95.00	$ 1,443,539
Teamsters	4.00	$ 23,565	4.00	$ 22,168	2.00	$ 18,163
Total	**220.25**	**$ 2,964,715**	**219.00**	**$ 3,280,980**	**226.50**	**$ 2,988,965**

Return to Agenda

Cash & Investments

The City currently maintains cash in its bank account to earn earnings credit, which offsets banking service fees. The remainder is invested with the Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP). As of June 30, 2022, the total invested with the LGIP is $52.93M with net earnings of 1.02% compared to the average yield on the 6-month Treasury Bill of 1.65%.

By Fund Summary

The following table provides a summary of each fund's activity as of June 30, 2022.

Fund	Beginning Fund Balance 1/1/2022	YTD Activity Revenues (1)	YTD Activity Expenditures (2)	Revenue Over/(Under) Expenditures	Ending Fund Balance 6/30/2022	Cash Balance (3) 6/30/2022
Total All Funds	**$59,025,955**	**$ 58,714,132**	**$ 53,714,244**	**$ 4,999,888**	**$ 64,025,850**	**$ 60,901,128**
001General Fund	**$17,750,655**	**$ 23,583,990**	**$ 22,831,013**	**$ 752,977**	**$ 18,503,633**	**$ 14,472,126**
1XX Special Revenue Funds	**$ 6,852,658**	**$ 11,950,150**	**$ 12,933,825**	**$ (983,675)**	**$ 5,868,987**	**$ 8,786,295**
101 Street Operations & Maintenance	23,781	1,087,445	1,111,226	(23,781)	0	(116,414)
103 Transportation Benefit District	1,581,424	431,900	1,858,000	(1,426,100)	155,324	155,323
104 Hotel/Motel Lodging Tax	2,305,435	669,195	167,563	501,632	2,807,070	2,550,724
105 Property Abatement/RHSP/1406 Funds	649,622	$773,855	245,674	528,181	1,177,803	1,190,126
106 Public Art	120,223	36,198	79,903	(43,705)	76,517	76,519
180 Narcotics Seizure	192,000	12,203	176,856	(164,653)	27,349	22,622
181 Felony Seizure	36,198	6,958	14,386	(7,428)	28,770	29,537
182 Federal Seizure	143,505	2,737	142,743	(140,006)	3,499	3,499
190 CDBG	1,513,495	494,919	279,132	215,787	1,729,281	(74,095)
191 Neighborhood Stabilization Program	254,676	35,907	2,743	33,164	287,841	287,840
192 South Sound Military Partnership	32,299	7,182,990	$7,649,350	(466,360)	(434,061)	195,514
195 Public Safety Grants	-	246,463	246,463	-	-	(184,902)
196 ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act)	-	969,380	959,785	9,595	9,595	4,650,002
2XX Debt Service Fund	**$ 986,131**	**$ 893,422**	**$ 1,036,501**	**$ (143,079)**	**$ 843,052**	**$ 843,053**
201 General Obligation Bond Debt Service	-	463,621	463,621	-	-	-
202 Local Improvement District Debt Service	118,951	142	95,262	(95,120)	23,831	23,830
204 Sewer Project Debt Service	734,088	429,415	477,618	(48,203)	685,885	685,885
251 Local Improvement District Guaranty	133,093	244	-	244	133,337	133,338
3XX Capital Project Funds	**$16,983,759**	**$ 15,205,164**	**$ 11,204,174**	**$ 4,000,990**	**$ 20,984,749**	**$ 18,818,430**
301 Parks CIP	3,388,224	1,311,838	445,114	866,724	4,254,949	4,284,430
302 Transportation CIP	6,989,572	11,067,123	4,668,886	6,398,237	13,387,809	11,872,411
103 Real Estate Excise Tax	5,080,463	2,674,718	6,040,927	(3,366,209)	1,714,253	1,028,269
311 Sewer Project CIP	1,525,500	151,486	49,248	102,238	1,627,738	1,633,319
4XX Enterprise Funds	**$10,975,879**	**$ 2,864,233**	**$ 1,692,258**	**$ 1,171,974**	**$ 12,147,854**	**$ 12,200,845**
401 Surface Water Management	10,975,879	2,864,233	1,692,258	1,171,974	12,147,853	12,200,845
5XX Internal Service Funds	**$ 5,377,080**	**$ 3,916,958**	**$ 3,668,792**	**$ 248,167**	**$ 5,625,249**	**$ 5,728,055**
501 Fleet & Equipment	4,597,080	692,076	527,223	164,853	4,761,934	4,761,932
502 Property Management	574,479	354,801	304,801	50,000	624,480	648,623
503 Information Technology	205,523	1,223,685	1,190,372	33,313	238,836	309,930
504 Risk Management	-	1,646,397	1,646,397	-	-	7,570
6XX Fiduciary Funds	**$ 99,792**	**$ 300,215**	**$ 347,682**	**$ (47,467)**	**$ 52,325**	**$ 52,325**
631 Custodial Funds	99,792	300,215	347,682	(47,467)	52,325	52,325

(1)Revenues includes all sources, ongoing and one-time.

(2) Expenditures includes all uses, ongoing and one-time.

(3) Negative cash balance due to timing of grant reimbursements and/or revenue collection.

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
(001) GENERAL FUND						
REVENUES:						
Taxes	**$28,546,334**	**$33,579,772**	**$17,116,557**	**$28,853,140**	**$30,915,610**	**$17,606,620**
Property Tax	7,259,756	7,431,434	4,093,191	7,508,500	7,605,010	4,174,366
Local Sales & Use Tax	11,946,044	14,413,902	7,277,365	10,724,000	11,800,000	7,102,332
Sales/Parks	671,080	789,461	382,526	670,000	750,000	414,714
Brokered Natural Gas Use Tax	39,494	54,213	22,078	45,000	45,000	32,355
Criminal Justice Sales Tax	1,213,087	1,434,092	687,122	1,188,900	1,368,900	740,320
Admissions Tax	96,599	226,165	63,869	275,000	235,000	168,501
Utility Tax	5,402,943	5,436,800	2,864,862	5,556,700	5,556,700	2,966,030
Leasehold Tax	6,903	6,936	3,744	5,000	5,000	3,888
Gambling Tax	1,910,429	3,786,769	1,721,801	2,880,040	3,550,000	2,004,114
Franchise Fees	**4,289,904**	**4,364,450**	**2,075,896**	**4,397,000**	**4,397,000**	**2,174,256**
Cable, Water, Sewer, Solid Waste	3,082,339	3,191,516	1,489,429	3,119,800	3,119,800	1,566,012
Tacoma Power	1,204,366	1,172,934	586,467	1,277,200	1,277,200	608,244
Small Cell	3,200	-	-	-	-	-
Development Service Fees	**2,252,765**	**2,066,139**	**1,126,993**	**1,772,600**	**1,914,825**	**1,052,168**
Building Permits	992,686	963,054	557,987	743,000	885,225	499,777
Other Building Permit Fees	273,605	175,675	90,783	300,600	300,600	142,949
Plan Review/Plan Check Fees	810,634	747,948	386,886	587,200	587,200	326,012
Other Zoning/Development Fees	175,840	179,462	91,337	141,800	141,800	83,431
Licenses & Permits	**354,013**	**409,993**	**205,938**	**382,500**	**382,500**	**227,880**
Business License	254,104	282,550	144,725	276,500	276,500	156,240
Alarm Permits & Fees	63,533	92,496	30,538	70,000	70,000	44,389
Animal Licenses	36,376	34,947	30,676	36,000	36,000	27,251
State Shared Revenues	**1,479,167**	**1,373,339**	**714,518**	**1,246,265**	**1,284,835**	**742,110**
Criminal Justice	179,221	187,341	91,126	176,235	176,235	95,072
Criminal Justice High Crime	427,878	275,031	176,033	249,500	249,500	178,362
Liquor Excise Tax	393,098	436,678	210,152	334,600	389,129	222,016
Liquor Board Profits	478,969	474,288	237,208	485,930	469,971	246,660
Intergovernmental	**453,830**	**224,685**	**127,331**	**275,274**	**264,936**	**147,544**
Police FBI & Other Misc	12,870	12,960	12,960	12,000	12,000	-
Police-Animal Svcs-Steilacoom	15,630	17,543	7,436	16,843	16,843	9,167
Police-Animal Svcs-Dupont	33,917	34,595	17,298	35,164	35,164	18,644
Police-South Sound 911 Background Investigations	17,298	21,590	8,968	15,000	15,000	15,640
Muni Court-University Place Contract	251,187	6,000	6,000	-	(13,500)	(13,520)
Muni Court-Town of Steilacoom Contract	87,364	63,917	37,810	106,090	99,062	55,722
Muni Court-City of Dupont	35,565	68,080	36,860	90,177	100,367	61,891

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
(001) GENERAL FUND-continued						
Charges for Services & Fees	**1,365,370**	**1,243,338**	**496,808**	**1,414,300**	**1,414,300**	**430,436**
Parks & Recreation Fees	127,720	153,762	88,211	274,000	274,000	107,671
Police - Various Contracts	3,851	9,855	1,455	4,000	4,000	98,962
Police - Towing Impound Fees	3,000	-	-	4,000	4,000	-
Police - Extra Duty	875,281	719,810	226,674	775,000	775,000	-
Police - Western State Hospital Community Policing	355,500	355,750	177,750	355,500	355,500	220,981
Other	18	4,162	2,718	1,800	1,800	2,821
Fines & Forfeitures	**1,273,308**	**1,629,997**	**796,745**	**1,363,205**	**1,388,205**	**789,284**
Municipal Court	608,159	546,047	320,005	663,205	588,205	167,364
Photo Infraction	665,148	1,083,951	476,740	700,000	800,000	621,920
Miscellaneous/Interest/Other	**161,833**	**169,515**	**53,390**	**136,967**	**136,967**	**53,225**
Interest Earnings	52,458	19,124	9,928	67,930	67,930	31,541
Penalties & Interest - Taxes	34,294	19,004	10,276	7,500	7,500	1,614
Miscellaneous/Other	75,081	131,388	33,185	61,537	61,537	20,069
Interfund Transfers	**284,700**	**284,700**	**142,350**	**284,700**	**284,700**	**142,350**
Transfers In - Fund 401 SWM	284,700	284,700	142,350	284,700	284,700	142,350
Subtotal Operating Revenues	**$40,461,225**	**$45,345,928**	**$22,856,525**	**$40,125,951**	**$42,383,878**	**$23,365,873**
EXPENDITURES:						
City Council	**134,101**	**132,143**	**62,948**	**148,304**	**148,304**	**69,873**
Legislative	134,101	132,128	62,948	144,854	144,854	69,873
Sister City	-	15	-	3,450	3,450	-
City Manager	**636,362**	**618,248**	**284,502**	**786,062**	**815,043**	**376,422**
Executive	551,617	519,561	249,716	636,217	662,755	310,536
Communications	84,745	98,687	34,787	149,845	152,288	65,886
Municipal Court	**1,853,556**	**1,745,159**	**887,568**	**2,009,513**	**2,134,372**	**867,995**
Judicial Services	1,045,965	1,007,638	529,816	1,072,114	1,135,669	513,795
Professional Services	562,198	573,451	260,837	588,000	624,000	254,185
Probation & Detention	245,393	164,071	96,915	349,399	374,703	100,015
Administrative Services	**1,372,582**	**1,398,748**	**713,064**	**1,460,461**	**1,543,746**	**714,095**
Finance	1,265,348	1,279,028	642,912	1,323,536	1,404,569	644,151
Non-Departmental (City-Wide)	107,234	119,720	70,152	136,925	139,177	69,943
Legal	**2,006,145**	**2,161,184**	**994,899**	**2,283,786**	**2,379,523**	**1,067,533**
Civil Legal Services	956,930	977,929	493,273	1,069,919	1,126,411	526,388
Criminal Prosecution Services	164,818	214,387	107,579	232,432	248,568	119,465
City Clerk	217,889	195,951	95,403	238,880	243,601	92,973
Election	91,302	171,865	-	90,000	90,000	-
Human Resources	575,206	601,053	298,645	652,555	670,943	328,707

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
(001) GENERAL FUND-continued						
Community & Economic Development	**2,188,040**	**2,439,060**	**1,087,437**	**2,666,419**	**2,905,420**	**1,427,477**
Current Planning	715,817	849,705	425,756	806,399	885,049	573,291
Long Range Planning	196,147	203,805	124,222	254,760	282,779	144,725
Building	1,135,909	1,186,925	448,221	1,387,786	1,500,609	568,144
Eonomic Development	140,167	198,627	89,238	217,474	236,982	141,317
Parks, Recreation & Community Services	**2,407,609**	**2,788,467**	**1,251,309**	**2,998,234**	**3,421,562**	**1,342,229**
Human Services	370,123	419,355	89,528	493,607	504,295	103,744
Administration	341,371	419,838	203,637	323,442	412,571	233,016
Recreation	297,314	359,860	149,043	488,877	530,236	190,503
Senior Services	180,325	153,114	75,044	247,197	262,737	82,773
Parks Facilities	424,886	499,351	263,710	453,027	607,936	327,754
Fort Steilacoom Park	619,238	715,634	364,119	811,231	903,888	283,964
Street Landscape Maintenance	174,352	221,316	106,228	180,853	199,899	120,475
Police	**22,920,852**	**24,337,584**	**11,505,599**	**24,985,911**	**27,104,423**	**13,173,692**
Command	3,413,795	4,009,900	1,995,519	4,046,127	4,845,221	2,538,144
Jail Service	365,591	286,225	114,381	700,000	950,000	158,305
Dispatch Services/SS911	2,048,834	2,024,211	1,012,105	1,995,290	2,023,290	1,011,393
Investigations	3,898,138	4,133,204	1,902,314	4,399,550	4,399,550	1,800,414
Patrol	7,522,202	8,247,439	3,782,155	7,902,057	8,751,272	5,046,316
Special Units	291,102	150,489	126,693	270,533	270,533	25,366
Special Response Team (SRT)	37,322	95,717	53,350	70,730	165,730	77,844
Neighborhood Policing Unit	1,287,326	1,278,287	638,253	1,353,865	1,353,865	444,636
Contracted Services (Extra Duty, offset by Revenue)	900,942	804,173	368,749	775,000	775,000	376,490
Community Safety Resource Team (CSRT)	370,379	429,601	180,659	484,226	526,259	258,917
Training	749,949	853,910	375,651	833,722	844,047	471,767
Traffic Policing	883,041	762,349	331,381	967,924	972,906	379,264
Property Room	229,129	263,380	114,639	321,692	342,109	149,057
Reimbursements	276,459	207,665	142,879	64,650	64,650	48,907
Emergency Management	47,987	44,785	-	39,640	39,640	-
Animal Control	319,129	369,110	183,171	370,905	390,352	193,432
Road & Street/Camera Enforcement	279,528	377,140	183,700	390,000	390,000	193,440
Interfund Transfers	**1,462,408**	**1,764,403**	**875,787**	**1,873,112**	**1,907,233**	**827,155**
Transfer to Fund 101 Street O&M	981,149	1,280,910	606,902	1,390,574	1,424,695	557,761
Transfer to Fund 105/190 Abatement Program	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Transfer to Fund 201 GO Bond Debt Service	446,260	448,494	233,885	447,538	447,538	234,394
Subtotal Operating Expenditures	**$34,981,655**	**$37,384,996**	**$17,663,113**	**$39,211,802**	**$42,359,627**	**$19,866,469**
OPERATING INCOME (LOSS)	**5,479,570**	**7,960,932**	**5,193,413**	**914,149**	**24,251**	**3,499,405**
As a % of Operating Expenditures	**15.7%**	**21.29%**	**29.40%**	**2.33%**	**0.06%**	**17.61%**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
(001) GENERAL FUND-continued						
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:						
Grants, Donations/Contrib, 1-Time	**3,434,273**	**712,586**	**256,225**	**100,250**	**823,384**	**218,116**
Contibutions/Donations/Other	58,319	78,706	51,793	100,250	362,241	39,634
Grants	3,375,954	633,879	204,432	-	461,143	178,482
Subtotal Other Financing Sources	**$3,434,273**	**$712,586**	**$256,225**	**$100,250**	**$823,384**	**$218,116**
OTHER FINANCING USES:						
Capital & Other 1-Time	**4,042,415**	**1,169,618**	**450,402**	**137,028**	**2,087,345**	**467,219**
Municipal Court	76,136	66,228	38,869	8,279	123,881	24,845
City Manager	1,666	32,293	14,416	2,005	111,264	12,705
Administrative Services	3,055	10,137	8,867	4,629	20,116	6,434
City-Wide COVID-19 Grants	2,877,860	5,847	570	-	-	-
Legal/Clerk	36,694	48,572	32,027	11,378	70,324	29,318
Community & Economic Development	293,575	209,439	76,236	13,796	568,260	123,432
Parks, Recreation & Community Services	156,355	261,131	102,815	14,358	658,384	88,572
Police	597,075	535,972	176,600	82,583	535,117	181,913
Interfund Transfers	**1,014,676**	**3,484,047**	**1,353,750**	**745,465**	**2,621,406**	**2,497,325**
Transfer Out - Fund 101 Street	-	-	-	-	124,081	-
Transfer Out - Fund 105 Property Abatement/RHSP	50,000	149,287	50,000	50,000	550,000	550,000
Transfer Out - Fund 106 Public Art	-	22,500	-	-	30,000	30,000
Transfer Out - Fund 192 SSMCP	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Transfer Out - Fund 301 Parks CIP	494,129	2,562,260	553,750	212,500	647,500	647,500
Transfer Out - Fund 302 Transportation CIP	393,547	700,000	700,000	432,965	1,219,825	1,219,825
Transfer Out - Fund 311 Sewer	27,000	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Other Financing Uses	**$5,057,091**	**$4,653,665**	**$1,804,152**	**$882,491**	**$4,708,751**	**$2,964,544**
Total Revenues and Other Sources	**$43,895,498**	**$46,058,514**	**$23,112,750**	**$40,226,201**	**$43,207,262**	**$23,583,989**
Total Expenditures and other Uses	**$40,038,746**	**$42,038,661**	**$19,467,265**	**$40,094,292**	**$47,068,378**	**$22,831,013**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$9,874,049**	**$13,730,802**	**$13,730,802**	**$4,804,154**	**$17,750,655**	**$17,750,655**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$13,730,802**	**$17,750,655**	**$17,376,287**	**$4,936,063**	**$13,889,539**	**$18,503,632**
Ending Fund Balance as a % of Gen/Street Operating Rev	33.2%	38.3%	74.5%	12.0%	32.0%	77.5%
Reserve - Total Target 12% Reserves & Set Aside	$4,958,178	$5,560,616	$2,799,134	$4,936,063	$5,207,015	$5,207,015
2% Contingency Reserves	$826,363	$926,769	$466,522	$822,677	$867,836	$867,836
5% General Fund Reserves	$2,065,908	$2,316,923	$1,166,306	$2,056,693	$2,169,589	$2,169,589
5% Strategic Reserves	$2,065,908	$2,316,923	$1,166,306	$2,056,693	$2,169,589	$2,169,589
Set Aside for Economic Development Opportunity Fund	$0	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$0	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
Unreserved/Designated 2022-2024 Budget	$8,772,623	$11,190,039	$13,577,153	$0	$6,682,525	$11,296,617

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 101 STREET OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE						
REVENUES:						
Permits	147,196	189,474	98,865	152,500	152,500	83,080
Engineering Review Fees	40	11,408	-	-	-	35,096
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax	709,693	791,653	370,726	855,410	855,410	400,414
Subtotal Operating Revenues	**$ 856,929**	**$ 992,535**	**$ 469,591**	**$ 1,007,910**	**$ 1,007,910**	**$ 518,591**
EXPENDITURES:						
Street Lighting	353,182	390,257	132,424	337,210	337,210	162,805
Traffic Control Devices	235,746	311,617	120,493	431,508	431,508	129,137
Snow & Ice Response	28,747	39,171	33,667	45,500	45,500	59,092
Road & Street Preservation	1,190,004	1,356,749	774,188	1,568,811	1,642,168	729,331
Subtotal Operating Expenditures	**$1,807,679**	**$2,097,795**	**$1,060,773**	**2,383,029**	**2,456,386**	**1,080,365**
OPERATING INCOME (LOSS)	**($950,750)**	**($1,105,260)**	**($591,182)**	**($1,375,119)**	**($1,448,476)**	**($561,774)**
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:						
Grants	12,000	-	-	-	-	
Donations/Contributions	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
Judgments, Settlements/Miscellaneous	319	3,247	2,861	-	-	1,093
Transfer In From General Fund	981,149	1,280,910	606,902	$1,390,574	$1,548,776	$557,761
Subtotal Other Financing Sources	**$993,467**	**$1,284,157**	**$609,763**	**$1,390,574**	**$1,548,776**	**$568,854**
OTHER FINANCING USES:						
Building, Vehicles, Equipment &Other 1-Time	47,507	155,117	18,581	15,454	124,081	30,861
Subtotal Other Financing Uses	**$47,507**	**$155,117**	**$18,581**	**$15,454**	**$124,081**	**$30,861**
Total Revenues and Other Sources	**$1,850,396**	**$2,276,692**	**$1,079,354**	**$2,398,484**	**$2,556,686**	**$1,087,445**
Total Expenditures and other Uses	**$1,855,185**	**$2,252,912**	**$1,079,354**	**$2,398,483**	**$2,580,467**	**$1,111,226**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$4,789**	**($0)**	**$0**	**$0**	**$23,780**	**$23,780**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$0**	**$23,780**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 103 LAKEWOOD TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT						
REVENUES:						
$20 Vehicle License Fee (Net of State Admin Fee)	881,849	892,796	454,742	835,000	835,000	429,669
Interest Earnings	904	875	359	-	-	2,230
Total Revenue	**$882,753**	**$893,671**	**$455,101**	**$835,000**	**$835,000**	**$431,900**
EXPENDITURES:						
Transfer to Fund 302 Transportation Capital	247,457	-	-	640,000	2,358,000	1,858,000
Total Expenditures	**$247,457**	**$0**	**$0**	**$640,000**	**$2,358,000**	**$1,858,000**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$52,457**	**$687,753**	**$687,753**	**$1,475,000**	**$1,581,424**	**$1,581,424**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$687,753**	**$1,581,424**	**$1,142,854**	**$1,670,000**	**$58,424**	**$155,324**

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 104 HOTEL/MOTEL LODGING TAX						
REVENUES:						
Special Hotel/Motel Lodging Tax (5%)	$619,508	$884,764	$414,844	$714,286	$714,286	$474,963
Transient Rental income Tax (2%)	247,803	355,057	165,942	285,714	285,714	189,985
Interest Earnings	7,693	2,118	722	-	-	4,246
Total Revenues	**$875,005**	**$1,241,939**	**$581,508**	**$1,000,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$669,195**
EXPENDITURES:						
Lodging Tax Programs	456,515	527,489	243,868	800,000	780,500	167,563
Lodging Tax Programs-Transfer Out to Fund 301 Parks CIP	320,093	68,049	68,049	-	72,893	-
Total Expenditures	**$776,609**	**$595,538**	**$311,917**	**$800,000**	**$853,393**	**$167,563**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$1,560,637**	**$1,659,033**	**$1,659,033**	**$1,375,103**	**$2,305,435**	**$2,305,435**
Ending Fund Balance (*earmarked for next year's grant awards)*	**$1,659,033**	**$2,305,435**	**$1,928,624**	**$1,575,103**	**$2,452,042**	**$2,807,067**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 105 PROPERTY ABATEMENT/RENTAL HOUSING SAFETY PROGRAM/1406 FUNDS						
REVENUES:						
Abatement Program:	**132,535**	**173,509**	**143,628**	**86,500**	**586,500**	**547,861**
Abatement Charges	59,134	93,741	68,481	45,000	45,000	11,392
Interest Earnings	13,401	44,768	40,147	6,500	6,500	1,469
Transfer In - Fund 001 General	60,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	535,000	535,000
Rental Housing Safety Program:	**204,398**	**312,254**	**197,096**	**225,000**	**232,910**	**190,916**
Transfer In - Fund 001 General	25,000	149,287	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Rental Housing Safety Program Fees	179,398	162,967	147,096	175,000	182,910	140,916
1406 Affordable Housing Program:	**72,316**	**109,042**	**47,483**	**98,000**	**98,000**	**35,078**
Sales Tax	72,316	109,042	47,483	98,000	98,000	35,078
Total Revenues	**$409,250**	**$594,805**	**$388,207**	**$409,500**	**$917,410**	**$773,855**
EXPENDITURES:						
Abatement	92,934	365,186	48,800	86,500	1,005,210	86,095
Rental Housing Safety Program	263,719	238,412	106,600	225,000	282,464	159,579
1406 Affordable Housing Program	-	-	-	98,000	279,358	-
Total Expenditures	**$356,653**	**$603,598**	**$155,400**	**$409,500**	**$1,567,032**	**$245,674**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$605,817**	**$658,414**	**$658,414**	**$0**	**$649,622**	**$649,622**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$658,414**	**$649,622**	**$891,221**	**$0**	**$0**	**$1,177,803**
Abatement Program	$610,386	$418,710	$705,214	$0	$0	$880,476
Rental Housing Safety Program	($24,288)	$49,554	$66,208	$0	$0	$80,891
1406 Affordable Housing Program	$72,316	$181,359	$119,800	$0	$0	$216,436

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 106 PUBLIC ART						
REVENUES:						
Interest Earnings	722	124	62	-	-	198
Facility Rentals	(3,000)	-	-	15,000	15,000	6,000
Transfer In - Fund 001 General	-	22,500	-	-	30,000	30,000
Total Revenues	**($2,278)**	**$22,624**	**$62**	**$15,000**	**$45,000**	**$36,198**
EXPENDITURES:						
Arts Commission Programs	-	-	-	2,000	4,626	-
Public Art	5,000	37,902	-	13,000	160,598	79,903
Total Expenditures	**$5,000**	**$37,902**	**$0**	**$15,000**	**$165,224**	**$79,903**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$142,778**	**$135,500**	**$135,500**	**$0**	**$120,223**	**$120,223**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$135,500**	**$120,223**	**$135,562**	**$0**	**$0**	**$76,518**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 180 NARCOTICS SEIZURE						
REVENUES:						
Forfeitures	71,670	15,794	15,794	-	-	6,587
Law Enforcement Contracts	33,485	2,217	2,217	-	-	5,393
Interest Earnings	1,197	171	81	-	-	224
Transfer In from Fleet & Equipment Fund	-	14,500	-	-	-	
Total Revenues	**$106,352**	**32,681**	**18,091**	**$0**	**$0**	**$12,203**
EXPENDITURES:						
Investigations	162,477	66,876	42,714	-	192,000	43,481
Total Expenditures	**$162,477**	**$66,876**	**$42,714**	**$0**	**$192,000**	**$176,856**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$282,321**	**$226,196**	**$226,196**	**$0**	**$192,000**	**$192,000**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$226,196**	**$192,000**	**$201,573**	**$0**	**$0**	**$27,347**

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 181 FELONY SEIZURE						
REVENUES:						
Forfeitures/Misc/Interest	42,660	40	20	-	-	6,958
Total Revenues	**$42,660**	**$40**	**$20**	**$0**	**$0**	**$6,958**
EXPENDITURES:						
Investigations/Predictive Policing	2,966	11,679	6,528	-	16,198	14,386
Capital Purchases	-	-	-	-	20,000	-
Total Expenditures	**$2,966**	**$11,679**	**$6,528**	**$0**	**$36,198**	**$14,386**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$8,143**	**$47,837**	**$47,837**	**$0**	**$36,198**	**$36,198**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$47,837**	**$36,198**	**$41,329**	**$0**	**$0**	**$28,770**

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 182 FEDERAL SEIZURE						
REVENUES:						
Forfeitures	63,492	919	-	-	-	2,590
Interest Earnings	1,132	181	86	-	-	147
Total Revenues	**$64,624**	**$1,100**	**$86**	**$0**	**$0**	**$2,737**
EXPENDITURES:						
Crime Prevention	399	0	-	-	22,006	93
Capital	163,147	18,501	-	-	121,499	142,650
Total Expenditures	**$163,546**	**$18,501**	**$0**	**$0**	**$143,505**	**$142,743**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$259,829**	**$160,907**	**$160,907**	**$0**	**$143,505**	**$143,505**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$160,907**	**$143,505**	**$160,992**	**$0**	**$0**	**$3,499**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 190 CDBG						
REVENUES:						
Grants	385,342	925,565	458,754	595,000	3,287,587	493,604
Interest Earnings	16	6	6	-	-	15
Miscellaneous/Contributions	3,411	5,661	3,411	-	-	1,300
Total Revenues	**$388,769**	**$931,232**	**$462,171**	**$595,000**	**$3,287,587**	**$494,919**
EXPENDITURES:						
Grants	402,213	799,461	533,295	595,000	4,801,082	279,132
Transfer Out - Fund 302 Transportation	8,056	-	-	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$410,269**	**$799,461**	**$533,295**	**$595,000**	**$4,801,082**	**$279,132**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$1,403,224**	**$1,381,724**	**$1,381,724**	**$0**	**$1,513,495**	**$1,513,495**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$1,381,724**	**$1,513,495**	**$1,310,600**	**$0**	**$0**	**$1,729,282**

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 191 NEIGHBORHOOD STABLILIZATION PROGRAM						
REVENUES:						
Grant-NSP 1	43,741	46,093	46,093	-	42,000	29,581
Grant-NSP 3	57,505	-	-	-	-	-
Abatement Charges	-	-	-	37,000	-	-
Abatement Interest	12,257	6,090	6,090	5,000	-	6,326
Total Revenues	**$113,503**	**$52,182**	**$52,182**	**$42,000**	**$42,000**	**$35,907**
EXPENDITURES:						
Grant-NSP 1	822	9,263	5,601	42,000	282,528	2,743
Grant-NSP 3	-	43,357	43,357	-	14,148	-
Total Expenditures	**$822**	**$52,620**	**$48,959**	**$42,000**	**$296,676**	**$2,743**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$142,433**	**$255,115**	**$255,115**	**$0**	**$254,676**	**$254,676**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$255,115**	**$254,676**	**$258,338**	**$0**	**$0**	**$287,840**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 192 SSMCP (SOUTH SOUND MILITARY COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP)						
REVENUES:						
Grants	461,015	531,351	115,196	-	8,428,040	6,903,052
Partner Participation	186,000	204,800	180,500	177,500	177,500	170,500
Misc/Other	500	-	-	-	593,802	59,438
Transfer In From Fund 001 General	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Total Revenues	**$697,515**	**$786,151**	**$345,696**	**$227,500**	**$9,249,342**	**$7,182,990**
EXPENDITURES:						
OEA/SSMCP	732,928	771,870	214,588	227,500	9,281,641	7,649,350
Total Expenditures	**$732,928**	**$771,870**	**$214,588**	**$227,500**	**$9,281,641**	**$7,649,350**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$53,431**	**$18,018**	**$18,018**	**$0**	**$32,299**	**$32,299**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$18,018**	**$32,299**	**$149,125**	**$0**	**$0**	**$ (434,061)**

Note: The negative ending fund balance is due to accounting of the General Fund interfund loan as a liability in this fund.

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 195 PUBLIC SAFETY GRANTS						
REVENUES:						
Grants	535,656	460,460	249,010	132,328	688,015	246,463
Total Revenues	**$535,656**	**$460,460**	**$249,010**	**$132,328**	**$688,015**	**$246,463**
EXPENDITURES:						
Grants	535,656	460,460	249,010	132,328	688,015	246,463
Total Expenditures	**$535,656**	**$460,460**	**$249,010**	**$132,328**	**$688,015**	**$246,463**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$0**	**($0)**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 196 ARPA (AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT) GRANT						
REVENUES:						
Grants	-	1,298,065	-	-	5,922,926	959,785
Interest		1,209	-	-	-	9,595
Total Revenues	**$0**	**$1,299,275**	**$0**	**$0**	**$5,922,926**	**969,380**
EXPENDITURES:						
Grants	-	1,299,275	-	-	5,922,926	959,785
Total Expenditures	**$ -**	**$ 1,299,275**	**$ -**	**$0**	**$5,922,926**	**$959,785**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$9,595**

Note: ARPA funds received totaling $6.7M is deposited as unearned revenue in the balance sheet and recorded as revenue as expeditures are incurred.

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 201 GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND DEBT SERVICE						
REVENUES:						
Transfer-In From General Fund	446,260	448,494	233,885	447,538	447,538	234,394
Transfer-In REET Fund	535,296	773,601	162,902	1,242,400	1,242,400	229,227
Total Revenues	**$981,556**	**$1,222,095**	**$396,787**	**$1,689,938**	**$1,689,938**	**$463,621**
EXPENDITURES:						
Principal & Interest - 59th Avenue	77,000	77,000	77,000	77,000	77,000	77,000
Principal & Interest - Police Station - 2009/2016	209,006	212,594	15,935	210,707	210,707	14,444
Principal & Interest - LOCAL LED Streetlight	154,650	158,900	140,950	158,707	157,775	142,950
Principle & Interest - Transp CIP - LTGO 2019	540,900	537,900	133,950	1,243,524	539,400	127,200
Principle & Interest - Transp CIP - LTGO 2020	-	235,701	28,952	-	235,699	28,534
Principle & Interest - Transp CIP - LTGO 2021	-	-	-	-	469,357	73,492
Total Expenditures	**$981,556**	**$1,222,095**	**$396,787**	**$1,689,938**	**$1,689,938**	**$463,621**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 202 LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (LID) DEBT SERVICE						
REVENUES:						
Interest	1,407	224	108	-	-	142
Assessments	270,724	252,218	-	247,774	245,641	-
LID 1109 Bond Proceeds for Admin Fees (Fund 302)	17,730	-	-	-	-	-
Total Revenues	**$289,861**	**$252,442**	**$108**	**$247,774**	**$245,641**	**$142**
EXPENDITURES:						
LID 1101/1103	10,800	220,690	665	950	-	165
LID 1108	65,521	63,100	182	59,977	137,950	82
LID 1109	600	97,739	96,564	94,686	226,641	95,015
Total Expenditures	**$76,921**	**$381,529**	**$97,411**	**$155,613**	**$364,591**	**95,262**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$35,097**	**$248,038**	**$248,038**	**$0**	**$118,951**	**$118,951**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$248,038**	**$118,951**	**$150,735**	**$92,161**	**$0**	**$23,831**

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 204 SEWER PROJECT DEBT SERVICE						
REVENUES:						
Sewer Charges (4.75% Sewer Surcharge)	791,007	790,478	383,888	805,000	805,000	427,911
Interest Earnings/Other	4,127	734	409	9,200	9,200	1,504
Sanitary Side Sewer Connection Home Loan Repayment	30,413	5,649	5,649	20,058	20,058	-
Total Revenues	**$825,547**	**$796,861**	**$389,946**	**$834,258**	**$834,258**	**$429,415**
EXPENDITURES:						
Principal & Interest	482,554	480,086	480,086	477,618	477,618	477,618
Transfer To Fund 311 Sewer Capital	55,000	190,000	-	50,000	50,000	-
Total Expenditures	**$537,554**	**$670,086**	**$480,086**	**$527,618**	**$527,618**	**$477,618**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$319,321**	**$607,313**	**$607,313**	**$708,683**	**$734,088**	**$734,088**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$607,313**	**$734,088**	**$517,173**	**$1,015,323**	**$1,040,728**	**$685,885**

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 251 LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (LID) GUARANTY DEBT SERVICE						
REVENUES:						
Interest Earnings	674	125	59	-	-	244
Total Revenues	**$674**	**$125**	**$59**	**$0**	**$0**	**$244**
EXPENDITURES:						
Transfer Out - Fund 001 General	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$132,294**	**$132,968**	**$132,968**	**$132,294**	**$133,093**	**$133,093**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$132,968**	**$133,093**	**$133,028**	**$132,294**	**$133,093**	**$133,337**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 301 PARKS CAPITAL						
REVENUES:						
Grants	2,112,047	686,715	336,070	2,518,000	9,796,355	30,350
Motor Vehicle Excise Tax for Paths & Trails	4,198	4,683	2,193	-	-	2,369
Interest Earnings	12,768	1,539	721	-	-	7,119
Contributions/Donations/Utility & Developers	5,023	13,540	13,540	-	-	-
Transfer In From Fund 001 General	494,129	2,562,260	553,750	212,500	647,500	647,500
Transfer In From Fund 102 REET	519,589	158,000	-	624,500	624,500	624,500
Transfer In From Fund 104 Hotel/Motel Lodging Tax	320,093	68,049	68,049	-	72,892	-
Transfer In From Fund 401 Surface Water Mgmt	-	-	-	-	206,277	-
Total Revenues	**$3,467,848**	**$3,494,786**	**$974,323**	**$3,355,000**	**$11,347,524**	**$1,311,838**
EXPENDITURES:						
Capital	3,478,905	2,712,062	1,729,969	3,355,000	14,643,911	445,114
Transfer to Fund 102 REET	100,000	-	-	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**3,578,905**	**$2,712,062**	**$1,729,969**	**$3,355,000**	**$14,643,911**	**$445,114**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$2,716,557**	**$2,605,500**	**$2,605,500**	**$0**	**$3,388,224**	**$3,388,224**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$2,605,500**	**$3,388,224**	**$1,849,853**	**$0**	**$91,837**	**$4,254,948**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 302 TRANSPORATION CAPITAL PROJECT						
REVENUES:						
Motor Vehicle Excise Tax	285,676	318,668	149,230	330,560	330,560	161,181
State Transportation Package - Multi-Modal Distribution	81,341	81,553	40,284	79,240	79,240	41,889
State Transportation Package - Increased Gas Tax (MVET)	71,174	71,360	35,249	69,635	69,635	36,653
Traffic Mitigation Fees	-		-			
Pavement Degradation Fees	28,135	44,110	21,263	-	-	10,717
Grants/Congressional Direct Spending	2,192,897	3,574,537	1,627,115	4,859,598	12,064,501	2,152,608
Contributions from Utilities/Developers/Partners	150,126	950,443	-	-	1,999,753	290,678
LID Financing	922,757	-	-	-	-	-
Proceeds from Sale of Asset/Street Vacation	65,203	-	-	-	-	-
Interest/Other	57,861	4,346	1,982	-	-	14,309
GO Bond Proceeds	3,029,885	6,639,010	-	-	-	-
Transfer In - Fund 001 General	512,000	700,000	700,000	432,965	1,219,825	1,219,825
Transfer In - Fund 102/303 REET	1,100,950	818,295	-	-	5,187,200	5,187,200
Transfer In - Fund 103 TBD	247,457	-	-	640,000	2,358,000	1,858,000
Transfer In - Fund 190 CDBG	8,056	18,137	(5,040)	-	276,823	26,581
Transfer In - Fund 401 SWM	492,901	930,556	779,458	3,000,000	5,979,543	67,482
Total Revenues	**$9,246,420**	**$14,151,015**	**$3,349,540**	**$9,411,998**	**$29,565,080**	**$11,067,123**
EXPENDITURES:						
Capital Projects (Excluding TBD Bond Projects Add'l Cost)	14,571,364	11,981,972	4,374,487	9,411,998	31,575,723	4,668,886
Debt Issue Cost	19,500	49,389	10,380	-	-	-
Transfer Out - Fund 201 GO Bond Debt Service	17,730	-	-	-	-	-
Transfer Out - Fund 401 SWM	241,840	-	-	-	-	-
Intefund Loan Repayment	880,204	-	-	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$15,730,638**	**$12,031,361**	**$4,384,867**	**$9,411,998**	**$31,575,723**	**$4,668,886**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$11,354,136**	**$4,869,918**	**$4,869,918**	**$181,246**	**$6,989,572**	**$6,989,572**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$4,869,918**	**$6,989,572**	**$3,834,590**	**$181,246**	**$4,978,929**	**$13,387,809**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 303 REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX						
REVENUES:						
Real Estate Excise Tax	3,643,117	4,557,032	1,592,505	1,800,000	1,931,553	2,627,510
Interest Earnings	2,413	1,817	725	-	-	5,124
Transfer In - Parks CIP	100,000	-	-	-	-	42,084
Transfer In - Transportation CIP	-	-		-	42,084	
Total Revenue	**$3,745,530**	**$4,558,849**	**$1,593,230**	**1,800,000**	**1,973,637**	**$2,674,718**
EXPENDITURES:						
Transfer Out - Fund 201 GO Bond Debt Service	535,296	773,601	162,902	1,242,400	1,242,400	229,227
Transfer Out - Fund 301 Parks CIP	519,589	158,000	-	624,500	624,500	624,500
Transfer Out - Fund 302 Transportation CIP	1,219,403	818,295	-	-	5,187,200	5,187,200
Total Expenditures	**$2,274,288**	**$1,749,896**	**$162,902**	**$1,866,900**	**$7,054,100**	**$6,040,927**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$800,269**	**$2,271,510**	**$2,271,510**	**$261,900**	**$5,080,463**	**$5,080,463**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$2,271,510**	**$5,080,463**	**$3,701,838**	**$195,000**	**$0**	**$1,714,254**

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 311 SEWER CAPITAL PROJECT						
REVENUES:						
Grants	-	-	-	-	75,000	-
Sewer Availability Charge	297,919	613,517	125,914	200,000	385,020	147,342
Interest Earnings	5,381	81,850	868	-	-	3,013
Proceeds from Lien	1,543	4,081	625	-	-	1,130
Transfer In Fund 001 General	27,000	-	-	-	-	-
Transfer In From Fund 401 Surface Water Mgmt	8,000	-	-	-	-	-
Transfer In Fund 204 Sewer Debt (Sewer Surcharge 4.75%)	55,000	190,000	-	50,000	50,000	-
Total Revenues	**$394,844**	**$889,447**	**$127,407**	**$250,000**	**$510,020**	**$151,486**
EXPENDITURES:						
Capital/Administration	108,745	895,865	42,709	130,000	967,520	49,248
Total Expenditures	**$108,745**	**$895,865**	**$42,709**	**$130,000**	**$967,520**	**49,248**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$1,245,820**	**$1,531,919**	**$1,531,919**	**$25,586**	**$1,525,500**	**$1,525,500**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$1,531,919**	**$1,525,500**	**$1,616,616**	**$145,586**	**$1,068,000**	**$1,627,738**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 401 SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT						
REVENUES:						
Storm Drainage Fees & Charges	4,480,680	4,682,408	2,588,348	4,466,400	4,516,400	2,763,836
Site Development Permit Fee	74,816	86,145	44,665	50,000	50,000	41,835
Interest Earnings & Misc	22,701	6,283	2,684	15,600	15,600	21,049
Subtotal Operating Revenues	**$4,578,197**	**$4,774,836**	**$2,635,698**	**$4,532,000**	**$4,582,000**	**$2,826,719**
EXPENDITURES:						
Engineering Services	1,430,305	1,478,580	807,724	1,912,690	1,945,473	837,432
Operations & Maintenance	623,702	889,557	96,068	965,501	965,501	281,221
Revenue Bonds - Debt Service (15-Year Life, 4%)	-	-	-	501,000	501,000	35,308
Transfer to Fund 001 General Admin Support	284,700	284,700	142,350	284,700	284,700	142,350
Subtotal Operating Expenditures	**$2,338,707**	**$2,652,837**	**$1,046,142**	**$3,663,891**	**$3,696,674**	**$1,296,310**
% Expenditure Change over Prior Year	**-7.45%**	**13.43%**		**38.11%**	**39.35%**	
OPERATING INCOME (LOSS)	**$2,239,490**	**$2,122,000**	**$1,589,555**	**$868,109**	**$885,326**	**$1,530,409**
As a % of Operating Expenditures	**95.8%**	**80.0%**	**151.9%**	**23.7%**	**23.9%**	**118.1%**
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:						
Grants/Contributions	120,168	37,518	21,398	-	-	25,968
American Lake Management District	32,337	32,659	9,710	33,476	33,476	11,545
Flood Control Opportunity Fund	300,202	-	-	-	-	-
Revenue Bonds - Bond Proceeds	-	4,028,365	-	3,000,000	-	-
Transfer In From Fund 302 Transportation Capital	241,840	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Other Financing Sources	**$694,546**	**$4,098,541**	**$31,108**	**$3,033,476**	**$33,476**	**$37,514**
OTHER FINANCING USES:						
Capital/1-Time	903,821	75,635	39,720	906,270	1,257,262	326,826
Debt Issue Cost	-	28,361		-	-	-
American Lake Management District	14,584	31,129	2,246	30,464	59,830	1,640
Transfer to Fund 301 Parks CIP	-	-	-	-	206,277	-
Transfer to Fund 302 Transportation Capital	492,901	930,556	779,458	3,000,000	5,979,543	67,482
Transfer To Fund 311 Sewer Capital	8,000	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Other Financing Uses	**$1,419,305**	**$1,065,681**	**$821,424**	**$3,936,734**	**$7,502,912**	**$395,948**
Total Revenues and Other Sources	**$5,272,743**	**$8,873,377**	**$2,666,805**	**$7,565,476**	**$4,615,476**	**$2,864,233**
Total Expenditures and other Uses	**$3,758,013**	**$3,718,518**	**$1,867,566**	**$7,600,625**	**$11,199,586**	**$1,692,258**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$4,306,289**	**$5,821,019**	**$5,821,019**	**$1,881,315**	**$10,975,879**	**$10,975,879**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$5,821,019**	**$10,975,879**	**$6,620,258**	**$1,846,166**	**$4,391,769**	**$12,147,853**
Ending Fund Balance as a % of Operating Rev	127.1%	229.9%	251.2%	40.7%	95.8%	429.8%
17% Operating Reserves (of operating revenues)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
33% Operating Reserves (of operating expenditures)	$771,773	$875,436	$345,227	$1,209,084	$1,219,902	$1,219,902
1% Capital Reserves	$453,795	$490,130	$490,130	$529,130	$525,630	$525,630
American Lake Management District	$31,237	$29,679	$35,614	$33,604	$0	36,714
SWM Bonds for Transportation CIP	$0	4,000,000	$4,000,000	$0	$0	$4,000,000
Unreserved / (Shortfall):	$4,564,214	$5,580,633	$1,749,287	$74,348	$2,646,236	$6,365,607

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 501 FLEET & EQUIPMENT						
OPERATING REVENUES:						
M&O Revenue	617,408	609,767	268,986	740,720	740,720	367,684
Interest Earnings	19,472	3,932	1,883	15,000	15,000	8,346
Total Revenues	**$636,880**	**$613,700**	**$270,868**	**$755,720**	**$755,720**	**$376,030**
OPERATING EXPENDITURES:						
Fuel/Gasoline	255,476	323,367	131,198	424,150	424,150	192,171
Other Supplies	11,720	12,089	9,432	3,990	3,990	2,543
Repairs & Maintenance	380,884	308,472	130,112	327,580	327,580	199,424
Other Services & Charges	516	352	126	-	-	472
Total Expenditures	**$648,597**	**$644,280**	**$270,868**	**$755,720**	**$755,720**	**$394,610**
Operating Revenue Over/(Under) Expenditures	**($11,716)**	**($30,580)**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**($18,580)**
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:						
Interfund Loan (Fund 302 LID Interim Financing)	880,204	-	-	-	-	-
Replacement Reserves Collections	-	835,636	-	-	843,891	281,297
Capital Contribution	25,807	99,695	-	-	120,250	16,169
Proceeds From Sale of Assets	11,716	30,580	24,660	-	-	18,580
Transfer In From Fund 504 Risk Management	64,851	-	-	-	-	-
Total Other Financing Sources	**$982,578**	**$965,911**	**$24,660**	**$0**	**$964,141**	**$316,046**
OTHER FINANCING USES:						
Fleet & Equipment New & Replacement	490,005	585,059	211,055	252,000	560,563	132,613
Transfer to Fund 180 Narcotics Seizure	-	14,500	-			
Total Other Financing Uses	**$490,005**	**$599,559**	**$211,055**	**$252,000**	**$560,563**	**$132,613**
Total Revenues	**$1,619,459**	**$1,579,611**	**$295,528**	**$755,720**	**$1,719,861**	**$692,076**
Total Expenditures	**$1,138,602**	**$1,243,839**	**$481,923**	**$1,007,720**	**$1,316,283**	**$527,223**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$3,780,451**	**$4,261,308**	**$4,261,308**	**$3,456,779**	**$4,597,080**	**$4,597,080**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$4,261,308**	**$4,597,080**	**$4,074,913**	**$3,204,779**	**$5,000,658**	**$4,761,933**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 502 PROPERTY MANAGEMENT						
OPERATING REVENUES:						
M&O Revenue	702,611	769,605	361,618	698,917	748,917	303,707
Interest Earnings	2,278	549	258	-	-	1,094
Total Operating Revenues	**$ 704,888**	**$ 770,154**	**$ 361,876**	**$ 698,917**	**$ 748,917**	**$ 304,801**
OPERATING EXPENDITURES:						
City Hall Facility	374,899	415,462	193,137	383,354	406,354	165,671
Police Station	275,469	294,848	148,740	245,881	268,881	119,821
Parking Facilities/Light Rail	54,521	59,844	19,999	69,682	73,682	19,308
Total Operating Expenditures	**$ 704,888**	**$ 770,154**	**$ 361,876**	**$ 698,917**	**$ 748,917**	**$ 304,801**
Operating Revenue Over/(Under) Expenditures	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:						
Annual Replacement Reserve Collections / Other 1-Time	156,178	26,782	-	100,000	198,142	50,000
Total Other Financing Sources	**$ 156,178**	**$ 26,782**	**$ -**	**$ 100,000**	**$ 198,142**	**$ 50,000**
OTHER FINANCING USES:						
Capital/1-Time/6-Year Property Management Plan	7,934	36,604	9,822	5,000	428,320	-
Total Other Financing Uses	**$ 7,934**	**$ 36,604**	**$ 9,822**	**$ 5,000**	**$ 428,320**	**$ -**
Total Revenues	**$ 861,066**	**$ 796,936**	**$ 361,876**	**$ 798,917**	**$ 947,059**	**$ 354,801**
Total Expenditures	**$ 712,823**	**$ 806,758**	**$ 371,698**	**$ 703,917**	**$ 1,177,237**	**$ 304,801**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$436,057**	**$584,300**	**$584,300**	**$159,124**	**$574,479**	**$574,479**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$584,300**	**$574,479**	**$574,479**	**$254,124**	**$344,301**	**$624,479**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 503 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY						
REVENUES:						
M&O Revenue	1,337,482	1,381,651	694,736	1,952,033	2,104,333	918,254
Misc/Interest/Other	2,826	215	89	-	-	411
Total Operating Revenues	**$ 1,340,308**	**$ 1,381,866**	**$ 694,825**	**$ 1,952,033**	**$ 2,104,333**	**$ 918,665**
EXPENDITURES:						
Personnel	524,535	583,361	293,341	601,193	657,693	298,977
Supplies	60,796	49,704	33,630	179,520	179,520	22,032
Services & Charges	754,976	748,801	367,854	1,171,320	1,267,120	597,632
6-Year IT Strategic Plan/IS Expenses to be Allocated	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Operating Expenditures	**$1,340,308**	**$1,381,866**	**$694,825**	**$1,952,033**	**$2,104,333**	**$918,640**
Operating Revenue Over/(Under) Expenditures	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$25**
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:						
Replacement Reserve Collection	66,845	-	-	66,756	66,756	33,288
Capital Contrib & Other 1-Time /6-Year Strategic Plan	305,350	344,580	246,788	158,750	628,093	271,731
Total Other Financing Sources	**$372,195**	**$344,580**	**$246,788**	**$225,506**	**$694,849**	**$305,019**
OTHER FINANCING USES:						
One-Time/Capital	305,350	344,580	60,658	158,750	628,093	271,731
Total Other Financing Uses	**$305,350**	**$344,580**	**$60,658**	**$158,750**	**$628,093**	**$271,731**
Total Revenues	**$1,712,503**	**$1,726,446**	**$941,612**	**$2,177,539**	**$2,799,182**	**$1,223,685**
Total Expenditures	**$1,645,658**	**$1,726,446**	**$755,483**	**$2,110,783**	**$2,732,426**	**$1,190,372**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$138,678**	**$205,523**	**$205,523**	**$205,522**	**$205,522**	**$205,522**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$205,523**	**$205,523**	**$391,652**	**$272,278**	**$272,278**	**$238,835**

Return to Agenda

	2020 Annual Actual	2021 Annual Actual	2021 Actual YTD	2022 Original	2022 Current Revised	2022 Actual YTD
FUND 504 RISK MANAGEMENT						
REVENUES:						
M&O Revenue	1,289,027	1,273,297	1,465,350	1,396,480	1,502,450	1,560,362
AWC Retro Refund	128,938	117,286	-	-	112,495	0
Interest/Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	130
Insurance Proceeds/3rd Party Recoveries	371,383	215,508	83,259	200,000	400,000	85,904
Total Revenues	**$1,789,348**	**$1,606,091**	**$1,548,609**	**$1,596,480**	**$2,014,945**	**$1,646,397**
EXPENDITURES:						
Safety Program	2,474	2,754	1,310	3,980	3,980	991
AWC Retro Program	37,356	33,945	33,945	37,500	37,500	29,923
WCIA Assessment	1,438,931	1,364,838	1,364,838	1,355,000	1,477,365	1,477,145
Claims/Judgments & Settlements	245,735	204,554	148,516	200,000	496,100	138,338
Total Expenditures	**$1,724,497**	**$1,606,091**	**$1,548,609**	**$1,596,480**	**$2,014,945**	**$1,646,397**
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES:						
Capital Contribution/1-Time M&O	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Other Financing Sources	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
OTHER FINANCING USES:						
Transfer To Fund 501 Fleet & Equipment	64,851	-	-	-	-	-
Total Other Financing Uses	**$64,851**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
Total Revenues	**$1,789,348**	**$1,606,091**	**$1,548,609**	**$1,596,480**	**$2,014,945**	**$1,646,397**
Total Expenditures	**$1,789,348**	**$1,606,091**	**$1,548,609**	**$1,596,480**	**$2,014,945**	**$1,646,397**
Beginning Fund Balance:	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
Ending Fund Balance:	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

Return to Agenda

Building Permit Activity Report

Permit Type Description	2021 Total YTD Jun			2022 Total YTD Jun			2022 Change over 2021 Increase/(Decrease)					
	# of Permits	Permit Fees	Valuation	# of Permits	Permit Fees	Valuation	# of Permits		Permit Fees		Valuation	
Commercial	**178**	**$ 563,656**	**$ 55,699,655**	**170**	**$ 430,958**	**$ 33,251,392**	**(8)**	**-4%**	**$ (132,699)**	**-24%**	**$ (22,448,263)**	**-40%**
Commercial Addition	2	$ 3,568	$ 158,864	5	$ 21,991	$ 1,632,504	3	150%	$ 18,423	516%	$ 1,473,640	928%
Commercial Carport	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
Commercial Deck	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
Commercial Demolition Permit	8	$ 2,036	$ 144,500	6	$ 1,792	$ 228,750	(2)	-25%	$ (244)	-12%	$ 84,250	58%
Commercial Gate	1	$ 1,337	$ 30,000	4	$ 4,949	$ 141,894	3	300%	$ 3,612	270%	$ 111,894	373%
Commercial Mechanical	36	$ 14,475	$ -	44	$ 28,389	$ 930,097	8	22%	$ 13,913	96%	$ 930,097	n/a
Comm Over-the-Counter Mechanical	9	$ 1,859	$ -	12	$ 1,724	$ 38,050	3	33%	$ (135)	-7%	$ 38,050	n/a
Solar - Comm/Non-prescriptive Res	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
New Commercial Building	12	$ 165,671	$ 17,814,332	5	$ 91,642	$ 10,386,517	(7)	-58%	$ (74,030)	-45%	$ (7,427,815)	-42%
New Commercial Bldg - Multi-Family	-	$ -	$ -	2	$ 44,441	$ 4,130,426	2	n/a	$ 44,441	n/a	$ 4,130,426	n/a
Commercial Plumbing	31	$ 10,142	$ -	34	$ 17,820	$ 124,100	3	10%	$ 7,678	76%	$ 124,100	n/a
Commercial Swimming Pool/Spa	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
Comm over-the-counter plumbing	5	$ 879	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	(5)	-100%	$ (879)	-100%	$ -	n/a
Commercial Retaining Wall	1	$ 3,573	$ 172,000	1	$ 789	$ 8,100	0	0%	$ (2,784)	-78%	$ (163,900)	-95%
Commercial Remodel	46	$ 329,683	$ 35,683,322	52	$ 215,111	$ 15,530,876	6	13%	$ (114,571)	-35%	$ (20,152,446)	-56%
Commercial Re-roof	7	$ 14,376	$ 870,675	2	$ 1,554	$ 86,778	(5)	-71%	$ (12,823)	-89%	$ (783,897)	-90%
Comm re-roof over-the-counter	16	$ 15,746	$ 822,613	-	$ -	$ -	(16)	-100%	$ (15,746)	-100%	$ (822,613)	-100%
Commercial Window Replacement	-	$ -	$ -	3	$ 757	$ 13,300	3	n/a	$ 757	n/a	$ 13,300	n/a
Comm Window replacement OTC	4	$ 311	$ 3,349	-	$ -	$ -	(4)	-100%	$ (311)	-100%	$ (3,349)	-100%
Residential	**574**	**$ 502,302**	**$ 32,736,332**	**679**	**$ 397,288**	**$ 17,221,844**	**105**	**18%**	**$ (105,015)**	**-21%**	**$ (15,514,489)**	**-47%**
Residential Accessory Structure	11	$ 15,354	$ 597,553	8	$ 8,159	$ 295,331	(3)	-27%	$ (7,195)	-47%	$ (302,221)	-51%
Residential Addition	15	$ 26,000	$ 962,023	13	$ 17,372	$ 579,966	(2)	-13%	$ (8,628)	-33%	$ (382,057)	-40%
Residential Accessory Dwelling Unit	2	$ 6,287	$ 268,750	2	$ 7,060	$ 307,947	0	0%	$ 773	12%	$ 39,197	15%
Residential Demolition Permit	12	$ 1,914	$ 352,327	18	$ 3,617	$ 310,680	6	50%	$ 1,703	89%	$ (41,647)	-12%
Residential Gate	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
Residential Mechanical	1	$ 115	$ -	76	$ 6,849	$ 2,200	75	7500%	$ 6,734	5855%	$ 2,200	n/a
Res over-the-counter mechanical	263	$ 20,096	$ -	267	$ 21,067	$ 8,150	4	2%	$ 971	5%	$ 8,150	n/a
New Single Family Residence	47	$ 318,183	$ 20,401,412	35	$ 178,907	$ 10,159,061	(12)	-26%	$ (139,276)	-44%	$ (10,242,351)	-50%
Residential Plumbing	10	$ 748	$ -	44	$ 8,673	$ 140,610	34	340%	$ 7,925	1059%	$ 140,610	n/a
Res over-the-counter plumbing	24	$ 1,407	$ -	29	$ 1,924	$ 13,000	5	21%	$ 517	37%	$ 13,000	n/a
Residential Re-roof	-	$ -	$ -	14	$ 6,434	$ 264,456	14	n/a	$ 6,434	n/a	$ 264,456	n/a
Res re-roof over-the-counter	31	$ 11,427	$ 498,936	31	$ 12,029	$ 518,328	0	0%	$ 602	5%	$ 19,392	4%
Residential Remodel/Repair	72	$ 82,677	$ 2,905,849	84	$ 94,602	$ 3,766,755	12	17%	$ 11,925	14%	$ 860,905	30%
Solar - Residential Prescriptive OTC	3	$ 1,146	$ 28,635	14	$ 10,488	$ 280,282	11	367%	$ 9,343	816%	$ 251,647	879%
Residential Window Replacement	-	$ -	$ -	32	$ 9,642	$ 265,869	32	n/a	$ 9,642	n/a	$ 265,869	n/a
Res Window replacement OTC	83	$ 16,949	$ 6,720,847	12	$ 10,465	$ 309,208	(71)	-86%	$ (6,483)	-38%	$ (6,411,638)	-95%
WEB Residential Furnace	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
WEB Residential Water Heater	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
Manufactured Home	**10**	**$ 8,262**	**$ 275,922**	**5**	**$ 3,196**	**$ 101,626**	**(5)**	**-50%**	**$ (5,066)**	**-61%**	**$ (174,296)**	**-63%**
Manufactured Home - residential lot	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
Manufactured Home - MH Park	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
Monument Sign	10	$ 8,262	$ 275,922	5	$ 3,196	$ 101,626	(5)	-50%	$ (5,066)	-61%	$ (174,296)	-63%
Other	**32**	**$ 10,641**	**$ 211,682**	**36**	**$ 13,044**	**$ 370,754**	**4**	**13%**	**$ 2,402**	**23%**	**$ 159,072**	**75%**
Change of Use	1	$ 184	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	(1)	-100%	$ (184)	-100%	$ -	n/a
Day Care	-	$ -	$ -	1	$ 117	$ -	1	n/a	$ 117	n/a	$ -	n/a
Pole Sign	2	$ 1,499	$ 47,190	3	$ 3,355	$ 199,000	1	50%	$ 1,857	124%	$ 151,810	322%
Wall Sign	18	$ 6,935	$ 164,492	19	$ 7,179	$ 171,754	1	6%	$ 244	4%	$ 7,262	4%
Adult Family Home	11	$ 2,024	$ -	13	$ 2,392	$ -	2	18%	$ 368	18%	$ -	n/a
Universal Base Plan	-	$ -	$ -	-	$ -	$ -	0	n/a	$ -	n/a	$ -	n/a
	794	**$ 1,084,862**	**$ 88,923,591**	**890**	**$ 844,485**	**$ 50,945,616**	**96**	**12%**	**$ (240,377)**	**-22%**	**$ (37,977,975)**	**-43%**

Note:

- Reports generated in the permits module are based either on application date range or issued date range and are meant to show activity.

- At application a portion of the fees are collected with the balance being collected at issuance which could fall in two different reporting periods.

- The report is not intended to be a revenue report, rather it is intended to show the number and types of permits and information on what those permits generated overall in permit fees and valuation.

- The Building Permit Report only reflects the building division and does not include planning and public works.

- The revenue reported on this spreadsheet is based on issued permits and will never match the financial revenue report as it does not include monies collected on permits that have not yet been issued.

Return to Agenda

Annual Totals	2021 # Permits	2022 # Permits	2021 Permit Fees	2022 Permit Fees	2021 Valuation	2022 Valuation
Commercial	178	170	$ 563,656	$ 430,958	$ 55,699,655	$ 33,251,392
Residential	574	679	$ 502,302	$ 397,288	$ 32,736,332	$ 17,221,844
Manufactured & Other	42	41	$ 18,903	$ 16,240	$ 487,604	$ 472,380
Total	794	890	$ 1,084,862	$ 844,485	$ 88,923,591	$ 50,945,616

Return to Agenda

MyLakewood311 # of Requests by Type							
	2019		2020		2021		2022
Type	YTD	Annual	YTD	Annual	YTD	Annual	YTD
Abandon/Vacant Property	14	55	15	53	5	61	31
Abandoned Vehicles	40	178	30	180	57	250	115
Animal-Related Calls	7	77	29	56	16	98	57
Compliments	3	13	2	10	4	11	5
Drug Activity/House	3	16	2	27	10	38	16
Flooding	14	75	30	95	24	67	42
Gang Activity	2	8	2	11	1	11	-
Garbage-Related Calls	225	1187	207	861	191	988	385
General Questions	25	110	29	115	19	87	25
Graffiti/Vandalism	47	192	65	192	25	141	60
Hazardous Materials	2	8	-	4	-	2	2
Hazardous Weather/Road Conditions	31	52	11	46	22	60	17
Homeless Concerns	0	0	29	141	28	173	67
Illegal Auto Activity	5	44	7	38	12	62	26
Illegal Dumping	0	0	3	6	51	238	119
Noise/Nuisance	5	26	7	90	29	143	59
Other Police Requests	13	54	5	34	16	102	33
Parking Commercial Vehicle Private Property	5	18	4	30	5	35	11
Patrol Response	2	31	7	24	4	13	2
Play Equipment	0	7	3	11	-	6	4
Pothole	89	263	165	294	72	196	250
Restroom	0	2	1	2	-	8	3
Signs	133	392	145	401	92	362	158
Speed Complaint	2	47	12	47	6	62	26
Street Light	38	83	14	54	25	82	52
Street Sweeper Requests	0	0	3	26	2	56	15
Traffic	1	17	2	24	5	26	25
Traffic Signal	19	86	11	39	7	43	16
Unpermitted/Prohibited Signs	5	80	30	127	26	101	18
Unsafe Power Lines	5	5	-	8	-	4	2
Vegetation-Related calls	37	162	34	148	24	123	75
Other Requests			28	267	4	28	34
Total	**786**	**3,406**	**932**	**3,461**	**782**	**3,677**	**1,750**

Return to Agenda

Return to Agenda

Return to Agenda

MyLakewood311 # of Requests by Type Year 2019														
Type	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD June	Total Annual
Abandon/Vacant Property	3	2	9	1	8	5	5	8	4	3	5	2	28	55
Abandoned Vehicles	11	16	13	17	8	16	30	13	21	10	11	12	81	178
Animal-Related Calls	3	1	3	3	4	13	8	17	6	12	2	5	27	77
Compliments	2	1	-	-	-	3	1	2	1	2	-	1	6	13
Crime Tips	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	11	13
Drug Activity/House	-	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	-	2	10	16
Flooding	7	6	1	1		2	3		5	9	1	40	17	75
Gang Activity	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	1	2	8
Garbage-Related Calls	72	53	100	106	95	105	158	132	93	103	90	80	531	1,187
General Questions	11	7	7	1	8	13	8	12	8	15	10	10	47	110
Graffiti/Vandalism	9	19	19	8	30	17	17	17	11	16	8	21	102	192
Hazardous Materials	2	-	-		-	-	1	2	2	-	1	-	2	8
Hazardous Weather/Road Conditions	29	-	2	3	2	-	1	2	2	7	2	2	36	52
Homeless Concerns	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Homeless Encampment	5	-	5	11	7	12	15	15	10	2	14	9	40	105
Illegal Auto Activity	2	2	1	1	5	11	4	6	4	2	3	3	22	44
Illegal Dumping	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Noise/Nuisance	3	1	1	4	-	3	1	6	4	2	1	-	12	26
Other Police Requests	4	4	5	3	5	9	13	2	1	6	2	-	30	54
Parking Commercial Vehicle Private	1	2	2	2	-	1		3	2	2	1	2	8	18
Patrol Response	2	-	-	4	2	3	6	4	1	5	2	2	11	31
Play Equipment	-	-	-		1	2	1		1	1	1	-	3	7
Pothole	23	36	30	30	23	19	13	14	12	21	16	26	161	263
Restroom	-	-	-		-	-			-	-	-	2	-	2
Signs	75	38	20	27	31	25	27	31	34	38	18	28	216	392
Speed Complaint	1	1		7	11	1	8	5	9	2	-	2	21	47
Street Light	17	8	13	4	3	6	6	1	6	10	2	7	51	83
Street Sweeper Request	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Traffic	-	1	-	2	1	3	3	3	2	2	-	-	7	17
Traffic Signal	10	5	4	2	5	7	9	6	9	7	13	9	33	86
Unpermitted/Prohibited Signs	2	3	-	1	1	-	11	8	9	14	14	17	7	80
Unsafe Power Lines	3	2	-			-			-	-	-	-	5	5
Vegetation-Related calls	18	11	8	6	21	21	18	13	13	19	11	3	85	162
Other Requests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Total	317	223	246	248	276	302	371	323	271	311	232	286	1,612	3,406

Return to Agenda

MyLakewood311 # of Requests by Type Year 2020														
Type	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD June	Total Annual
Abandon/Vacant Property	3	7	5	1	5	1	4	7	11	3	3	3	22	53
Abandoned Vehicles	8	11	11	6	21	16	22	18	17	24	12	14	73	180
Animal-Related Calls	10	11	8	5		1		1	5	12		3	35	56
Compliments		1	1	1		2	1	1	2			1	5	10
Drug Activity/House	1	1	-	4	1	4	9	1	5			1	11	27
Flooding	25	1	4	-	1	3	1	1	31	13	10	5	34	95
Gang Activity	2						3	4			1	1	2	11
Garbage-Related Calls	65	74	68	63	58	71	70	123	93	64	54	58	399	861
General Questions	8	9	12	20	16	13	11	4	3	5	6	8	78	115
Graffiti/Vandalism	25	17	23	11	16	8	12	10	9	24	24	13	100	192
Hazardous Materials						1				2		1	1	4
Hazardous Weather/Road Conditions	6	5		3	6	5	4	4	1	5	1	6	25	46
Homeless Concerns	12	11	6	7	4	12	15	18	18	19	7	12	52	141
Illegal Auto Activity	4	1	2	8	4	1	3	1	7	2	3	2	20	38
Illegal Dumping	3						3						3	6
Noise/Nuisance	2	3	2	3	10	13	9	13	6	5	11	13	33	90
Other Police Requests		1	4	4	1	1	3	3	8	5	2	2	11	34
Parking Commercial Vehicle Private Property	1		3	1	3	2	7	6	3	1	3		10	30
Patrol Response	2	1	4	7		6			2		1	1	20	24
Play Equipment		1	2	1			4	2			1		4	11
Pothole	65	74	26	33	4	29	5	15	12	4	14	13	231	294
Restroom		1									1		1	2
Signs	63	53	29	28	21	18	23	38	24	52	38	14	212	401
Speed Complaint	5	3	4	3	9	2	7	5	3	3	2	1	26	47
Street Light	2	7	5	2	2	2	5	3	2	9	6	9	20	54
Street Sweeper Requests		3			3	4	2	1	1	5	3	4	10	26
Traffic			2	1	3	2	3	5	3	4		1	8	24
Traffic Signal	6	2	3		1	2	5	7	4	4	3	2	14	39
Unpermitted/Prohibited Signs	9	15	6	2	9	23	7	20	12	14	8	2	64	127
Unsafe Power Lines	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	2	-	-	-	-	-	8
Vegetation-Related calls	13	15	6	8	17	13	16	25	3	16	10	6	72	148
Other Requests	2	9	17	14	37	46	29	16	20	25	24	28	125	267
Total	342	337	253	236	252	301	289	354	305	320	248	224	1,721	3,461

Return to Agenda

MyLakewood311 # of Requests by Type
Year 2021

Type	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD June	Total Annual
Abandon/Vacant Property	-	3	2	13	9	7	10	9	3	-	2	3	34	61
Abandoned Vehicles	22	15	20	22	28	22	33	21	13	16	14	24	129	250
Animal-Related Calls	5	2	9	7	14	10	10	11	12	6	4	8	47	98
Compliments	2	1	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	1	-	1	5	11
Drug Activity/House	6	2	2	4	2	4	3	4	4	1	3	3	20	38
Flooding	21	3	-	-	-	4	-	-	5	7	18	9	28	67
Gang Activity	-	-	1	-	2	2	2	3	-	-	1	-	5	11
Garbage-Related Calls	71	53	67	126	109	75	97	99	95	87	57	52	501	988
General Questions	5	5	9	12	3	10	8	5	9	3	12	6	44	87
Graffiti/Vandalism	15	3	7	13	10	5	15	25	19	16	12	1	53	141
Hazardous Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
Hazardous Weather/Road Conditions	17	5	-	-	-	1	3	4	3	3	9	15	23	60
Homeless Concerns	6	7	15	25	14	11	16	25	20	20	4	10	78	173
Illegal Auto Activity	2	6	4	6	7	5	9	5	6	5	4	3	30	62
Illegal Dumping	16	16	19	29	23	15	37	17	18	20	13	15	118	238
Noise/Nuisance	9	8	12	11	14	7	13	17	11	18	13	10	61	143
Other Police Requests	2	7	7	10	11	14	8	7	16	7	9	4	51	102
Parking Commercial Vehicle Private Property	-	2	3	1	9	3	2	2	4	2	5	2	18	35
Patrol Response	2	1	1	1	-	2	1	4	1	-	-	-	7	13
Play Equipment	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	3	6
Pothole	28	27	17	16	17	13	10	6	7	11	20	24	118	196
Restroom	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	3	1	1	-	1	8
Signs	43	22	27	32	38	30	24	16	29	40	41	20	192	362
Speed Complaint	2	1	3	3	6	6	10	5	8	5	11	2	21	62
Street Light	5	11	9	4	4	-	3	4	6	12	12	12	33	82
Street Sweeper Requests	1	-	1	8	-	10	2	2	4	8	15	5	20	56
Traffic	3	2	-	2	3	1	3	2	2	2	4	2	11	26
Traffic Signal	3	-	4	5	5	1	-	4	5	3	8	5	18	43
Unpermitted/Prohibited Signs	7	6	13	7	9	25	6	11	6	4	5	2	67	101
Unsafe Power Lines	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	4
Vegetation-Related calls	11	4	9	17	17	26	18	17	-	-	3	1	84	123
Other Requests	1	2	1	3	4	5	3	1	2	2	2	2	16	28
Total	305	214	263	378	361	316	351	329	313	301	303	243	1,837	3,677

Return to Agenda

MyLakewood311 # of Requests by Type Year 2022													
Type	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD June
Abandon/Vacant Property	9	1	6	5	-	10							31
Abandoned Vehicles	18	12	21	22	17	25							115
Animal-Related Calls	13	1	10	11	13	9							57
Compliments	1	1	2	1	-	-							5
Drug Activity/House	6	1	1	1	2	5							16
Flooding	32	2	2	-	4	2							42
Gang Activity	-	-	-	-	-	-							-
Garbage-Related Calls	63	54	80	70	72	46							385
General Questions	5	3	4	4	6	3							25
Graffiti/Vandalism	7	7	9	19	11	7							60
Hazardous Materials	-	-	1	-	1	-							2
Hazardous Weather/Road Conditions	7	1	-	3	2	4							17
Homeless Concerns	8	5	14	18	11	11							67
Illegal Auto Activity	6	4	3	4	4	5							26
Illegal Dumping	18	29	24	18	16	14							119
Noise/Nuisance	8	10	8	8	5	20							59
Other Police Requests	11	6	6	1	3	6							33
Parking Commercial Vehicle Private Property	3	2	4	-	-	2							11
Patrol Response	1	-	-	-	-	1							2
Play Equipment	-	-	2	1	-	1							4
Pothole	75	13	51	37	39	35							250
Restroom	-	-	3	-	-	-							3
Signs	42	26	26	31	20	13							158
Speed Complaint	6	2	6	4	4	4							26
Street Light	10	16	8	6	6	6							52
Street Sweeper Requests	1	1	2	7	3	1							15
Traffic	2	4	5	4	2	8							25
Traffic Signal	2	2	-	2	5	5							16
Unpermitted/Prohibited Signs	1	3	2	6	2	4							18
Unsafe Power Lines	-	-	-	-	-	2							2
Vegetation-Related calls	-	-	6	11	16	42							75
Other Requests	3	2	2	9	12	6							34
Total	358	208	308	303	276	297	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,750

Return to Agenda

		YTD		Previous Year Ends		
Performance Measures	Target	Q1	Q2	2021	2020	2019
# of City Council retreats	2 times per year	1	1	2	1	1
# of City Council sponsored/supported events	20 per year	3	11	21	5	33

MLK Jr. Virtual Ceremony
APCC Asia Pacific New Year Celebration
Reel Life 96 Film Event
Spring Community Clean Up Event
Parks Appreciation Day
United Way 100 Years Event
Law Enforcement Memorial Ceremony
Youth Fishing Event
Youth Summit
Dancing in the Streets Event
Arlington Project
Paddle Row and Canoe Day
Buffalo Soldiers Museum Grand Opening
Summer Nights at the Pavilion

Return to Agenda

City Manager

		YTD		Previous Year Ends		
Performance Measures	**Target**	**Q1**	**Q2**	**2021**	**2020**	**2019**
Average # of items on study session agenda	< 6 items	3	4	5	5	4
# of presentations of the State of the City	10	2	2	6	6	11
# of new followers: City Twiter	180	105	168	2710	198	219
# of new followers: LPD Twitter	180	472	829	8809	550	969
# of new likes: City FB	180	306	578	10907	3612	1160
# of new likes: LPD FB	180	115	208	18248	n/a	2402
# of new likes: Parks FB	180	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	179
# of new likes: Senior Center FB	180	10	32	523	n/a	67
# of posts: City Instragram	180	23	58	49	n/a	145
# of multimedia items prduced - video	12	7	7	7	n/a	23

Return to Agenda

Performance Measures	Target	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
% of accounts receivable aged balances over 60 days versus annual billing	5%	7.34%	8.22%	0.17%	0.07%	1.54%
GFOA Award Received for Current Year CAFR	Yes	Pending	Pending	Yes	Yes	Yes
GFOA Award Received for Biennium's Budget Document	Yes	n/a	n/a	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clean Audit for Prior Fiscal Year (2)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bond Rating Per Standard & Poor's (3)	AA	AA	AA	AA	AA	AA

Informational Measures	Historic Average	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
# of invoices paid annually	n/a	1857	3714	7221	7160	8350
% of invoices paid within 30 days of invoice date (1)	95%	88.7%	88.40%	89.25%	89.18%	89.83%

(1) Requires coordination with departments to ensure Accounts Payable receives invoices timely.

(2) The audit finding was related to financial audit of 1998 assets.

(3) Bond rating upgraded June 2018.

Return to Agenda

Performance Measures	Target	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
Overall Phish-Phone Percentage (Cyber Phishing)	< 29%	16%	20%	5%	19%	n/a

Informational Measures	Historic Average	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
# of users served	n/a	233	225	259	223	259
# of personal computers maintained	n/a	492	501	492	444	428
# of applications maintained	n/a	140	140	140	139	139
# of servers maintained (LAN/WAN)	n/a	81	81	81	82	83
# of Cell Phones maintained	n/a	238	238	205	205	229
# of Shoretel phones operated and maintained	n/a	290	290	290	290	290
% of IT system up-time during normal business hours	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%
% of communications up-time during normal business hours	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of help desk requests received	n/a	351	691	1601	1466	1885
Help desk requests resolved: Total requests resolved	n/a	602	961	1478	1311	1759

Return to Agenda

Informational Measures	Historic Average	YTD		Previous Years		
		Q1	Q2	2021	2020	2019
Human Resources						
Number of current (unexpired) Collective Bargaining Agreements as of EOQ	4	3	4	3.25	3.5	3.25
Voluntary Employee Turnover Rate (reported cumulatively each quarter)	<12%	2.40%	6.23%	7.79%	8.17%	7.97%
Number of recruitments in progress	n/a	21	46	31	10	40
Percentage of employees hired during the quarter last year and still employed	100%	100%	100%	88%	77.5%	93%
Average number of days to complete external recruitment (excluding Police Officers)	<45	42.6	43	41.25	58.00	36
Percentage of Applicants who are People of Color	40%	48%	46%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percentage of new hires from underutilized EEO category	60%	50%	33%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Percentage of performance evaluations due during quarter completed	100%	47%	39%	31.25%	38%	43.75%
Risk Management						
Percentage of employees in compliance with quarterly mandatory training	100%	98%	96%	85.25%	91.25%	88.75%
Percentage Stay at Work applications of total medical releases to light duty	70%	0.00%	50%	33%	0	66%
Percentage workers comp developed claim expense of total annual premium cost = Loss Ratio% (reported cumulative YTD)	<70%	3.2%	27.3%	149%	7.3%	131%
Worker's Compensation Experience Factor	<1.0	0.8988	0.8988	0.8908	1.0137	101587

Return to Agenda

Performance Measures	YTD			Previous Year Ends		
	Target	Q1	Q2	2021	2020	2019
# of days on average to review/process a contract	3	2.49	2.57	2.78	2.12	1.8
Average days from incident to charging decision by Prosecutor	14	1	5	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average days from charging decision to filing complaint in Muncipal Court	5	4.5	5	n/a	n/a	n/a

Informational Measures	YTD			Previous Year Ends		
	Historic Average	Q1	Q2	2021	2020	2019
# of criminal citation cases filed	n/a	620	812	1576	2274	3050
# of days on average for PRA response (Next Request)	30	34	23.7	34	21	24
# of days on average for PRA response (GovQA)	30	34	18.56	21.82	13.31	52.19

Return to Agenda

Performance Measures	Target	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
CDBG						
# of owner-occupied units rehabilitated	12	0	6	7	11	4
# of new affordable housing units constructed	9	0	Boat St not started	0	0	5
# persons assisted with emergency HOME tenant-based rental assistance	100	program closed	program closed	108	n/a	n/a
# persons assised with emergency CDBG-CV assistance payments for rental and mortgage assistance	150	47	70	394	n/a	n/a
# persons with access to affordable housing through fair housing activities	40	4- EADR/ 47- TBRA	70- TBRA	0	15	7
Nuisances and Abatements						
#of dangerous building abatements completed annually	30	3	3	16	14	5
RHSP						
# rental properties inspected annually	913	76	200	254	283	232
# rental units inspected annually	2,451	131	210	394	735	787
Economic Development						
# of participant attending forums, focus groups, or special events	500	175	175	153	35	230

Informational Measures	Historic Average	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
Measure- CDBG						
# of persons with new or improved access to public facility or infrastructure	5,115	0	5,345	0	875	5,115
# units assisted that are occupied by the elderly	12	3	6	28	5	4
$ program income received (CDBG & NSP)	$180,894	$22,023	$36,846	$270,294	$171,163	$101,225
Measure - Nuisances and Abatements**						
#of dangerous building abatements pending	65	14	14	78	75	41
#of public nuisances completed annually	3	1	2	5	14	3
#of public nuisances pending	10	3	5	16	7	6
Measure- RHSP						
# rental properties registered	3,732	1,633	3,456	1,921	2,499	198
# rental units registered	13,915	8,811	20,157	11,629	13,902	1,116
Measure- Economic Development						
$ investment created through economic dev efforts	$320,000,000	$52,607,246	$242,988,016	$470,001,046	$488, 375,205	$303,316,305
# of business retention/expansion of interviews conducted	80	21	44	106	127	101
# of new market rate, owner-occupied housing units constructed annually	40	13	18	89	25	48
# of projects where permit assistance was provided	40	18	36	60	37	48
# of special projects completed	50	11	28	64	46	71
# of economic development inquiries received	200	89	160	277	266	636
# of new companies located in Lakewood	20	166	358	732	755	553
# of new development projects assisted	30	8	19	32	38	32
Measure- Building Permit						
# of permits issued	tbd	486	959	tbd	1,769	1,716
# of plan reviews performed	tbd	158	379	tbd	875	1,057
# of inspections performed	tbd	1,304	2,692	tbd	5,443	7,174

Return to Agenda

Informational Measures	Historic Average	YTD		Previous Year Ends		
		Q1	Q2	2021	2020	2019
Measure- Long Range Planning						
Annual Comprehensive Plan & Development Regulation Amendments (setting docket, drafting city-initiated amendments, SEPA review of city-initiated amendments and privately-initiated amendments)	n/a	In process	Completed	Completed for 2021	Completed for 2020	In-process
Annual Development Regulation Amendments	n/a	Not started	Not started	Not started	Completed for 2020	Not started
Annual Shoreline Restoration Plan and Master Program Review	n/a	In-process	Completed	Completed for 2021	Completed for 2020	Completed
Biennial Review of Downtown Subarea Plan (even years)	n/a	In-process	In-process	n/a	Completed for 2020	In-process
Biennial Review of Lakewood Station District Subarea Plan (odd years)	n/a	In-process	In-process	Subarea Plan app'd in 2021; next review 2023	n/a	Not started
American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Program - Distribute Funds, Quarterly Reports to Treasury, Quarterly Reports to City Council, Technical Assistance to Subrecipients	n/a	In-process	In-process	In-process	In-process	In-process
Statutory Periodic Review of Comprehensive Plan per GMA (every 8 years/every 10 years)	n/a	In-process	In-process	Not started in 2021	Not started in 2020	In-process
Participation on Countywide and Regional Planning Bodies (GMCC, PSRC Regional Staff Committee, SSHAP Staff Working Group, TLP Continuum of Care, Other Appointed Positions)	n/a	Ongoing	Ongoing	Continual	Continual	Continual
Reporting to City Council re Projects and Programs	n/a	Ongoing	Ongoing	Continual	Continual	Continual
Monthly Lakewood Planning Commission Meetings	n/a	Y(6)		20-24	20-24	20-24
Buildable Lands Report - Development and Tracking	n/a	Completed	Completed	Completed for 2021	In-process for 2020	In-process 2019
City Population and Employment Growth Targets - Development and Tracking	n/a	In-process	In-process	In-process	In-process for 2020	In-process
Dicennial Census Data Development and Tracking	n/a	Ongoing	Ongoing	In-process/ nearing completion	In-process for 2020	In-process for 2019
Special Projects as Directed by City Manager	n/a	Ongoing (2 projects)	Ongoing (2 projects)	2 projects in-process	2 projects in-process	2 projects in-process
Special Projects as Directed by CED Director	n/a	Ongoing (3 projects)	Ongoing (3 projects)	n/a	3 projects completed for 2020	1 project in-process

Return to Agenda

		Q1				Q2					Total Permits at Year End		
Permit Type- Current Planning	Target # of Days to first review	Total Permits	Average Days	% w/in Target?	# Outside Target	Target # of Days	Total Permits	Average Days	% w/in Target?	# Outside Target	2021	2020	2019
Zoning Certification	30	10	27.00	80%	2	30	16	22	88%	2	43	28	38
Conditional use	120	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	120	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	4	4
Design Review	120	6	11.00	100%	0	120	4	26.25	1	0	19	10	12
Preliminary plat	120	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	120	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0
Sign permit	90	2	14	100%	0	90	4	26.5	100%	0	62	55	51
SEPA Environmental	20	14	9.00	100%	0	20	12	8	1	0	20	13	9
Building Permit	90	4	22	100%	0	90	3	27.67	100%	0	393	346	335
Shoreline permit	20	149	20.5	100%	0	20	215	21	100%	0	21	27	19

Permit Type	Target # of Days	Total Permits	Average Days	% w/in Target?	# Outside Target	Target # of Days	Total Permits	Average Days	% w/in Target?	# Outside Target
Commercial Building Permits	30	44	14	93%	1	30	43	12	93%	3
New commercial buildings *	30	0	0.0	0%	0	30	2	14	100%	0
New multi-family *	30	1	0.0	0%	0	30	0	0	0%	0
Residential Building Permits	30	159	13	92%	1	30	93	1	100%	0
New Single Family Homes	30	5	19	92%	1	30	50	22	100%	0
Mechanical	30	180	14	100%	0	30	232	1	100%	0
Plumbing	30	48	12.0	100%	0	30	71	1	100%	0
Accessory Dwelling Unit	30	0	0	0%	0	30	2	1	100	0

Return to Agenda

		YTD		Previous Year Ends		
Performance Measures	**Target**	**Q1**	**Q2**	**2021**	**2020**	**2019**
# of community group road tours	8	3	6	15	6	16
Cost saved from reduced number of court transports	$35,000	$7,407	$14,169	$30,516	$25,708	$24,113
Number of Veteran's Court participants	18	4	7	29	26	33

		YTD		Previous Year Ends		
Informational Measures	**Historic Average**	**Q1**	**Q2**	**2021**	**2020**	**2019**
# of incidents with offenders involving risk management	-	0	0	0	0	0
# of work crew hours performed in lieu of jail	-	80	208	568	872	2344
Cost saved by using alternative sentencing	-	$13,480	$45,310	$30,426	$46,751	$29,399
Number of Veteran's Court graduates	-	1	2	7	5	5

Return to Agenda

Performance Measures	Target	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
Specialty Units						
Successful Property Room Audits (percentage)	1	0	0	100%	100%	100%
K9 training hours	tbd	93	220	128	N/A	N/A
Marine Service Hours	90	63	149.5	131	216	363
Criminal Investigations						
Cases assigned for follow up (percent of cases followed up)	1000	237	186	1284	619	1914
# of findings during Special Operations quarterly audits	0	0	0	0	0	0
Patrol						
# of minutes to respond to call for service	12	24.95	21.2	20.16	19.01	23.61
Top Priority calls: Average time from receipt to dispatch (in minutes)	3	4.24	4.3	2.84	2.90	3.32
Top Priority calls: Average time from dispatch to arrival on scene (in minutes)	3.5	4.02	3.7	4.11	3.97	4.36
Professional Standards						
% of officers meeting state requirements for annual training hours	100	100	100	100	100	100
# of training hours provided	8080	2865	4948	12453	11190	11199
Use of force as percent of arrests	5%	13%	8.50%	7%	6.25%	5.25%
Uses of force as percent of calls for service	0.20%	0.41%	0.23%	0.23%	0.21%	0.20%
CSRT						
Average calendar days: Code complaint to first investigation	7	3	5	2.5	2.25	2.25

Informational Measures	Historic Average	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
Specialty Units						
# of traffic stops	9000	717	1629	3437	5021	8934
Animal Complaints	2600	393	945	1366	1301	2538
# of captures by K9	25	3	7	17	16	22
Special Response Team (SRT) Missions/Callout	10	5	8	15	10	14
Special Response Team (SRT) Training Days	31	10	20	30	32	30
Civil Disturbance missions	0	0	0	1	9	0
Civil Disturbance Team Training Days	13	1	0	4	2	6
Vehicle Collisions (Fatality)	0	1	2	3	3	3
Vehicle Collisions (Injury)	250	53	94	231	194	233
Vehicle Collisions (Non-Injury)	2100	239	417	992	832	1000
Criminal Investigations						
Cases cleared by investigation	700	277	191	1284	621	1177
Amount of narcotics seized (lbs)	30	0	0	450	45	n/a
Patrol						
# of arrests	2500	361	340	1455	1806	2271
# of self-initiated calls for service	2200	2312	2645	10792	14399	21448
Total calls for service	55000	11652	12507	48496	49474	56838
Professional Standards						
Successful WASPC accreditation	Yes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# of internal investigations conducted	0	3	1	6	13	12
Use of force as percent of arrests	5%	13%	8.50%	7.76%	6.37%	5.21%
Uses of force as percent of calls for service	0.20%	0.41%	0.23%	0.23%	0.23%	0.27%
Pursuits	35	6	10	25	39	34
Pursuit Terminations	15%	1	1	6	16	17
Promotional processes completed	2	0	0	2	0	3
Hiring processes completed	4	5	4	12	2	5
CSRT						
Total number of code enforcement complaints received	600	157	325	708	619	680
Total code enforcement cases initiated during the reporting period	500	145	302	671	503	700
Code enforcement cases resolved through voluntary compliance	300	63	121	242	202	234
Code enforcement cases resolved through forced compliance	0	12	20	65	72	45
Code enforcement: Average calendar days, Inspection to Forced Compliance	60	7	15	24	10	2
Code enforcement: Average calendar days, Inspection to Voluntary Compliance	14	11	25	41	14	11.25
Code enforcement: Average calendar days, Inspection to Compliance	60	18	58	65	59	58
Community Meetings Attended	120	3	11	92	28	159

Parks and Recreation

Performance Measures	Target	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
Street Operations and Maintenance						
% of completed MyLakewood311 requests	100%	95%	89%	97%	97%	98%
# of potholes responded to	<275	141	106	187	289	259

Informational Measures	Historic Average	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
Admin						
Cost Recovery % Target - 45% for parks and recreation services *	45 %	51%	50%	49%	44%	46%
Human Services						
Monthly average attendance at Lakewood Community Collaboration Meetings (duplicate participants)	40 each month	32	67	102	145	150
# of human services contracts Managed	22	22	22	26	26	24
Recreation						
$ vendor sales generated from Farmers Market	$140,000	na	$211,000	$520,000	$56,000	$372,500
# of partners at SummerFEST	50	50	200	n/a	20	95
$ vendor fees generated from SummerFest	$17,000	na	$10,000	n/a	$5,700	n/a
$ sponsorship, grants and in-kind service	$70,000	$23,800	$123,800	$52,150	$62,000	$113,300
Senior Center						
# of unduplicated seniors served	1,400	513	774	687	1074	1692
$ revenue generated from grants, fees, donations & in-kind support	$80,000	$5,856	$14,037	$26,514	$46,607	$78,566
# of volunteer hours	1,300	67	130.5	552	1192	2140
Park Facilities						
# of special use permits generated at park site (not FSP)	160	4	43	100	36	144
Boat Launch Revenue	$50,000	$9,388	$23,016	$61,932	$60,869	$51,716
# of returning customers	20	3	15	39	11	52
Fort Steilacoom						
# of acres of open space to maintain	500	500	500	500	500	500
# of special use permits for park use	230	10	132	313	66	241
# of returning customers	25	10	54	111	24	52
Property Management						
# of square feet of coverage per building maintenance employee	158,615	158,615	158,615	158,615	158,615	158,615
# of unscheduled system failures	0	8	13	26	12	44
# of service requests	400	51	157	547	356	689
Street Operations and Maintenance						
# of MyLakewood311 service requests regarding street maintenance	n/a	516	916	1943	1183	1824
# of reported downed signs	<400	83	137	326	385	385
# of traffic signal major equipment failures	<2	0	0	0	0	0
# of after hour call outs	<250	28	51	112	119	59

Return to Agenda

Performance Measures	Target	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
SWM Operations & Maintenance						
# of City street curb miles swept	3,600	1,159	790.47	4270	4234	3776
# of catch basins cleaned or inspected	3,400	1,672	1061	3242	3269	4765
# of hours of storm drain pipe video inspections recorded	900	136	8.5	1267	442	709
# of linear feet of storm drain pipe cleaned	30,000	0	0	1752	21586	47452
# of tons of sweeping and vactor waste disposed of	2,000	391.5	324	1538	886	1381
# of gallons of sweeping and vactor liquid waste disposed of	100,000	0	67,200	122500	67260	103960
Engineering Services						
Average turnaround time for 1st review - Site Development Permits	30 days	40	40	30	30	29
Average turnaround time for Right of Way Permits	5 days	3	5	5	5	6
% of operational traffic signals	100%	100	100	n/a	n/a	n/a
% of time traffic signals are repaired within 30 days	100%	100	100	n/a	n/a	n/a
% of opeational street lights	100%	98.5	98.7	n/a	n/a	n/a
% of time street lights are repaired within 30 days	100%	80	38.5	n/a	n/a	n/a

Informational Measures	Historic Average	YTD Q1	YTD Q2	Previous Year Ends 2021	2020	2019
Transportation Capital						
Annual transportation capital funds administered	n/a	$1,811,426	$2,815,375	$11,953,635	$17,430,575	$6,950,749
Amount of transportation grant funds awarded	n/a	0	$746,000	$8,959,901	$3,800,000	$1,880,000
Engineering Services						
# of businesses/properties inspected for SWM compliance	400/yr	43	209	110	189	234
# of volunteer hours for water quality sampling	150/yr	32	0	165	100	200
# of traffic signals operated and maintained	69	66	66	68	69	69
# of City maintained street lights	2,555	2,555	2,637	2555	2372	2372

Return to Agenda

TO: City Council

FROM: Tiffany Speir, Long Range & Strategic Planning Manager

THROUGH: John Caulfield, City Manager

DATE: September 12, 2022

SUBJECT: American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Requests for Proposals (RFPs)

ATTACHMENTS: Draft ARPA RFPs (Attachments A, B, and C)

BACKGROUND

On July 25, the City Council provided direction that the City issue American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for three types of projects:

- Emergency food bank capital costs (Attachment A)
- Veterans emergency shelter capital costs (Attachment B)
- Permanently low income housing capital construction (Attachment C)

On August 29, Lakewood received its second tranche of $ $6,883,118 in ARPA funds, meaning the City has now received its full $13,766,236 award. To date, the City Council has approved expenditures totaling $7,222,200 by ordinance or motion. The Council has also verbally approved reserving funds for the personnel and administrative costs for the Lakewood Police Department body worn camera program in 2023 and 2024.

Interest accumulated from held ARPA funds as of June 30, 2022 totals $9,595; these funds and future accumulated interest, along with any funds that were not fully expended on completed ARPA programs or projects, will be presented to the Council at a future date.

DISCUSSION

Included below are the summaries of the purpose for each of the attached ARPA RFPs.

Emergency Food Bank Capital Cost

To inform the use of its ARPA funds, the City of Lakewood is seeking proposals for program and project **funding for acquisition of property and/or capital construction or expansion of emergency food bank services within the City of Lakewood to support ongoing efforts to combat food insecurity** and that comply with the criteria in the ARPA Final Rule and the priorities set by the Lakewood City Council to respond to the public health emergency and/or its negative economic impacts.

Veteran Emergency Shelter Capital Cost

To inform the use of its ARPA funds, the City of Lakewood ("City") is seeking proposals for program and project **funding for the capital costs to provide veteran emergency shelter/transitional housing to be located near veterans' supportive service providers** and that comply with the criteria in the ARPA Final Rule and the priorities set by the

Lakewood City Council to respond to the public health emergency and/or its negative economic impacts.

Lakewood is seeking an agency or agencies to construct emergency shelter for eligible homeless veterans or family members. Shelter costs may only be paid for eligible homeless veterans or family members.

Permanently Low income Housing Construction Capital Costs

To inform the use of its ARPA funds, the City of Lakewood is seeking proposals for program and project **funding for the provision of housing perpetually affordable to individuals and families at 30%-60% of the City of Lakewood Area Median Household Income (AMI)** and that comply with the criteria in the ARPA Final Rule and the priorities set by the Lakewood City Council to respond to the public health emergency and/or its negative economic impacts.

All Topics	Lakewood city, Washington	Pierce County, Washington
Population Estimates, July 1 2021, (V2021)	**63,331**	**925,708**
Median household income (in 2020 dollars), 2016-2020	$55,723	$76,438
Per capita income in past 12 months (in 2020 dollars), 2016-2020	$30,856	$36,548
Persons in poverty, percent	14.7%	8.7%

Source: 2020 Census Quick Facts:
https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/lakewoodcitywashington,piercecountywashington/PST045221

Once the City Council has approved their release, these RFPs will be announced to the public along with the application time period. Response will be reviewed by the City for responsiveness to the RFPs, and recommended awards will be presented to the City Council at a future date.

ATTACHMENT A

CITY OF LAKEWOOD, WA

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR FOOD BANK PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND/OR CAPITAL COSTS: ARPA PROGRAM

DATE

DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTAL:

DATE

A. BACKGROUND

The American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA) is a $1.9 trillion economic stimulus bill passed by the 117th United States Congress and signed into law by the President on March 21, 2021. ARPA is providing billions of dollars in relief to states and local governments.

The City of Lakewood is receiving $13,766,236 in State & Local Fiscal Relief Funds (SLFRF). ARPA presents an opportunity for the City to revitalize the community after the hardships endured throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

B. PURPOSE OF RFP – Emergency Food Bank Capital Costs

To inform the use of its ARPA funds, the City of Lakewood is seeking proposals for program and project **funding for acquisition of property and/or capital construction or expansion of emergency food bank services within the City of Lakewood to support ongoing efforts to combat food insecurity** and that comply with the criteria in the ARPA Final Rule and the priorities set by the Lakewood City Council to respond to the public health emergency and/or its negative economic impacts.

C. APPLICANT REQUIREMENTS

All applicants must meet eligibility and submit the required information to be considered for a funding recommendation. To be considered for funding, applicants must:

1. Submit a complete and responsive application.

2. Attach any supplemental information that demonstrates the implementation of the program or project.

3. Applicant organization must be an IRS-recognized tax exempt 501(c)3 nonprofit organization to apply. Organizations can use a fiscal sponsor who is a 501(c)3 to serve as the "applicant". Applicant organization must also have UEI number assigned through www.SAM.gov

4. Applicant organizations must serve residents of the City of Lakewood with 100% of any ARPA funds awarded at the completion of this RFP process.

5. Applicant organization must have no outstanding financial obligations to the City of Lakewood (e.g., property taxes, personal property tax, motor vehicle tax, past due bills, etc.)

6. Applicant organization must be an established organization in operation for at least one full year prior to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020).

7. Award must be used by subrecipient and cannot be used to make additional grants to other organizations.

8. Applicant organizations must be able to comply with ARPA federal reporting guidelines, including but not limited to: submitting quarterly project and expenditure reports. At a minimum, all grantees will be required to provide periodic grant reports

and make presentations to the City Council.

9. Applicant must comply with all ARPA audit and record retention requirements. Retaining a project/program records is required through December 31, 2031.

D. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

ALL PROPOSALS MUST MEET ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) STATE & LOCAL FISCAL RECOVERY FUND (SLFRF) AWARDS, AND SUBRECIPIENTS OF ARPA FUNDS MUST COMPLY WITH ALL ARPA REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.

The City of Lakewood strongly encourages applicants to read and understand the eligible uses of the funds to respond to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts. The U.S. Department of the Treasury website has important information to review, such as the Overview of the Final Rule and updates.

Additional resources and information are available on the City of Lakewood's website: https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/.

Proposals must be responsive to ARPA's purpose as well as the following City of Lakewood, WA ARPA priorities and Policy Positions:

- ARPA is for one-time costs; however, exceptions may be made for certain programs or pilot programs.
- ARPA funds will be focused on projects that would provide long-lasting benefits to Lakewood residents.
- ARPA funds will be focused on what the Lakewood community needs;
- ARPA funds will be used to make a permanent investment in the City;
- ARPA funds will be used to support organizations that have been long term supporters of Lakewood and its residents;
- ARPA funding may be used for –
    - Capital expenditures with long-lasting benefit for the City, including but not limited to:
        - **Food bank property acquisition and/or capital costs**;
        - Housing, including
            - Veterans Shelter Housing; and
            - Permanent Low Income Housing

If you have any questions about the RFP application, please contact Tiffany Speir, ARPA Program Manager, at tspeir@cityoflakewood.us

E. TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. All responses to this RFP become the property of City, and as such may be subject to public review.

2. Any costs and expenses incurred by an organization in preparing or submitting responses are the sole responsibility of the Respondent.

3. This RFP does not commit the City to award funds.

4. The City reserves the right to request additional information and/or clarification from any of the Respondents to this RFP.

5. A Respondent must be prepared to present evidence to their responses to satisfactorily meet the requirements set forth or implied in the RFP.

6. Respondents may be asked to attend a meeting or be interviewed to provide further explanation to the City's RFP reviewers.

7. Respondents agree there is an expectation that quantitative and qualitative information may be required on an as needed basis for reporting requirements.

8. Respondent agrees to the following **funding payout schedule**: The City will process reimbursement payments within 30 days of receipt of a complete submission (invoice and supporting documentation.)

9. All Respondents to the RFP must conform to instructions. Failure to include required signatures, meet deadlines, answer all questions, follow the required format, or failure to comply with other requirements of the RFP may be considered appropriate cause for rejection of the response**. All communication must be done through the City's ARPA Program Manager, Tiffany Speir at tspeir@cityoflakewood.us.**

10. The contract produced from the selection process will represent the entire agreement between the Respondent and City and will supersede all prior negotiations, representations, or agreements - alleged or made - between the parties.

11. The City may **terminate** the funding agreement, in whole or in part, for default based on the following conditions:
    (i) Respondent fails to provide the City with timely and/or acceptable progress reporting data;
    (ii) insolvency of the Respondent;
    (iii) loss of key personnel responsible administering the program/service;
    (iv) lack of responsiveness to City inquiries; or
    (v) Respondent fails to fulfill any of its obligations under ARPA.

    Prior to termination, the City shall notify Respondent of the default condition and shall allow Respondent thirty (30) calendar days within which to rectify the condition. If the condition is ameliorated within the allowed period, the funding agreement shall remain in full force and effect. If the default condition remains beyond the allowed period; the City may terminate the funding agreement, in whole or in part, by written "Notice of Termination" to the Respondent stating the basis for termination and effective date. Termination of funding will require any received funding to be refunded.

F. REVIEW & SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals will be reviewed by the City of Lakewood. The City will consider the applications and provide the City Council with a list of funding recommendations for review and action.

Return to Agenda

The review process will consider the review rubric included below as well as the application's responsiveness to the City of Lakewood, WA ARPA Priorities and Policy Positions described in Section D above. The five criteria will be reviewed as either Green, Yellow, or Red. The overall review will be used as the basis for ultimately determining funding recommendations.

CITY OF LAKEWOOD
2022 AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
REVIEW RUBRIC

	GREEN	YELLOW	RED
Planning/ Strategic	Program or project aligns with recommendations in the City's most recent Consolidated Plan (CDBG).	Program or project related to City goals listed in a City plan or process.	Not linked to an existing City plan or process.
Transformative	Makes a permanent and noticeable change in a service or community condition.	Has potential for noticeable change in a service or community condition, but not fully demonstrated.	Demonstrates a short-term or no noticeable change in a service or community condition.
Scale and Management	Requesting organization provides same or similar service on a consistent basis.	Requesting organization provides same/similar service on a periodic basis.	Requesting organization has not previously provided same/similar service.
Collaborative	Partnerships/funding from other organizations have been identified to improve return on investment of proposal.	Partnerships/funding from other organizations have been requested or are under consideration to improve ROI of proposal.	Does not have partnerships/funding from other organizations to improve ROI of proposal.
Equity	Majority of impact/investment is in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.	Some impact/investment in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.	Little to no impact/investment in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.

G. ANTICIPATED KEY DATES (Subject to Change)

Date	Event
TBD	RFP Released
TBD	Deadline for Submitting RFP (5 pm)
TBD	Review and Evaluation Process – **INTERVIEWS WITH APPLICANTS MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT BE REQUIRED.**

TBD	City Council presented recommended ARPA projects at Study Session
TBD	City Council public hearing on proposed ARPA projects
TBD	City Council action on ARPA Projects
TBD	Funds available for disbursement
December 31, 2026	Federal Deadline to exhaust ARPA Funds. **DEADLINE FOR SUBAWARDS GRANTED AS A RESULT OF THIS PROCESS MAY HAVE AN EARLIER DEADLINE.**

H. DELIVERY OF PROPOSALS

The completed PDF application must be emailed to Tiffany Speir, ARPA Program Manager, at tspeir@cityoflakweood.us no later than:

5:00 pm on DATE TBD

Candidates are solely responsible for ensuring that proposals are delivered on time. Delays caused by any delivery service will not be grounds for an extension of the proposal due date and time. Proposals received after the due date and time will be not be considered. Early submissions are recommended and encouraged.

The City of Lakewood is committed to a program of equal employment opportunity regardless of race, color, creed, sex, age, nationality, disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression. The City encourages submittals from firms that demonstrate the same commitment.

I. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Attached hereto are the presentation materials from the June 29, 2022 City of Lakewood ARPA technical assistance session, which includes descriptions of allowed expenses, Subrecipient reporting and auditing requirements, and links to additional information. More information can be found at https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/.

J. ORIENTATION SESSION

One orientation session for this funding cycle will be provided on _____, 2022 from _____ p.m. via Zoom. Zoom virtual meeting information will be posted to the City ARPA website here: https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/

Return to Agenda

City of Lakewood, WA

American Rescue Plan Funding Application - Food Bank Property Acquisition and/or Facility Capital Costs -

6000 Main St SW • Lakewood, WA 98499
Office Phone: (253) 983.7702 • Email: tspeir@cityoflakewood.us

Organization Information

Legal Name of Organization:

_____

Doing Business As:

_____

Address: _____

_____ **City:** _____**Zip:** _____

Website:_____

Year of Formation:_____

	CEO/Executive Director	Project Coordinator (if different)
Name		
Title		
Email Address		
Phone Number		
Mailing Address		

Taxpayer Identification Number: _____

UEI Number (Required*): _____
*UEI Number can be obtained here.

Is your Entity registered with SAM.gov (Required)? Yes _____No _____

If a nonprofit, have you attached a current nonprofit 501(c)(3) tax exempt status, as confirmed by IRS?: Yes_____ No _____

Return to Agenda

I certify that I have the legal authority of the organization represented in this application to submit this request for funding on its behalf, and I further certify that the information submitted in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the City of Lakewood will rely on the accuracy of the submittals and certifications made in conjunction with this application. Any misrepresentation of inaccurate information or unused ARPA funds may result in a repayment of funds. If awarded, my organization intends to enter into a contract with the City of Lakewood, provide liability insurance as may be required for the duration of the contract naming the City of Lakewood as an additional insured and in an amount determined by the City.

_____ _____

SIGNATURE **DATE**

_____

Print Name and Title

Return to Agenda

Treasury has updated its guidance to clarify two presumptively eligible ways to use SLFRF to fund affordable housing investments under the final rule.

SLFRF Affordable Housing Updates at a Glance:

- **Expanded Presumptive Eligibility.** SLFRF permits funds to be used, among other uses, to combat the public health and negative economic impacts (PH-NEI) of the pandemic. Treasury has updated its guidance to clarify two presumptively eligible ways to use SLFRF to fund affordable housing investments under the final rule.[1]

  - **Option 1:** SLFRF funds used for affordable housing projects under the PH-NEI eligible use category are presumptively eligible if the project meets certain core requirements of the following expanded list of federal housing programs:
    - National Housing Trust Fund (HTF)
    - HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
    - Low-Income Housing Credit (LIHTC)
    - Public Housing Capital Fund
    - Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program
    - Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities Program
    - Project-Based Rental Assistance
    - Multifamily Preservation & Revitalization Program
    - Affordable housing projects provided by a Tribal government if they would be eligible for funding under the Indian Housing Block Grant program, the Indian Community Development Block Grant program, or the Bureau of Indian Affairs Housing Improvement Program

    The program requirements of these federal housing programs that must be met for presumptive eligibility have been clarified to include four core requirements:
    - Resident income restrictions;
    - The affordability period and related covenant requirements for assisted units;
    - Tenant protections; and
    - Housing quality standards.

  - **Option 2:** SLFRF funds used for affordable rental housing under the PH-NEI eligible use category are presumptively eligible uses if the units funded serve households at or below 65% of AMI for a period of 20 years or greater.
  - A broader range of affordable housing investments may also be eligible uses of SLFRF funds under the final rule if they are related and are reasonably proportional to addressing the negative economic impacts of the pandemic and otherwise meet the final rule's requirements. Depending on the needs of the local rental market, it may be reasonably proportional to address the negative economic impacts of the pandemic by funding units (e.g., up to 80% AMI) that do not fall into the presumptively eligible categories listed above.

[1] Refer to Final Rule FAQs 2.14 and 4.9 for additional information about presumptively eligible affordable housing investments and other program requirements.

Return to Agenda

Project Information

Please attach additional pages as needed.

Project Name: _____

Total Project/Program Cost: _____

Amount of ARPA Funds Requested*: _____
*Include detailed itemized budget to support amount requested later in this application. Provide any relevant attachments.

Annual Project/Program Cost to be funded with ARPA Funds (if different than amount above):
_____

Have you received other COVID-19 Relief Funding* related to this project/program?
Yes____ No___
*(e.g., funds from ARPA, CARES Act, other nonprofits, or government)

If Yes, please provide details on funding:
_____
_____
_____

Estimated Project/Program Schedule: Start Date: _____ **End Date*:** ____
*Per the act, ARPA funds must be fully expended by 12/31/26. **This project's contract may require that its specific funds be fully expended by an earlier date.**

Project Description:_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Return to Agenda

Discuss and describe the community to be addressed through this project/program.

- **Is your food bank project presumptively eligible under ARPA's Final Rule (see criteria above)?**

Yes__ No_____

If yes, please describe how it is presumptively eligible (i.e., which criteria it follows from the ARPA Final Rule FAQs):_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

- **Is the community served a disproportionately impacted community under ARPA?**

- **How will this project or program address the community public health and/or negative economic impacts of COVID-19 (i.e., supporting the health of communities, and helping households, small businesses, impacted industries, nonprofits, and the public sector recover from economic impacts)?**

- **Explain your organization's experience and ability to implement, administer, and manage the proposed project/ program. How will success of this request be measured?**

Return to Agenda

PROJECT BUDGET

Provide a detailed itemized budget below to support amount requested later in this application. Also provide any relevant attachments.

ATTACHMENT B

CITY OF LAKEWOOD, WA

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TO PROVIDE VETERANS EMERGENCY SHELTER HOUSING CAPITAL COSTS:

ARPA PROGRAM

DATE

DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTAL:

DATE

A. BACKGROUND

The American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA) is a $1.9 trillion economic stimulus bill passed by the 117th United States Congress and signed into law by the President on March 21, 2021. ARPA is providing billions of dollars in relief to states and local governments.

The City of Lakewood ("City") is receiving $13,766,236 in ARPA State & Local Fiscal Relief Funds (SLFRF). ARPA presents an opportunity for the City to revitalize the community after the hardships endured throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

B. PURPOSE OF RFP – Veteran Emergency Shelter Housing Capital Expenditures

To inform the use of its ARPA funds, the City of Lakewood ("City") is seeking proposals for program and project **funding for the capital costs to provide veteran emergency shelter housing to be located near veterans' supportive service providers** and that comply with the criteria in the ARPA Final Rule and the priorities set by the Lakewood City Council to respond to the public health emergency and/or its negative economic impacts.

Lakewood is seeking an agency or agencies to construct emergency shelter for eligible homeless veterans or family members. Shelter costs may only be paid for eligible homeless veterans or family members. Scope of work required includes maintaining documentation as described below.

The project must meet the following requirements:

- Be completed before December 31, 2026.
- Provide overnight stays for eligible veterans or family members.
- Assure that persons will not be required to attend or participate in religious activities as a condition of receiving shelter services.
- Meet all applicable requirements of the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA).

C. APPLICANT REQUIREMENTS

All applicants must meet eligibility and submit the required information to be considered for a funding recommendation. To be considered for funding, applicants must:

1. Submit a complete and responsive application.

2. Attach any supplemental information that demonstrates the implementation of the program or project.

3. Applicant organization must be an IRS-recognized tax exempt 501(c)3 nonprofit organization to apply. Organizations can use a fiscal sponsor who is a 501(c)3 to serve as the "applicant". Applicant organization must also have UEI number assigned through www.SAM.gov

4. The successful application shall provide prescribed resident intake procedures, including documentation of veteran status, and maintain a file with supporting documents on each client assisted.

5. The Contractor shall maintain a copy of the completed application on file along with all

the back-up documentation which supports the applicant's eligibility for assistance. Those records must be retained through December 31, 2031 and must be available for audit by the City, the state and any other designated auditors. After December 31, 2031, the applications and back-up documentation shall be destroyed by the Contractor.

6. Applicant organization must have no outstanding financial obligations to the City of Lakewood (e.g., property taxes, personal property tax, motor vehicle tax, past due bills, etc.)

7. Applicant organization must be an established organization in operation for at least one full year prior to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020).

8. Award must be used by subrecipient and cannot be used to make additional grants to other organizations.

9. Applicant organizations must be able to comply with ARPA federal reporting guidelines, including but not limited to: submitting quarterly project and expenditure reports. At a minimum, all grantees will be required to provide periodic grant reports.

10. Applicant must comply with all ARPA audit and record retention requirements. Records must be retained through December 31, 2031.

D. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

ALL PROPOSALS MUST MEET ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) STATE & LOCAL FISCAL RECOVERY FUND (SLFRF) AWARDS, AND SUBRECIPIENTS OF ARPA FUNDS MUST COMPLY WITH ALL ARPA REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.

The City of Lakewood strongly encourages applicants to read and understand the eligible uses of the funds to respond to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts. The U.S. Department of the Treasury website has important information to review, such as the Overview of the Final Rule and updates.

Additional resources and information are available on the City of Lakewood's website: https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/.

Proposals must be responsive to ARPA's purpose as well as the following City of Lakewood, WA ARPA priorities and Policy Positions:

- ARPA is for one-time costs; however, exceptions may be made for certain programs or pilot programs.
- ARPA funds will be focused on projects that would provide long-lasting benefits to Lakewood residents.
- ARPA funds will be focused on what the Lakewood community needs;
- ARPA funds will be used to make a permanent investment in the City;
- ARPA funds will be used to support organizations that have been long term supporters of Lakewood and its residents;
- ARPA funding may be used for –

- Capital expenditures with long-lasting benefit for the City, including but not limited to:
  - Food bank capital costs;
  - Housing, including
    - **Veterans Shelter Housing;** and
    - Permanent Low Income Housing.

If you have any questions about the RFP application, please contact Tiffany Speir, ARPA Program Manager, at tspeir@cityoflakewood.us

E. TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. All responses to this RFP become the property of City, and as such may be subject to public review.

2. Any costs and expenses incurred by an organization in preparing or submitting responses are the sole responsibility of the Respondent.

3. This RFP does not commit the City to award funds.

4. The City reserves the right to request additional information and/or clarification from any of the Respondents to this RFP.

5. A Respondent must be prepared to present evidence to their responses to satisfactorily meet the requirements set forth or implied in the RFP.

6. Respondents must be prepared to attend one or more City review committee and/or City Council meetings to provide information regarding the submission.

7. Respondents agree there is an expectation that quantitative and qualitative information may be required on an as needed basis for reporting requirements.

8. Respondent agrees to the following **funding payout schedule**: The Contractor shall submit, no more often than monthly, and invoice and supporting documentation for payment to the City. The City will process reimbursement payments within 30 days of receipt of a complete submission (invoice and supporting documentation.)

9. All Respondents to the RFP must conform to instructions. Failure to include required signatures, meet deadlines, answer all questions, follow the required format, or failure to comply with other requirements of the RFP may be considered appropriate cause for rejection of the response**. All communication must be done through the City's ARPA Program Manager, Tiffany Speir at tspeir@cityoflakewood.us.**

10. The contract produced from the selection process will represent the entire agreement between the Respondent and the City and will supersede all prior negotiations, representations, or agreements - alleged or made - between the parties.

11. The City may **terminate** the funding agreement, in whole or in part, for default based on the following conditions:

(i) Respondent fails to provide the City with timely and/or acceptable progress reporting data;
(ii) insolvency of the Respondent;
(iii) loss of key personnel responsible administering the program/service;
(iv) lack of responsiveness to City inquiries; or
(v) Respondent fails to fulfill any of its obligations under ARPA.

Prior to termination, the City shall notify Respondent of the default condition and shall allow Respondent thirty (30) calendar days within which to rectify the condition. If the condition is ameliorated within the allowed period, the funding agreement shall remain in full force and effect. If the default condition remains beyond the allowed period; the City may terminate the funding agreement, in whole or in part, by written "Notice of Termination" to the Respondent stating the basis for termination and effective date. Termination of funding will require any received funding to be refunded.

F. REVIEW & SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals will be reviewed by the City of Lakewood. The City will consider the applications and provide the City Council with a list of funding recommendations for review and action.

The review process will consider the review rubric included below as well as the application's responsiveness to the City of Lakewood, WA ARPA Priorities and Policy Positions described in Section D above. The five criteria will be reviewed as either Green, Yellow, or Red. The overall review will be used as the basis for ultimately determining funding recommendations.

CITY OF LAKEWOOD
2022 AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
REVIEW RUBRIC

	GREEN	YELLOW	RED
Planning/ Strategic	Program or project aligns with recommendations in the City's most recent Consolidated Plan (CDBG).?	Program or project related to City goals listed in a City plan or process.	Not linked to an existing City plan or process.
Transformative	Makes a permanent and noticeable change in a service or community condition.	Has potential for noticeable change in a service or community condition, but not fully demonstrated.	Demonstrates a short-term or no noticeable change in a service or community condition.
Scale and Management	Requesting organization provides same or similar service on a consistent basis.	Requesting organization provides same/similar service on a periodic basis.	Requesting organization has not previously provided same/similar service.

Collaborative	Partnerships/funding from other organizations have been identified to improve return on investment of proposal.	Partnerships/funding from other organizations have been requested or are under consideration to improve ROI of proposal.	Does not have partnerships/funding from other organizations to improve ROI of proposal.
Equity	Majority of impact/investment is in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.	Some impact/investment in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.	Little to no impact/investment in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.

G. ANTICIPATED KEY DATES (Subject to Change)

Date	Event
TBD	RFP Released
TBD	Deadline for Submitting RFP (5 pm)
TBD	Review and Evaluation Process – **INTERVIEWS WITH APPLICANTS MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT BE REQUIRED.**
TBD	City Council presented recommended ARPA projects at Study Session
TBD	City Council public hearing on proposed ARPA projects
TBD	City Council action on ARPA Projects
TBD	Funds available for disbursement
December 31, 2026	Federal Deadline to exhaust ARPA Funds. **DEADLINE FOR SUBAWARDS GRANTED AS A RESULT OF THIS PROCESS MAY HAVE AN EARLIER DEADLINE.**

H. DELIVERY OF PROPOSALS

The completed PDF application must be emailed to Tiffany Speir, ARPA Program Manager, at tspeir@cityoflakweood.us no later than:

5:00 pm on DATE TBD

Candidates are solely responsible for ensuring that proposals are delivered on time. Delays caused by any delivery service will not be grounds for an extension of the proposal due date and time. Proposals received after the due date and time will be not be considered. Early submissions are recommended and encouraged.

The City of Lakewood is committed to a program of equal employment opportunity regardless of race, color, creed, sex, age, nationality, disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression. The City encourages submittals from firms that demonstrate the same commitment.

I. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Attached hereto are the presentation materials from the June 29, 2022 City of Lakewood ARPA technical assistance session, which includes descriptions of allowed expenses, Subrecipient reporting and auditing requirements, and links to additional information. More information can be found at https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/.

J. ORIENTATION SESSION

One orientation session for this funding cycle will be provided on _____, 2022 from _____ p.m. via Zoom. Zoom virtual meeting information will be posted to the City ARPA website here: https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/

Return to Agenda

City of Lakewood, WA

American Rescue Plan Funding Application

- Veterans Emergency Shelter Capital Costs -

6000 Main St SW • Lakewood, WA 98499
Office Phone: (253) 983.7702 • Email: tspeir@cityoflakewood.us

Organization Information

Legal Name of Organization:
_____

Doing Business As:
_____

Address: _____

_____ **City:** _____

Zip: _____

Website:_____

Year of Formation:_____

	CEO/Executive Director	Project Coordinator (if different)
Name		
Title		
Email Address		
Phone Number		
Mailing Address		

Taxpayer Identification Number: _____

UEI Number (Required*): _____
*UEI Number can be obtained here.

Is your Entity registered with SAM.gov (Required)? Yes _____No _____

If a nonprofit, have you attached a current nonprofit 501(c)(3) tax exempt status, as confirmed by IRS?: Yes_____ No _____

Return to Agenda

I certify that I have the legal authority of the organization represented in this application to submit this request for funding on its behalf, and I further certify that the information submitted in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the City of Lakewood will rely on the accuracy of the submittals and certifications made in conjunction with this application. Any misrepresentation of inaccurate information or unused ARPA funds may result in a repayment of funds. If awarded, my organization intends to enter into a contract with the City of Lakewood, provide liability insurance as may be required for the duration of the contract naming the City of Lakewood as an additional insured and in an amount determined by the City.

_____ _____

SIGNATURE **DATE**

_____

Print Name and Title

Return to Agenda

Treasury has updated its guidance to clarify two presumptively eligible ways to use SLFRF to fund affordable housing investments under the final rule.

SLFRF Affordable Housing Updates at a Glance:

- **Expanded Presumptive Eligibility.** SLFRF permits funds to be used, among other uses, to combat the public health and negative economic impacts (PH-NEI) of the pandemic. Treasury has updated its guidance to clarify two presumptively eligible ways to use SLFRF to fund affordable housing investments under the final rule.[1]

  - **Option 1:** SLFRF funds used for affordable housing projects under the PH-NEI eligible use category are presumptively eligible if the project meets certain core requirements of the following expanded list of federal housing programs:
    - National Housing Trust Fund (HTF)
    - HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
    - Low-Income Housing Credit (LIHTC)
    - Public Housing Capital Fund
    - Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program
    - Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities Program
    - Project-Based Rental Assistance
    - Multifamily Preservation & Revitalization Program
    - Affordable housing projects provided by a Tribal government if they would be eligible for funding under the Indian Housing Block Grant program, the Indian Community Development Block Grant program, or the Bureau of Indian Affairs Housing Improvement Program

    The program requirements of these federal housing programs that must be met for presumptive eligibility have been clarified to include four core requirements:
    - Resident income restrictions;
    - The affordability period and related covenant requirements for assisted units;
    - Tenant protections; and
    - Housing quality standards.

  - **Option 2:** SLFRF funds used for affordable rental housing under the PH-NEI eligible use category are presumptively eligible uses if the units funded serve households at or below 65% of AMI for a period of 20 years or greater.
  - A broader range of affordable housing investments may also be eligible uses of SLFRF funds under the final rule if they are related and are reasonably proportional to addressing the negative economic impacts of the pandemic and otherwise meet the final rule's requirements. Depending on the needs of the local rental market, it may be reasonably proportional to address the negative economic impacts of the pandemic by funding units (e.g., up to 80% AMI) that do not fall into the presumptively eligible categories listed above.

[1] Refer to Final Rule FAQs 2.14 and 4.9 for additional information about presumptively eligible affordable housing investments and other program requirements.

Return to Agenda

Project Information

Please attach additional pages as needed.

Project Name: _____

Total Project/Program Cost: _____

Amount of ARPA Funds Requested*: _____
*Include detailed itemized budget later in this application to support amount requested. Provide any relevant attachments.

Annual Project/Program Cost to be funded with ARPA Funds (if different than amount above):
_____

Have you received other COVID-19 Relief Funding* related to this project/program?
Yes____ No___
*(e.g., funds from ARPA, CARES Act, other nonprofits, or government)

If Yes, please provide details on funding:
_____
_____
_____

Estimated Project/Program Schedule: Start Date: _____ **End Date*:** ____
*Per the act, ARPA funds must be fully expended by 12/31/26. **This project's contract may require that its specific funds be fully expended by an earlier date.**

Project Description:_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Return to Agenda

Discuss and describe the community to be addressed through this project/program.

- **Is your veteran emergency shelter housing project presumptively eligible under ARPA's Final Rule (see criteria above)?**

Yes__ No_____

If yes, please describe how it is presumptively eligible (i.e., which criteria it follows from the ARPA Final Rule FAQs):_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

- **Is the community served a disproportionately impacted community under ARPA?**

- **How will this project or program address the community public health and/or negative economic impacts of COVID-19 (i.e., supporting the health of communities, and helping households, small businesses, impacted industries, nonprofits, and the public sector recover from economic impacts)?**

- **Explain your organization's experience and ability to implement, administer, and manage the proposed project/ program. How will success of this request be measured?**

Return to Agenda

PROJECT BUDGET

Provide a detailed itemized budget below to support amount requested later in this application. Also provide any relevant attachments.

ATTACHMENT C

CITY OF LAKEWOOD, WA

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TO PROVIDE PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING: ARPA PROGRAM

DATE

DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTAL:

DATE

A. BACKGROUND

The American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA) is a $1.9 trillion economic stimulus bill passed by the 117th United States Congress and signed into law by the President on March 21, 2021. ARPA is providing billions of dollars in relief to states and local governments.

The City of Lakewood is receiving $13,766,236 in State & Local Fiscal Relief Funds (SLFRF). ARPA presents an opportunity for the City to revitalize the community after the hardships endured throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

B. PURPOSE OF RFP – Permanently Affordable Housing

To inform the use of its ARPA funds, the City of Lakewood is seeking proposals for program and project **funding for the provision of housing permanently affordable to individuals and families at 30%-60% of the Pierce County Area Median Income (AMI)** and that comply with the criteria in the ARPA Final Rule and the priorities set by the Lakewood City Council to respond to the public health emergency and/or its negative economic impacts.

C. APPLICANT REQUIREMENTS

All applicants must meet eligibility and submit the required information to be considered for a funding recommendation. To be considered for funding, applicants must:

1. Submit a complete and responsive application.

2. Attach any supplemental information that demonstrates the implementation of the program or project.

3. Applicant organization must be an IRS-recognized tax exempt 501(c)3 nonprofit organization to apply. Organizations can use a fiscal sponsor who is a 501(c)3 to serve as the "applicant". Applicant organization must also have UEI number assigned through www.SAM.gov

4. Applicant organizations must serve residents of the City of Lakewood with 100% of any ARPA funds awarded at the completion of this RFP process.

5. Applicant organization must have no outstanding financial obligations to the City of Lakewood (e.g., property taxes, personal property tax, motor vehicle tax, past due bills, etc.)

6. Applicant organization must be an established organization in operation for at least one full year prior to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020).

7. Award must be used by subrecipient and cannot be used to make additional grants to other organizations.

8. Applicant organizations must be able to comply with ARPA federal reporting guidelines, including but not limited to: submitting quarterly project and expenditure reports. At a minimum, all grantees will be required to provide periodic grant reports and make presentations to the City Council.

9. Applicant must comply with all ARPA audit and record retention requirements. Retaining a project/program records is required through December 31, 2031.

D. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

ALL PROPOSALS MUST MEET ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) STATE & LOCAL FISCAL RECOVERY FUND (SLFRF) AWARDS, AND SUBRECIPIENTS OF ARPA FUNDS MUST COMPLY WITH ALL ARPA REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.

The City of Lakewood strongly encourages applicants to read and understand the eligible uses of the funds to respond to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts. The U.S. Department of the Treasury website has important information to review, such as the Overview of the Final Rule and updates.

Additional resources and information are available on the City of Lakewood's website: https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/.

Proposals must be responsive to ARPA's purpose as well as the following City of Lakewood, WA ARPA priorities and Policy Positions:

- ARPA is for one-time costs; however, exceptions may be made for certain programs or pilot programs.
- ARPA funds will be focused on projects that would provide long-lasting benefits to Lakewood residents.
- ARPA funds will be focused on what the Lakewood community needs;
- ARPA funds will be used to make a permanent investment in the City;
- ARPA funds will be used to support organizations that have been long term supporters of Lakewood and its residents;
- ARPA funding may be used for –
    - Capital expenditures with long-lasting benefit for the City, including but not limited to:
        - Food bank capital costs;
        - Housing, including
            - Veterans Shelter Housing; and
            - Permanent Low Income Housing

If you have any questions about the RFP application, please contact Tiffany Speir, ARPA Program Manager, at tspeir@cityoflakewood.us

E. TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. All responses to this RFP become the property of City, and as such may be subject to public review.

2. Any costs and expenses incurred by an organization in preparing or submitting responses are the sole responsibility of the Respondent.

3. This RFP does not commit the City to award funds.

4. The City reserves the right to request additional information and/or clarification from any of the Respondents to this RFP.

5. A Respondent must be prepared to present evidence to their responses to satisfactorily meet the requirements set forth or implied in the RFP.

6. Respondents may be asked to attend a meeting or be interviewed to provide further explanation to the City's RFP reviewers.

7. Respondents agree there is an expectation that quantitative and qualitative information may be required on an as needed basis for reporting requirements.

8. Respondent agrees to the following **funding payout schedule**: The City will process reimbursement payments within 30 days of receipt of a complete submission (invoice and supporting documentation.)

9. All Respondents to the RFP must conform to instructions. Failure to include required signatures, meet deadlines, answer all questions, follow the required format, or failure to comply with other requirements of the RFP may be considered appropriate cause for rejection of the response**. All communication must be done through the City's ARPA Program Manager, Tiffany Speir at tspeir@cityoflakewood.us.**

10. The contract produced from the selection process will represent the entire agreement between the Respondent and City and will supersede all prior negotiations, representations, or agreements - alleged or made - between the parties.

11. The City may **terminate** the funding agreement, in whole or in part, for default based on the following conditions:
    (i) Respondent fails to provide the City with timely and/or acceptable progress reporting data;
    (ii) insolvency of the Respondent;
    (iii) loss of key personnel responsible administering the program/service;
    (iv) lack of responsiveness to City inquiries; or
    (v) Respondent fails to fulfill any of its obligations under ARPA.

    Prior to termination, the City shall notify Respondent of the default condition and shall allow Respondent thirty (30) calendar days within which to rectify the condition. If the condition is ameliorated within the allowed period, the funding agreement shall remain in full force and effect. If the default condition remains beyond the allowed period; the City may terminate the funding agreement, in whole or in part, by written "Notice of Termination" to the Respondent stating the basis for termination and effective date. Termination of funding will require any received funding to be refunded.

F. REVIEW & SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals will be reviewed by the City of Lakewood. The City will consider the applications and provide the City Council with a list of funding recommendations for review and action.

The review process will consider the review rubric included below as well as the application's

responsiveness to the City of Lakewood, WA ARPA Priorities and Policy Positions described in Section D above. The five criteria will be reviewed as either Green, Yellow, or Red. The overall review will be used as the basis for ultimately determining funding recommendations.

CITY OF LAKEWOOD
2022 AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
REVIEW RUBRIC

	GREEN	YELLOW	RED
Planning/ Strategic	Program or project aligns with recommendations in the City's most recent Consolidated Plan (CDBG).	Program or project related to City goals listed in a City plan or process.	Not linked to an existing City plan or process.
Transformative	Makes a permanent and noticeable change in a service or community condition.	Has potential for noticeable change in a service or community condition, but not fully demonstrated.	Demonstrates a short-term or no noticeable change in a service or community condition.
Scale and Management	Requesting organization provides same or similar service on a consistent basis.	Requesting organization provides same/similar service on a periodic basis.	Requesting organization has not previously provided same/similar service.
Collaborative	Partnerships/funding from other organizations have been identified to improve return on investment of proposal.	Partnerships/funding from other organizations have been requested or are under consideration to improve ROI of proposal.	Does not have partnerships/funding from other organizations to improve ROI of proposal.
Equity	Majority of impact/investment is in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.	Some impact/investment in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.	Little to no impact/investment in disadvantaged communities, businesses, or disparities caused by COVID-19.

G. ANTICIPATED KEY DATES (Subject to Change)

Date	Event
TBD	RFP Released
TBD	Deadline for Submitting RFP (5 pm)
TBD	Review and Evaluation Process – **INTERVIEWS WITH APPLICANTS MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT BE REQUIRED.**
TBD	City Council presented recommended ARPA projects at Study Session

TBD	City Council public hearing on proposed ARPA projects
TBD	City Council action on ARPA Projects
TBD	Funds available for disbursement
December 31, 2026	Federal Deadline to exhaust ARPA Funds. **DEADLINE FOR SUBAWARDS GRANTED AS A RESULT OF THIS PROCESS MAY HAVE AN EARLIER DEADLINE.**

H. DELIVERY OF PROPOSALS

The completed PDF application must be emailed to Tiffany Speir, ARPA Program Manager, at tspeir@cityoflakweood.us no later than:

5:00 pm on DATE TBD

Candidates are solely responsible for ensuring that proposals are delivered on time. Delays caused by any delivery service will not be grounds for an extension of the proposal due date and time. Proposals received after the due date and time will be not be considered. Early submissions are recommended and encouraged.

The City of Lakewood is committed to a program of equal employment opportunity regardless of race, color, creed, sex, age, nationality, disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression. The City encourages submittals from firms that demonstrate the same commitment.

I. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Attached hereto are the presentation materials from the June 29, 2022 City of Lakewood ARPA technical assistance session, which includes descriptions of allowed expenses, Subrecipient reporting and auditing requirements, and links to additional information. More information can be found at https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/.

J. ORIENTATION SESSION

One orientation session for this funding cycle will be provided on _____, 2022 from _____ p.m. via Zoom. Zoom virtual meeting information will be posted to the City ARPA website here: https://cityoflakewood.us/american-rescue-plan-act-of-2021/

Return to Agenda

City of Lakewood, WA

American Rescue Plan Funding Application

- Permanently Affordable Housing -

6000 Main St SW • Lakewood, WA 98499
Office Phone: (253) 983.7702 • Email: tspeir@cityoflakewood.us

Organization Information

Legal Name of Organization:

_____

Doing Business As:

_____

Address: _____

_____ **City:** _____**Zip:** _____

Website:_____

Year of Formation:_____

	CEO/Executive Director	Project Coordinator (if different)
Name		
Title		
Email Address		
Phone Number		
Mailing Address		

Taxpayer Identification Number: _____

UEI Number (Required*): _____
*UEI Number can be obtained here.

Is your Entity registered with SAM.gov (Required)? Yes _____No _____

If a nonprofit, have you attached a current nonprofit 501(c)(3) tax exempt status, as confirmed by IRS?: Yes_____ No _____

I certify that I have the legal authority of the organization represented in this application to submit

this request for funding on its behalf, and I further certify that the information submitted in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the City of Lakewood will rely on the accuracy of the submittals and certifications made in conjunction with this application. Any misrepresentation of inaccurate information or unused ARPA funds may result in a repayment of funds. If awarded, my organization intends to enter into a contract with the City of Lakewood, provide liability insurance as may be required for the duration of the contract naming the City of Lakewood as an additional insured and in an amount determined by the City.

_____ _____

SIGNATURE **DATE**

_____

Print Name and Title

Return to Agenda

Treasury has updated its guidance to clarify two presumptively eligible ways to use SLFRF to fund affordable housing investments under the final rule.

SLFRF Affordable Housing Updates at a Glance:

- **Expanded Presumptive Eligibility.** SLFRF permits funds to be used, among other uses, to combat the public health and negative economic impacts (PH-NEI) of the pandemic. Treasury has updated its guidance to clarify two presumptively eligible ways to use SLFRF to fund affordable housing investments under the final rule.[1]

  - **Option 1:** SLFRF funds used for affordable housing projects under the PH-NEI eligible use category are presumptively eligible if the project meets certain core requirements of the following expanded list of federal housing programs:
    - National Housing Trust Fund (HTF)
    - HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)
    - Low-Income Housing Credit (LIHTC)
    - Public Housing Capital Fund
    - Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program
    - Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities Program
    - Project-Based Rental Assistance
    - Multifamily Preservation & Revitalization Program
    - Affordable housing projects provided by a Tribal government if they would be eligible for funding under the Indian Housing Block Grant program, the Indian Community Development Block Grant program, or the Bureau of Indian Affairs Housing Improvement Program

    The program requirements of these federal housing programs that must be met for presumptive eligibility have been clarified to include four core requirements:
    - Resident income restrictions;
    - The affordability period and related covenant requirements for assisted units;
    - Tenant protections; and
    - Housing quality standards.

  - **Option 2:** SLFRF funds used for affordable rental housing under the PH-NEI eligible use category are presumptively eligible uses if the units funded serve households at or below 65% of AMI for a period of 20 years or greater.
  - A broader range of affordable housing investments may also be eligible uses of SLFRF funds under the final rule if they are related and are reasonably proportional to addressing the negative economic impacts of the pandemic and otherwise meet the final rule's requirements. Depending on the needs of the local rental market, it may be reasonably proportional to address the negative economic impacts of the pandemic by funding units (e.g., up to 80% AMI) that do not fall into the presumptively eligible categories listed above.

[1] Refer to Final Rule FAQs 2.14 and 4.9 for additional information about presumptively eligible affordable housing investments and other program requirements.

Return to Agenda

Project Information

Please attach additional pages as needed.

Project Name: _____

Total Project/Program Cost: _____

Amount of ARPA Funds Requested*: _____
*Include detailed itemized budget to support amount requested later in this application. Provide any relevant attachments.

Annual Project/Program Cost to be funded with ARPA Funds (if different than amount above):
_____

Have you received other COVID-19 Relief Funding* related to this project/program?
Yes____ No____
*(e.g., funds from ARPA, CARES Act, other nonprofits, or government)

If Yes, please provide details on funding:
_____
_____
_____

Estimated Project/Program Schedule: Start Date: _____ **End Date*:** ____
*Per the act, ARPA funds must be fully expended by 12/31/26. **This project's contract may require that its specific funds be fully expended by an earlier date.**

Project Description:_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Discuss and describe the community to be addressed through this project/program.

- **Is your affordable housing project presumptively eligible under ARPA's Final Rule (see criteria above)?**

Yes__ No_____

If yes, please describe how it is presumptively eligible (i.e., which criteria it follows from the ARPA Final Rule FAQs):_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

- **Is the community served a disproportionately impacted community under ARPA?**

- **How will this project or program address the community public health and/or negative economic impacts of COVID-19 (i.e., supporting the health of communities, and helping households, small businesses, impacted industries, nonprofits, and the public sector recover from economic impacts)?**

- **Explain your organization's experience and ability to implement, administer, and manage the proposed project/ program. How will success of this request be measured?**

Return to Agenda

PROJECT BUDGET

Provide a detailed itemized budget below to support amount requested later in this application. Also provide any relevant attachments.

Return to Agenda

TO:	City Council
FROM:	Tiffany Speir, Long Range & Strategic Planning Manager
THROUGH:	John Caulfield, City Manager
DATE:	September 12, 2022
SUBJECT:	Draft Lakewood Housing Needs by Income Band per HB 1220

BACKGROUND

In 2021, the Washington Legislature changed the way communities are required to plan for housing. House Bill 1220 (HB 1220) amended the Growth Management Act (GMA) housing goal to "plan for and accommodate" housing affordable to all income levels.

Commerce will provide guidance to communities to meet the new housing goal and updated requirements for housing elements in RCW 36.70A.070 (2) in later 2022 and early 2023. This includes:

1. **Projected housing needs for all economic segments of the population** (moderate, low, very low and extremely low income). Projections will be provided at the county level and must be incorporated into local planning efforts. This includes projected need for emergency housing, emergency shelters and permanent supportive housing, collectively referenced as special housing needs.

2. Guidance on provisions for moderate density housing options within an urban growth area (UGA), including but not limited to duplexes, triplexes and townhomes.

3. Guidance on reviewing for sufficient land capacity for existing and projected needs for all economic segments of the community.

4. Guidance on how to make adequate provisions for existing and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community. This includes guidance on how to assess zoning and regulations to allow and encourage housing to meet the projected housing needs in each income level.

5. Guidance on examining racially disparate impacts, displacement and exclusion in housing policies and regulations, and recommended policies to address them.

6. Guidance on how to identify areas that may be at a higher risk of displacement associated with zoning changes or capital facility investments and a collection of anti-displacement policies.

Return to Agenda

DISCUSSION

Because this is a new state requirement, the process by which Pierce County and its cities will make the final calculation for what housing needs will be "assigned" to each jurisdiction will be discussed by the PCRC in late 2022.

Included below is a preliminary and draft review of Lakewood's housing needs for all economic segments of the population. The first set of graphics show how the percentage of each area median income (AMI) segment would need to change from the current mix to a different mix by 2044 per HB 1220 and tentative Pierce County calculations. The second set of graphics describe how many units within each economic segment would need to be built by 2044 compared to City's total housing and population growth targets (9,734 new housing units for 23,180 new people) for Lakewood.

DRAFT Housing Needs Assessment Tool – Lakewood

Note: Example above shows only Method A from the Draft HNAT (i.e., assumes all housing needs are accommodated through new units.) Method B would assume all jurisdictions accommodate equivalent shares of housing, proportional to their jurisdiction size.

DRAFT Lakewood Permanent & Emergency Housing Needs per draft HNAT

Reset Jurisdiction Shares to Default	Note: default = jurisdiction's share of 2020 countywide population		100.00% Met Target	<-- Sum of user inputs for jurisdiction shares of county future net housing need; if below 100%, increase shares. If above 100%, decrease shares.							
User Input - Share of County Growth			Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)								Emergency Housing Needs (Temporary)
				0-30%							
			Total	Non-PSH	PSH	>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	[illegible]	
[illegible]	Lakewood city	Estimated Units (2020)	26,999	689	[illegible]	4,565	11,699	4,347	2,250	[illegible]	[illegible]
		Allocation Method A (2020-2044)	9,734	1,747	558	1,516	1,620	732	653	[illegible]	351

Pierce County Population Growth Targets 2020 - 2044			
Jurisdiction	**2020 Census Population**	**2020-2044 Population Growth**	**2044 Total Population**
Lakewood	63,612	23,180	86,792

Per Lakewood's 2044 growth target of 23,180 people and 9,734 housing units, the HB 1220 requirements for housing at all economic levels would mean the housing breakout as indicated below:

- 2,305 0-30% AMI
  - 1,747 units 0-30% AMI Non-Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)
  - 558 units 0-30% AMI PSH
- 1,516 units 30-50% AMI
- 1,620 units 50-80% AMI
- 732 units 80-100% AMI
- 653 units 100-120% AMI
- 351 units Emergency Housing Needs

Return to Agenda

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Courtney Brunell, Planning Manager

THROUGH: John Caulfield, City Manager

Date: September 12, 2022

Subject: Tree Preservation Code Update

Purpose

This memo summarizes the public hearing on September 6, 2022 and responds to questions about tree canopy data. It also provides some code scenarios. Minor changes to proposed redlines are recommended for clarity based on staff review.

Background

The regulation of significant trees on residential, commercial, and institutional sites is contained in Lakewood Municipal Code (LMC) section 18A.70 Article III. Other relevant rules include the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) in LMC 14.02 and critical areas in Title 14.

Beginning in 2021 community members expressed interest and concern with tree preservation throughout the City. In response, the City Council directed the City Manager to complete a review of the tree preservation code and associated chapters. The City Council approved a Scope of Work and Public Participation Plan in November 2021 and formed an Ad Hoc Tree Committee in February 2022. Since February the City has engaged the public in activities to learn about the tree code update including the urban tree canopy, habitat protection, and housing and job targets.

Following the Advisory Committee recommendations in April 2022, the Planning Commission evaluated the code in May and June 2022 and following a public hearing provided recommendations to the City Council in July 2022. The City issued its SEPA determination on the draft code in July 2022 and provided notice of intent to adopt the code to the Department of Commerce for review consistent with Growth Management Act requirements, requesting a review period of 55 days. The SEPA comment period closed with no comments. The Department of Commerce has logged the proposal. Comments have not been received to date.

The following links to prior Ad Hoc Advisory Committee Planning Commission and City Council packets provides additional background on public engagement and the evolution of the code proposals.

- Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations, April 2022
- Planning Commission Resolution and Recommendations, July 2022 (included in City Council August 8, 2022 packet, link below)
- Summary of Public Engagement, Comparison of Recommendations, and Example Cities provided to City Council, August 8, 2022
- Responses to City Council Questions and Options, Critical Areas Overview, Urban Forestry Program Overview, City Council, August 22, 2022

The City Council held a public hearing on September 6, 2022. It is considering comments and is anticipated to provide direction on desired changes to the proposed ordinance.

Public Hearing Summary

The City Council received oral testimony on September 6, 2022 from members of the public regarding tree canopy goals, replacement ratios, exemptions, and other elements of the proposal. Public comment was similar to that presented to the Planning Commission, with strong support for Ad Hoc Committee recommendations.

The full video of the hearing is available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2KRTJKuAO0k.

The minutes of the hearing will be prepared for the City Council in the normal course of the City Council's agenda preparation for its next regular meeting.

Written comments were also received ahead of the hearing and provided to the City Council. A copy of all written comments have been attached to the agenda packet.

Example Codes

Following is an excerpt comparing other example policies and codes previously shared with the City Council related to tree canopy goals, exemptions, and standards. Full context with comparisons can be found in the Study Session Memos August 8 and August 22, 2022

Table 1. City Tree Canopy Goals

City	Canopy %	Tree Equity Score	Tree Canopy Goals
Federal Way	Unknown	80	Comp Plan: Maintain urban tree canopy, preserve mature trees, implement tree density standards
Lacey	28% (2020)	78	Comp Plan/UFMP, Metric: No Net Loss
Lakewood	26% (2019)	69	Comp Plan: Institute an urban forestry program to preserve significant trees, promote healthy and safe trees, and expand tree coverage throughout the City. *Draft Metric, Planning Commission*: 30% by 2050
Olympia	Unknown	83	Comp Plan: Measure the tree canopy and set a city-wide target for increasing it through tree preservation and planting.
Puyallup	Unknown	71	Comp Plan: Establish policies and programs to protect

City	Canopy %	Tree Equity Score	Tree Canopy Goals
			and enhance the urban forest, including establishing improved policies for protecting trees, increasing tree canopy, and ensuring sufficient resources to properly maintain trees, improve tree health, and reduce potential hazards to the public.
Renton	29% (2018)	83	Metric: 33% by 2042 (subarea metrics range18-49% by planning area)
Tacoma	20% (2017)	77	Metric: 30% by 2030
University Place	Unknown	72	Comp Plan: Retain an abundance of mature trees; identify healthy significant trees that should be preserved; retain perimeter trees and preserve significant trees in interior of property.

Other: Seattle: Current 28% (2016). Goal 30% by 2037. Spokane: Current 23% (2021). 40% by 2030.

Table 2. Abbreviated Example Tree Protection Codes

City	Exemptions: Residential	Exemptions: Non-Residential	Regulated Trees	Retention / Standards	Replacement Standards	Permits	Fines & Penalties
Federal Way	X Subject to criteria/ approval	X Selected downtown zones	6" DBH	Tree densities	X Tree size spec.	X Written approval	X
Lacey	X Max number over 3 years with City approval Building footprint	X Max number over 3 years with City approval	4" DBH	Trees per lot area & priorities	X Per lot size.	X With other permits/ written approval	X
Olympia	X Max number over 1year Maintain tree density Building footprint	X Max number over 1 year	6" DBH	Tree densities	X 3:1	X	X
Puyallup	X < 4 DU (Heritage not exempt)	--	15" DBH	Retain significant trees and heritage trees.	X Street Trees	X	X Heritage
Renton	X Max number over 3 years with criteria		6" DBH	Tree densities	X Per tree size and lot size.	X	X
Tacoma	X Onsite exempt; not street trees	--	No min. Potential for maturity to 15'+	Tree percentages	X In-lieu	X With other permits	X
University Place	X Max number over 3 years Building footprint	X Max number over 3 years Building footprint	6" DBH	Tree percentages or tree sizes	X 3:1	X	X
Pierce County	X < 4 DU Signif. tree retention still required	X partial, mixed use	5"-24" for range of trees: > 40" legacy tree	Tree percentages and Tree units/ace	X	X With other permits	X

Other Items to Consider or Potential Changes

Based on the hearing and questions raised, following are clarifications or potential changes for City Council consideration.

Urban Tree Canopy Analysis Data. There were some statements made that shrubs were included in the canopy total.

Response: The urban tree canopy analysis is based on 60 cm resolution, and height of vegetation of at least 12-15 feet. That would exclude shrubs.

Irrigation of Planted Trees. Some comments suggested requiring watering and irrigation for five (5) years for new trees.

Response: Text similar to the following can be added into the redlines.

> *For a minimum of five (5) years following completion of tree planting, all replacement trees shall be given the following care at a minimum:*
>
> *i. Regular irrigation with deep watering during dry months to ensure proper establishment of the tree's root system.*
> *ii. Installation and maintenance of natural mulch material in a three (3)-foot circle around the tree, with three (3) inches of depth, and not within three (3) inches of the trunk of the tree. Volcano mulching is an improper tree care method and should not be used.*
> *iii. Maintenance and pruning using ANSI A300 tree care standards.*

Distinguish Shoreline Master Program, Critical Areas Ordinance, and Tree Preservation Standards. Current planners reviewed the code for proper cross references and procedural steps while maintaining the same intent as the proposed code. For example, the following is added to Article III, 18A.70.310:

> *Refer to Chapter 3, Section B.8 Shoreline Vegetation Conservation of the SMP for tree protection standards within shoreline buffers.*

Definition for Malicious Cutting. There was a request to define malicious cutting, which is also referenced in Seattle's tree code, though undefined there.

Response: Reviewing common dictionary definitions, and (state law: https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=64.12.030) it could be stated as:

> *"Malicious cutting" occurs when a person willfully and without permit removes a significant or heritage tree, or otherwise injures, cuts, or tops a significant or heritage tree to the extent that the tree's survival is compromised.*

Proposed Next Steps

1. September 12, 2022 City Council Study Session
2. September 19, 2022 City Council Review and Adoption

Attachments

A. PowerPoint

B. Draft City Council Ordinance

C. Proposed Redlines, Updated: Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Protection and Preservation of Landmarks, Tree Protection Regulations, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas, and other sections of Lakewood Municipal Code (LMC)

D. Written comments received during the public comment period

E. Written comments received during the public hearing held September 6, 2022

Return to Agenda

CITY OF LAKEWOOD, WA

Tree Preservation Code Update

City Council Meeting

September 12, 2022

Return to Agenda

Urban Tree Canopy Data

Tree Canopy Data: What's provided to Lakewood?

PlanIT Geo partnership with EarthDefine

US Tree Map: High resolution tree canopy data

Resolution = 60-centimeter

- Compared to:
  - EarthDefine standard: 1-meter
  - National Land Cover Database: 30-meter

Height = 12-15 feet (avoiding low growth/shrubs)

Accuracy = 98.3% (all State of WA via EarthDefine)

- Compared to 96.6% Nationwide via EarthDefine
- Assessed using 48,000 random points
  - 1,000 points/state

Comparison
30m resolution vs. 60cm resolution

https://www.earthdefine.com/treemap

Return to Agenda

Watering Requirements

For a minimum of five (5) years following completion of tree planting, all replacement trees shall be given the following care at a minimum:

- Regular irrigation with deep watering during dry months to ensure proper establishment of the tree's root system.
- Installation and maintenance of natural mulch material in a three (3)-foot circle around the tree, with three (3) inches of depth, and not within three (3) inches of the trunk of the tree. Volcano mulching is an improper tree care method and should not be used.
- Maintenance and pruning using ANSI A300 tree care standards.

Return to Agenda

SMP - CAO - TPS

Shoreline Master Program, Critical Areas Ordinance, and Tree Preservation Standards.

Current planners reviewed the code for proper cross references and procedural steps while maintaining the same intent as the proposed code. For example, the following is added to Article III, 18A.70.310

Refer to Chapter 3, Section B.8 Shoreline Vegetation Conservation of the SMP for tree protection standards within shoreline buffers.

Return to Agenda

Malicious Cutting

"Malicious cutting" occurs when a person willfully and without permit removes a significant or heritage tree, or otherwise injures, cuts, or tops a significant or heritage tree to the extent that the tree's survival is compromised.

WA law: https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=64.12.030

MA law: https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartIII/TitleIII/Chapter242/Section7

Return to Agenda

Scenario 1

An applicant lives on a multifamily property that is part of a potential oak grove. They are interested in removing 10 oak trees that may be damaging the roadway and are believed to be “dangerous and sick”. There is not building permit application or plan associated with the request. Can they remove the trees?

Return to Agenda

Scenario 1

An applicant lives on a multifamily property that is part of a potential oak grove. They are interested in removing 10 oak trees that may be damaging the roadway and are believed to be “dangerous and sick”. There is not building permit application or plan associated with the request. Can they remove the trees?

Current code- permit required.

Application Received
- Tree retention survey
- Arborist report confirming property damage

LMC 18A.70.320.A.3 allows for trees that are damaged, diseased or safety hazards to be removed without being considered “significant”.

Yes

Tree Removal permit approved. No mitigation required.

No

Mitigation required 2:1 ratio

Proposed Code- Permit required

Application Received
- Tree retention survey
- Arborist report confirming property damage

Revised LMC 18A.70.320.A.3 allows for trees that are damaged, diseased or safety hazards to be removed without being considered “significant”. (Oregon white oaks are still subject to 2:1 replacement).

Yes

2:1 replacement required for the trees to be removed.

No

Additional review required by ISA certified arborist and/or staff. Reasonable Use Exception may be required

Return to Agenda

Scenario 2

A property owner is interested in subdividing their 38,000gsf lot into 4 lots via a short plat. All of the proposed lots are under 17,000 gsf. They have a stand of oaks on site with an average DBH of under 20”. Are they permitted to remove trees for future development? Is tree preservation required?

Current Code:

Yes, no permit required. No future preservation required.

Proposed Code- Permit & Preservation required

Application received

Staff Reviews reason for request. Is it for an administrative reasonable use development? Is it compliant with the preservation criteria attached to the plat?

yes

Tree Removal permit approved, mitigation required at 2:1 ratio

no

Tree Removal permit denied, applicant can apply for reasonable use exception

Return to Agenda

Thank You!

CITY OF LAKEWOOD, WA
•1996•

PLANIT GEO™
mapping a greener future

BERK

Return to Agenda

Appendix Slides

Return to Agenda

Tree Canopy on Single-Family Residential Lots

01

Single-Family Residential Lots under 17,000 sq.ft.

Lots of less than seventeen thousand (17,000) square feet in single-family residential zones are exempt from this chapter, except where specific tree preservation is required as a mitigation measure under SEPA. In the event a permit is not required for the establishment of a use, the standards of this section shall still apply.

R1-R4 Zoning Districts make up 59% of the citywide tree canopy:

- R1 = 8.2%
- R2 = 10.1%
- R3 = 31.2%
- R4 = 9.5%

All Single-Family Residential Lots

Return to Agenda

Tree Canopy on Single-Family Residential Lots

01 Single-Family Residential Lots under 17,000 sq.ft.

	Average SF Residential Lot Size (sq.ft.)	# of SF Residential Lots	# of SF Residential Lots Under 17,000 sq.ft.	% of SF Residential Lots Under 17,000 sq.ft.
R1	33,631	472	87	18%
R2	29,062	777	284	37%
R3	13,234	7,315	6,257	86%
R4	10,814	3,537	3,340	94%
		12,101	9,968	82%

	Total SF Residential Land Area (sq.ft.)	Land Area of All SF Residential Lots Under 17,000 sq.ft.	% of SF Residential Land Area in Lots Under 17,000 sq.ft.
R1	15,873,999.7	967,863.5	6%
R2	22,581,353.7	3,013,756.1	13%
R3	96,803,705.6	66,545,860.0	69%
R4	38,249,617.4	30,338,327.6	79%
	173,508,676.3	100,865,807.1	58%

Single-Family Residential Lots Under 17,000 sq.ft.

Return to Agenda

Tree Canopy on Single-Family Residential Lots

Single-Family Residential Lots Under 10,000 sq.ft.

01

SCENARIO: Single-Family Residential Lots under 10,000 sq.ft.

	Average SF Residential Lot Size (sq.ft.)	# of SF Residential Lots	# of SF Residential Lots Under 10,000 sq.ft.	% of SF Residential Lots Under 10,000 sq.ft.
R1	33,631	472	36	8%
R2	29,062	777	100	13%
R3	13,234	7,315	2,724	37%
R4	10,814	3,537	2,246	64%
		12,101	5,106	42%

	Total SF Residential Land Area (sq.ft.)	Land Area of All SF Residential Lots Under 10,000 sq.ft.	% of SF Residential Land Area in Lots Under 10,000 sq.ft.
R1	15,873,999.7	214,495.0	1%
R2	22,581,353.7	474,282.8	2%
R3	96,803,705.6	22,083,697.6	23%
R4	38,249,617.4	16,958,449.3	44%
	173,508,676.3	39,730,924.6	23%

Return to Agenda

Urban Forestry Program

- Measure, Maintain, and Update Lakewood's Urban Forestry Data
  - Urban Tree Canopy (UTC) Data
  - Tree Inventory Data

Citywide Tree Locations and Estimated Tree Count			
	Square Miles	Cost	Timeline
All Trees Citywide	19	$4,626	<1 month

Tree Point | Tree Polygon | Idealized Tree Crown

Public Tree Inventory			
	Tree Count (est.)	Cost	Timeline
Street Trees	20,000	$80,000	3 months
An inventory of all trees greater than 1 inch in diameter at breast height (DBH, measured at 4.5' above grade) on public streets. Based on aerial imagery, sampling, Google Street View, and local city comparisons, it is estimated the City has approximately 20,000 trees along streets and in medians in the public right-of-way.			
Park Trees	2,000	$8,000	1 month
An inventory of trees greater than 1 inch DBH in maintained areas of public parks.			

Private Tree Inventory			
	Tree Count (est.)	Cost	Timeline
All Trees >6" on Residential Property	150,000	$469,800	10 months
An inventory of all trees greater than 6 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH, measured at 4.5' above grade) on private residential land. This approach utilizes the City's most recent Zoning Class to identify all residential parcels. Based on aerial imagery, sampling, Google Street View, and local city comparisons, it is estimated the City has over 150,000 trees greater than 6 inches DBH on private residential land.			
Oak Trees >6" on Residential Property	50,000	$281,880	6 months
An inventory of only oaks (Quercus) greater than 6 inches DBH on private residential land. Based on research and comparisons, it is estimated the City has approximately 50,000 oak trees in this category.			
Oak Trees >6" on Residential, Industrial, and Commercial Property	70,000	$375,840	8 months
In addition to residential areas, the City also needs to address the protection, preservation, and replacement of oak trees on commercial and industrial development and redevelopment projects. Using the most recent Zoning Class map, approximately 70,000 oak trees greater than 6 inches DBH reside on residential, industrial, or commercial property.			

Return to Agenda

Urban Forestry Program

- Measure, Maintain, and Update Lakewood's Urban Forestry Data
  - Urban Tree Canopy (UTC) Data
  - Tree Inventory Data

Urban Tree Canopy (UTC) Cover

Lakewood's citywide UTC = 26.3%

Of the citywide UTC:

- 72% is on private land
- 28% is on public land

In total:

- 28% of private land has UTC
- 22% of public land has UTC

Lakewood's canopy has grown (2011-2019)!

- UTC gain = 53.5 acres or 0.5%

Return to Agenda

Urban Forestry Program

2. Grow Lakewood's Tree Canopy:

UTC and PPA data aggregated by Census block groups and compared with several other socioeconomic and demographic datasets

CBGs <75 TES

CBGs <25% UTC

CBGs >85 avg temp

CBGs >50% PPA

CBGs >50% POC

Low Employment CBGs

Return to Agenda

Tree Equity

American Forests Tree Equity Score

A Tree Equity Score is a metric that helps cities assess how well they are delivering equitable tree canopy cover to all residents. The score combines measures of tree canopy cover need and priority for trees in urban neighborhoods (defined as Census Block Groups). It is derived from tree canopy cover, climate, demographic and socioeconomic data.

Return to Agenda

Tree Equity

Lakewood, WA: Tree Equity Score

Return to Agenda

Tree Equity

Lakewood, WA: Tree Equity Score

Get all block groups to a Tree Equity Score of 75

28 of 50 have a Tree Equity Score below 75.

59,634 trees will be needed to get all block groups to a score of **75**. See the significant benefits to the community this will create.

Sources: i-Tree Landscape, American Forests. For more details, review our methodology.

Total Canopy Added	Annual Ecosystem Service Value	Jobs Supported
5.5 %	$1.0 Million	434.0

Annual Service Benefits

Carbon Sequestered 858.2 tons	Carbon Monoxide 0.2 tons	Nitrogen Dioxide 2.9 tons
Sulfur Dioxide 0.5 tons	PM10* Pollution 6.7 tons	PM2.5 Pollution 0.6 tons
Ozone 11.7 tons	Runoff Avoided 260,417 m^3	Rain Interception 359,359 m^3

Return to Agenda

Urban Forestry Program

2. Grow Lakewood's Tree Canopy:

Canopy goals: 30%, 35%, and 40% canopy cover by the year 2050

- shared commitment from the City and the community,
- increased resources for tree planting and maintenance on public and private property

	Metric	City & Public Led	City-Led
3-Year Goal: 27% by 2025	Existing Canopy % (2019)	26%	26%
	Canopy Goal % (2025)	27%	27%
	Total New Acres Added	75	37
	Benefits Added per Year	$19,710	$9,855
	Total Benefits Added	$59,131	$29,565
8-Year Goal: 30% by 2030	Existing Canopy % (2026)	27%	27%
	Canopy Goal % (2030)	30%	28%
	Total New Acres Added	337	169
	Benefits Added per Year	$53,385	$26,692
	Total Benefits Added	$266,924	$133,462
18-Year Goal: 35% by 2035	Existing Canopy % (2031)	30%	28%
	Canopy Goal % (2035)	35%	31%
	Total New Acres Added	562	281
	# of Trees per Year	2,462	1,231
	Total Benefits Added	$444,873	$222,437
25-Year Goal: 40% by 2047	Existing Canopy % (2036)	35%	31%
	Canopy Goal % (2047)	40%	33%
	Total New Acres Added	562	281
	Benefits Added per Year	$63,553	$31,777
	Total Benefits Added	$444,873	$222,437
TOTALS	Existing Canopy % (2019)	26.3%	26.3%
	Canopy Goal % (2047)	40%	33%
	Total New Acres Added	1,536	768
	Benefits Added per Year (avg)	$45,284	$22,642
	Total Benefits Added	$1,215,801	$607,901

Return to Agenda

ORDINANCE NO. 2022-XX

AN ORDINANCE of the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Washington, amending the Critical Areas Ordinance, Title 14, and Chapters 2.48, 18A.70.300-350, 18A.80.060, 18B.600, 18C.600, 18A.60.110, 18B.200.230, 18C.200.230, 18B.700.720, 18C.700.720, 18A.70.140, 18A.60.030-070, related to the Tree Preservation Code.

WHEREAS, the City of Lakewood is a code city planning under the Growth Management Act, codified in RCW 36.70A, and,

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted its Tree Preservation Code, LMC 18A.70.300- 330 via Ordinance No. 726 on December 16, 2019; and,

WHEREAS, the Lakewood City Council adopted Title 14, Title 18A, Land Use and Development Code, of the Lakewood Municipal Code (LMC) via Ordinance No. 630 on December 7, 2015; and,

WHEREAS, on July 6, 2022 The Lakewood City Council adopted Ordinance No. 756 amending the Comprehensive Plan to create Chapter 10, *Sustainability,* which focuses on Energy and Climate Change; and,

WHEREAS, Chapter 10 of the Comprehensive Plan includes goals related to tree preservation and the urban forest; and,

WHEREAS, it is appropriate for the Lakewood City Council to consider and adopt amendments needed to ensure that the Plan and implementing regulations provide appropriate policy and regulatory guidance for growth and development; and,

WHEREAS, the Lakewood City Council passed Resolution 2021-15 to form a Tree Advisory ad hoc Committee to review the tree preservation code and associated municipal code chapters and forward its recommendations onto the Planning Commission; and,

WHEREAS, the Tree Advisory Ad hoc Committee met on seven (7) occasions between March-April, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of its meetings, the Ad hoc Committee created a framework report to provide advice to the Lakewood Planning Commission; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the existing City tree preservation code and the Tree Advisory Ad hoc Committee recommendations on May 4th, May 18th, June 1st, June 8th and June 15th; and,

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2022 the Planning Commission set a public hearing date of July 6, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, public notice of the Planning Commission Public Hearing was provided

DRAFT

pursuant to Lakewood Municipal Code 18A.20.310 on June 15th and through post cards that were mailed to every Lakewood resident on June 1st; and,

WHEREAS, the Lakewood Planning Commission held an open record public hearing on July 5, 2022; and

WHEREAS, on July 20, 2022 the Planning Commission forwarded recommendations to the City Council via Planning Commission Resolution 2022-07; and,

WHEREAS, on July 21, 2022 the City issued a Determination of Non-Significance for the draft code; and,

WHEREAS, on July 25, 2022 the City provided notice of the intent to adopt code revisions to the Department of Commerce for review consistent with Growth Management Act requirements, requesting a review period of 55 days; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council reviewed the Adhoc Committee and Planning Commission recommendations on August 6, 2022 and August 22, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council set a public hearing date of September 6, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, public notice of the City Council Public Hearing was provided pursuant to Lakewood Municipal Code 18A.20.310 on August 17, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to encourage future development in the City of Lakewood consistent with the City's vision and Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Lakewood City Council finds that the proposed amendments further the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and promote the community's overall health, safety, and welfare;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE LAKEWOOD CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD, WASHINGTON, DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Adoption of Amendments to the Lakewood Municipal Code.

Amendments to the City's land use and development regulations are adopted as

summarized below and included in full in Exhibit A, attached hereto:

- Chapter 2.48 related to the Protection and Preservation of Landmarks to establish a Heritage Tree Program

- Title 14 to establish Provisions for the Protection of Priority Oregon White Oak Trees and Woodlands and create a new definition for "feasible".

DRAFT

- Title 18A.70.300-350 the City's Tree Preservation Code

- Chapters 18A.80.060, 18B.600, 18C.600, 18A.60.110, 18B.200.230, 18C.200.230, 18B.700.720, 18C.700.720, 18A.70.140, 18A.60.030-070 to establish incentives to encourage tree preservation in all zones.

Section 2. Severability. If any portion of this Ordinance or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Ordinance or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

Section 3. Effective Date. That this Ordinance shall be in full force and effect thirty (30) days after publication of the Ordinance Summary.

ADOPTED by the City Council this 19th day of September, 2022.

CITY OF LAKEWOOD

Attest:

_____
Don Anderson, Mayor

_____
Briana Schumacher, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

_____
Heidi Ann Wachter, City Attorney

DRAFT

Return to Agenda

Lakewood Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies

3.12.6 Urban Forestry

GOAL LU-60: Institute an urban forestry program to preserve significant trees, promote healthy and safe trees, and expand tree canopy coverage throughout the City.

Policies:

- LU-60.1: Establish an urban forestry program for the City.
- LU-60.2: Promote planting and maintenance of street trees.
- LU-60.3: Provide for the retention of significant tree stands and the restoration of tree stands within the City.
- LU-60.4: Work towards a citywide goal of 30% tree canopy cover by the year 2050. Consider opportunities to increase canopy and environmental equity when evaluating tree canopy distribution.

Chapter 2.48
PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION OF LANDMARKS

Sections:

2.48.010 Purpose.
2.48.020 Definitions.
2.48.030 Landmarks and Heritage Advisory Board created.
2.48.035 Powers of Lakewood Landmarks and Heritage Advisory Board.
2.48.040 Designation criteria.
2.48.050 Nomination procedure.
2.48.060 Designation procedure.
2.48.070 Certificate of appropriateness procedure.
2.48.080 Evaluation of economic impact.
2.48.090 Appeal procedure.
2.48.110 Penalties for violating this chapter.
2.48.120 Special valuation for historic properties.
2.48.130 Severability.
2.48.140 Retroactive approval of acts.

2.48.040 Designation criteria.

D. A tree may be designated as a heritage tree due to its historical, cultural, or environmental significance to the community. The purpose of the heritage tree designation is to ensure additional measures of protection and maintenance for trees with unique characteristics, historical importance, or cultural significance. A complete application shall include the following information:

1. A short description of the tree(s), including the address or location, species, and size (height, crown spread, and DBH);

2. Reason for designation as a heritage tree(s) including special characteristics of the tree and/or site; and

3. A report completed by an ISA Certified Arborist to identify the tree's characteristics, current condition, and maintenance needs.

Title 14
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION*

Chapters:

14.02 **Environmental Rules and Procedures**
14.142 **Critical Areas and Natural Resource Lands Authority, Intent, and General Provisions**
14.146 **Geologically Hazardous Areas**
14.150 **Aquifer Recharge Areas**
14.154 **Fish and Wildlife Habitat Areas**
14.158 **Flood Hazard Areas**
14.162 **Wetlands Areas**
14.165 **Definitions**

* **Prior legislation note:** Ord. 362 repealed Chapters 14.138 through 14.170 and enacted a Title 14A; Ord. 590 repealed Chapters 14.06 through 14.134. Prior to its repeal and reenactment, the title was based on the provisions of Ords. 56, 57 and 585.

14.154.020 Designation of critical fish and wildlife habitat areas.

A. *General.* This chapter applies to proposed regulated activities within critical fish and wildlife habitat areas. Critical fish and wildlife habitat areas are those areas identified either by known point locations of specific species (such as a nest or den) or by habitat areas or both.

B. *Identification of Critical Fish and Wildlife Species and Habitats.*

1. *Critical Fish and Wildlife Habitat Areas.*

a. *Federal and State Listed Species and Their Associated Habitats.* Areas which have a primary association with federally or state listed endangered, threatened, or sensitive species of fish or wildlife (specified in 50 CFR 17.11, 50 CFR 17.12, WAC 220-610-010 and 220-610-110) and which, if altered, may reduce the likelihood that the species will maintain and reproduce over the long term.

b. Habitats and species of local importance, including the following:

i. Areas with which state listed monitor or candidate species or federally listed candidate species have a primary association, and which, if altered, may reduce the likelihood that the species will maintain and reproduce over the long term.

ii. Documented habitat areas or outstanding potential habitat areas for fish and wildlife species. These areas include specific habitat types which are infrequent in occurrence in Pierce County and Lakewood, and may provide specific habitats with which endangered, threatened, sensitive, candidate, or monitor species have a primary association, such as breeding habitat, winter range, and movement corridors. These areas include the following:

(A) Priority Oregon white oak woodlands.

(B) Prairies.

(C) Old growth forests.

(D) Caves.

(E) Cliffs.

(F) Snag-rich areas.

(G) Rivers and streams with critical fisheries.

(H) Naturally occurring ponds under 20 acres and their submerged aquatic beds that provide fish or wildlife habitat.

(I) Waters of the state, including all water bodies classified by the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) water typing classification system as detailed in WAC 222-16-030, together with associated riparian areas.

(J) Lakes, ponds, streams, and rivers planted with game fish by a governmental entity or tribal entity.

(K) State natural area preserves and natural resource conservation areas.

2. *Mapping.* The resources listed below provide information on fish and wildlife habitat areas:

a. Puget Sound Environmental Atlas, Puget Sound Water Quality Authority.

b. The following Washington Department of Natural Resources documents and data sources:

i. Stream typing maps.

ii. Natural Heritage Database.

c. The following Washington Department of Wildlife documents and data sources:

i. Priority Habitats and Species Program.

ii. Nongame Database.

iii. Washington Rivers Information System.

d. The following Washington Department of Fisheries documents:

i. Water Resource Index Areas (WRIA). [Ord. 630 § 1, 2015; Ord. 362 § 3, 2004.]

14.154.030 Habitat protection standards.

A. *Education and Information.* A voluntary education program to explain the need for and methods of habitat management will help provide for long-term protection and enhancement of critical fish and wildlife habitat areas. By informing citizens of the declining populations of several fish and wildlife species in Pierce County, the diminishing animal habitat available, and the management techniques that individuals can use to preserve and restore fish and wildlife habitat areas, the City can foster good stewardship of the land by property owners.

1. The Department will provide educational materials and lists of additional sources of information to applicants proposing regulated activities in the vicinity of critical fish and wildlife habitat areas. Materials will be selected from a variety of state and local resources.

2. The Department will accumulate information on the number of proposed activities associated with fish and wildlife habitat areas as identified by this chapter and indicated by County maps to be in the vicinity of identified critical fish and wildlife habitats pursuant to LMC 14.154.020. Information shall include the number of single-family residences and other development occurring in the vicinity of critical fish and wildlife areas. Based on this information, additional regulations may be developed.

B. *Use of Existing Procedures and Laws, Biological Assessments.* The primary procedures used to implement this chapter shall include this chapter itself, the City's Land Use and Development Code, the State Environmental Policy Act (Chapter 43.21C RCW), the City's environmental regulations, the State Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW), and the City's shoreline management regulations.

Regulated activities subject to environmental review shall be reviewed with consideration for impacts on critical fish and wildlife habitat as identified in this title. The Community Development Director may require a biological assessment prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist whenever the Director finds that a project site may contain, affect, or be affected by, species or habitats designated in this chapter. Biological assessments shall be prepared in accordance with LMC 14.154.050(B), and are subject to the review and approval of the Director.

Projects undergoing review for fish and wildlife considerations shall be routed to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Washington Department of Ecology, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and any other appropriate state and federal agencies. These agencies will have an opportunity to provide specific habitat information on proposed development sites, advise the City of their

jurisdiction and applicable permit requirements, and suggest appropriate project modifications and/or other mitigation.

The City shall give substantial weight to the management recommendations contained in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Species Program~~, particularly the management recommendations for Oregon white oak woodlands~~. [Ord. 630 § 2, 2015; Ord. 362 § 3, 2004.]

14.154.080 Provisions for Priority Oregon white oak trees and woodlands

A. No person shall willfully remove, top, damage, destroy, break, injure, mutilate or kill any Priority Oregon white oak trees and woodlands except as allowed by this chapter.

B. During building or construction operations, suitable protective measures in LMC 18A.70.320(1) shall be erected around Oregon white oak trees, stands, or woodlands which may be subject to injury.

C. The following activities may be permitted regarding Priority Oregon white oak trees and woodlands:

1. Removal of diseased trees and trees that present an imminent threat to properties. The Director may require a written report by a certified arborist assessing the condition of any tree that is purported to be diseased or hazardous.

2. Trimming. Trimming shall be granted when it is determined:

(a) That trimming is needed for safety or public welfare or to remove diseased or dead branches; or

(b) That branches hang over an existing building or interfere with utility lines or right-of-way access.

3. Single Family Property. If the presence of the Priority Oregon white woodland renders the development of a house or permitted accessory structure infeasible, and the application of incentives in LMC 18A.70.320[1] is insufficient to result in a feasible development, the City may allow removal or trimming of a Priority Oregon white oak trees and woodlands in order to allow a maximum building footprint of one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet for a single family residence, 1,000 square feet for an accessory dwelling unit, and 1000 square feet for a detached garage. Additional impervious area for the driveway will be permitted which provides the shortest and most direct access to the house with minimal encroachment or impact into the critical area. The proposal shall demonstrate prior tree removal has met Article III of Chapter 18A.70 LMC in effect at the time, the proposal results in the least possible impact to the critical area to achieve a feasible development, and includes mitigation to offset any impacts to critical areas consistent with the provisions of this chapter and in accordance

[1] For example, building setbacks, parking standard adjustments, height/density bonuses, etc.

with a report prepared by a qualified biologist or certified arborist. The City may require a third-party review of the report at the applicant's expense. A minimum 2:1 replacement ratio shall be applied. See required findings in Subsection C.5. If a proposal does not meet the parameters of this paragraph see Subsection D.

4. Commercial, Industrial, Multifamily, Institutional or Other Development. On non-single-family properties where Priority Oregon white oak trees and woodlands does not exceed 1 acre in size contiguous and the application of incentives in LMC 18A.70.320[1] is insufficient to result in a feasible development[2], the City may allow for removal or trimming of a Priority Oregon white oak trees and woodlands to accommodate a legal use of the property with the least possible impact to the critical area, provided no clearing of trees occurred prior to the application for a land use permit in violation of Article III of Chapter 18A.70 LMC in effect at the time, and provided mitigation is instituted consistent with a report prepared by a qualified biologist or certified arborist. The City may require a third-party review of the report at the applicant's expense. A minimum 2:1 replacement ratio shall be applied. See required findings in Subsection C.5. If a proposal does not meet the parameters of this paragraph see Subsection D.

5. Required findings. To approve a proposal for a single family home in paragraph 3 or other non-single family development in paragraph 4, the Director shall find:

(a) The application of incentives in LMC 18A.70.320[1] is insufficient to result in a feasible development.

(b) The development results in the least possible impact to the critical area to achieve a feasible development that accommodates a legal use of the property.

(c) The report and mitigation prepared by a qualified biologist or certified arborist demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Director that mitigation addresses impacts to Priority Oregon white oak trees and woodlands consistent with the provisions of this chapter. The report and mitigation consider the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Species Program management recommendations for Oregon white oak woodlands. The report has been reviewed by either the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife through SEPA review and/or a qualified biologist or certified arborist at the applicant's expense as required by the Director.

(d) Prior tree removal has met Article III of Chapter 18A.70 LMC in effect at the time.

D. If the application of this section would deny all reasonable use of property, the applicant may apply for a reasonable use exception pursuant to LMC 14.142.080.

Chapter 14.165
DEFINITIONS

Sections:

14.165.010 Definitions.

14.165.010 Definitions.

For the purpose of this title, in addition to the definitions in LMC 18A.10.180, the following definitions shall apply:

"Abutting" means bordering upon, to touch upon, in physical contact with. Sites are considered abutting even though the area of contact may be only a point.

"Activity" means any use conducted on a site.

"Agricultural activities" means the production of crops and/or raising or keeping livestock, including operation and maintenance of farm and stock ponds, drainage ditches, irrigation systems, and normal operation, maintenance and repair of existing serviceable agricultural structures, facilities or improved areas, and the practice of aquaculture. Forest practices regulated under Chapter 76.09 RCW, Title 222 WAC are not included in this definition.

"Alluvial geologic unit" means geologically recent stream, lake, swamp and beach deposits of gravel, sand, silt and peat.

"Animal containment area" means a site where two or more animal units of large animals per acre or three-quarters of an animal unit of small animals per acre are kept, and where a high volume of waste material is deposited in quantities capable of impacting ground water resources.

"Animal unit" means the equivalent of 1,000 pounds of animal.

"Applicant" means a person, party, firm, corporation, or other legal entity that proposes a development on a site.

"Aquifer" means a saturated geologic formation which will yield a sufficient quantity of water to serve as a private or public water supply.

"Aquifer recharge area" means areas where the prevailing geologic conditions allow infiltration rates which create a high potential for contamination of ground water resources or contribute significantly to the replenishment of ground water with potential to be used for potable water. For the purposes of this title, all of the area located within the Clover/Chambers Creek Basin boundary or the two highest DRASTIC zone boundaries is included in the aquifer recharge area.

"Aquifer susceptibility" means the ease with which contaminants can move from the land surface to the aquifer based solely on the types of surface and subsurface materials in the area. Susceptibility usually defines the rate at which a contaminant will reach an aquifer unimpeded by chemical interactions with the vadose zone media.

"Base flood" means the flood having a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year, also referred to as the "100-year flood." The area subject to the base flood is the special flood hazard area designated on flood insurance rate maps as Zones "A" or "V."

"Base flood elevation" means the elevation of the base flood above the datum of the effective firm.

"Basement" means any area of structure having its floor sub-grade (below ground level) on all sides.

"Best management plan" means a plan developed for a property which specifies best management practices for the control of animal wastes, storm water runoff, and erosion.

"Buffer" means an area contiguous with a critical area that is required for the integrity, maintenance, function, and structural stability of the critical area.

"Building footprint" means the horizontal area measured within the outside of the exterior walls of the ground floor of all principal and accessory buildings on a lot.

"Channel migration area" means that area within the lateral extent of likely stream channel movement due to stream bank destabilization and erosion, rapid steam incision, aggradation, avulsions, and shifts in location of stream channels plus 50 feet.

"Class" means one of the wetland classes used to categorize wetlands by their attributes and characteristics. Wetlands shall be rated using the latest adopted version of the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington published by the Washington State Department of Ecology.

"Class I injection well" means a well used to inject industrial, commercial, or municipal waste fluids beneath the lowermost formation containing, within one-quarter mile of the well bore, an underground source of drinking water.

"Class II injection well" means a well used to inject fluids: brought to the surface in connection with conventional oil or natural gas exploration or production and may be commingled with wastewaters from gas plants that are an integral part of production operations, unless those waters are classified as dangerous wastes at the time of injection; for enhanced recovery of oil or natural gas; or for storage of hydrocarbons that are liquid at standard temperature and pressure.

"Class III injection well" means a well used for extraction of minerals, including but not limited to the injection of fluids for: in-situ production of uranium or other metals that have not been conventionally mined; mining of sulfur by Frasch process; or solution mining of salts or potash.

"Class IV injection well" means a well used to inject dangerous or radioactive waste fluids.

"Class V injection wells" means all injection wells not included in Class I, II, III, or IV.

"Classification" means defining value and hazard categories to which critical areas and natural resource lands will be assigned.

"Clearing" means the cutting, moving on site, or removal of standing or fallen timber; the removal or moving on site of stumps; or the cutting or removal of brush, grass, ground cover, or other vegetative matter from a site in a way which exposes the earth's surface of the site. In addition to the above, clearing is an activity which does not require reforestation per an approved forest practices application/notification issued by the Department of Natural Resources.

"Cliff" means a steep vertical or overhanging face of rock or earth greater than 25 feet in height.

"Compensatory mitigation" means mitigation to compensate for loss of wetland habitat due to filling of wetlands or other regulated activities in wetlands.

"Confined aquifer" means an aquifer bounded above and below by beds of distinctly lower permeability than that of the aquifer itself and that contains ground water under sufficient pressure for the water to rise above the top of the aquifer.

"Confining formation" means the relatively impermeable formation immediately overlying an artesian aquifer.

"Contaminant" means any chemical, physical, biological, or radiological substance that does not occur naturally or occurs at concentrations and duration as to be injurious to human health or welfare or shown to be ecologically damaging.

"Critical aquifer recharge area" means areas that are determined to have a critical recharging effect on aquifers used as a source for potable water, and are vulnerable to contamination from recharge.

"Critical areas" means wetlands, flood hazard areas, fish and wildlife habitat areas, aquifer recharge areas, and geologically hazardous areas as defined in this chapter.

"Critical facilities" means those facilities occupied by populations or which handle dangerous substances including but not limited to hospitals, medical facilities; structures housing, supporting or containing toxic or explosive substances; covered public assembly structures; school buildings through secondary including day-care centers; buildings for colleges or adult education; jails and detention facilities; and all structures with occupancy of greater than 5,000 people.

"Degraded" means to have suffered a decrease in naturally occurring functions and values due to activities undertaken or managed by persons, on or off a site.

"Delineation" means identification of wetlands and their boundaries done in accordance with the approved federal wetland delineation manual and applicable regional supplements.

"Delineation report" means a written document prepared by a wetland specialist which includes data sheets, findings of the delineation and a site plan which identifies the wetland boundaries.

"Department" means the City of Lakewood Department of Community Development.

"Designation" means taking formal legislative and/or administrative action to adopt classifications, inventories, and regulations.

"Developed lot" means any lot developed with a primary use and structure(s), not generally subject to further development with additional units or other primary uses.

"Development" means any human-induced change to improved or unimproved real property including, but not limited to, the construction of buildings or other structures, placement of manufactured home/mobile, mining, dredging, clearing, filling, grading, paving, excavation, drilling operations, storage of equipment or materials, subdivision of property, removal of substantial amounts of vegetation, or alteration of natural site characteristics.

"Director" means the Director of the Department of Community Development or his/her designee.

"DRASTIC" means a model developed by the National Water Well Association and Environmental Protection Agency used to measure aquifer susceptibility.

"Dry certificate" means any combination of structural and nonstructural measures that prevent flood waters from entering a structure.

"Earth/earth material" means naturally occurring rock, soil, stone, sediment, or combination thereof.

"Ecotone" means a transition area between two adjacent vegetation communities.

"Elevation certificate" means the official form (FEMA form 81-31) used to provide elevation information necessary to ensure compliance with provisions of this title and determine the proper flood insurance premium rate.

"Enhancement" means actions performed to improve the condition of existing degraded wetlands and/or buffers so that the quality of wetland functions increases (e.g., increasing plant diversity, increasing wildlife habitat, installing environmentally compatible erosion controls, removing nonindigenous plant or animal species, removing fill material or solid waste).

"Erosion" means the wearing away of the earth's surface as a result of the movement of wind, water, or ice.

"Erosion hazard areas" means those areas that because of natural characteristics, including vegetative cover, soil texture, slope, gradient, and rainfall patterns, or human-induced changes to such characteristics, are vulnerable to erosion.

"Excavation" means the mechanical removal of earth material.

"Existing" means those uses legally established prior to incorporation whether conforming or nonconforming.

"Extirpation" means the elimination of a species from a portion of its original geographic range.

"Feasible" means, for the purpose of this chapter, that an action, such as a development project, mitigation, or preservation requirement, meets all of the following conditions: (a) The action can be accomplished with technologies and methods that have been used in the past in similar circumstances, or studies or tests have demonstrated in similar circumstances that such approaches are currently available and likely to achieve the intended results; (b) The action provides a reasonable likelihood of achieving its intended purpose; and (c) The action does not physically preclude achieving the project's primary intended legal use. In cases where the chapter requires certain actions unless they are infeasible, the burden of proving infeasibility is on the applicant. In determining an action's infeasibility, the Director may weigh the action's relative public costs and public benefits, considered in the short- and long-term time frames.

"Fill/fill material" means a deposit of earth material, placed by human or mechanical means.

"Filling" means the act of placing fill material on any surface, including temporary stockpiling of fill material.

"Fish and wildlife habitat areas" means those areas identified as being of critical importance to maintenance of fish, wildlife, and plant species, including: areas with which endangered, threatened, and sensitive species have a primary association; habitats and species of local importance; naturally occurring ponds under 20 acres and their submerged aquatic beds that provide fish or wildlife habitat; waters of the state; lakes, ponds, streams, and rivers planted with game fish by a governmental or tribal entity, or private organization; state natural area preserves and natural resource conservation areas.

"Fisheries biologist" means a professional with a degree in fisheries, or certification by the American Fisheries Society, or with five years' professional experience as a fisheries biologist.

"Flood hazard areas" means areas of land located in floodplains which are subject to a one percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year. These areas include, but are not limited to, streams, rivers, lakes, coastal areas, wetlands, and the like.

"Flood insurance rate map (FIRM)" means the official map on which the Federal Emergency Management Agency has delineated both the special flood hazard areas and the risk premium zones applicable to the community.

"Flood or flooding" means a general and temporary condition of partial or complete inundation of normally dry land areas from:

1. The overflow of inland or tidal waters; and/or
2. The unusual and rapid accumulation of runoff of surface waters from any source.

"Flood protection elevation" (FPE) means the elevation above the datum of the effective FIRM to which the new and substantially improved structures must be protected from flood damage.

"Floodfringe" means the area subject to inundation by the base flood, but outside the limits of the floodway, and which may provide needed temporary storage capacity for flood waters.

"Floodplain" means the total area subject to inundation by the base flood, including the floodfringe and the floodway areas.

"Floodway" means the channel of a river, or other watercourse, and the land areas that must be reserved in order to convey and discharge the base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation by more than one foot, and those areas designated as deep and/or fast-flowing water.

"Geological assessment" means an assessment prepared by a professional engineer licensed by the state of Washington with expertise in geotechnical engineering or prepared by a professional geologist, hydrologist, or soils scientist, who has earned the related bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university, or equivalent educational training, and has a minimum of five years' experience assessing the relevant geologic hazard. A geological assessment must detail the surface and subsurface conditions of a site and delineate the areas of a property that might be subject to specified geologic hazards.

"Geologically hazardous areas" means areas that, because of their susceptibility to erosion, sliding, earthquake, or other geological events, may pose a risk to the siting of commercial, residential, or industrial development consistent with public health or safety concerns.

"Geotechnical report" means a report prepared by a professional engineer licensed by the state of Washington with expertise in geotechnical engineering, evaluating the site conditions and mitigating measures necessary to reduce the risks associated with development in geologically hazardous areas.

"Grading" means any excavating, filling, clearing, creating (or combination thereof) of impervious surfaces.

"Ground amplification" means an increase in the intensity of earthquake induced ground shaking which occurs at a site whereby thick deposits of unconsolidated soil or surficial geologic materials are present.

"Ground water" means all water found beneath the ground surface, including slowly-moving subsurface water present in aquifers and recharge areas.

"Ground water management area" means a specific geographic area or subarea designated pursuant to Chapter 173-100 WAC for which a ground water management program is required.

"Ground water management program" means a comprehensive program designed to protect ground water quality, to assure ground water quantity, and to provide for efficient management of water resources while recognizing existing ground water rights and meeting future needs consistent with local and state objectives, policies and authorities within a designated ground water management area or subarea and developed pursuant to Chapter 173-100 WAC.

"Habitat assessment" means a report prepared by a professional wildlife biologist or fisheries biologist, which identifies the presence of fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas in the vicinity of the proposed development site.

"Habitat management plan" means a report prepared by a professional wildlife biologist or fisheries biologist, which discusses and evaluates the measures necessary to maintain fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas on a proposed development site.

"Habitat of local importance" means an area, range or habitat within which a species has a primary association and which, if altered, may reduce the likelihood that the species will maintain and reproduce over the long term. Examples include areas of high relative density or species richness, breeding habitat, winter range, and movement corridors. These areas may also include habitats that are of limited availability or high vulnerability to alteration. The Lakewood City Council may designate specific habitats of local importance by ordinance or resolution.

"Hazardous substance(s)" means any liquid, solid, gas, or sludge, including any materials, substance, product, commodity, or waste, regardless of quantity, that exhibits any of the physical, chemical or biological properties described in WAC 173-303-090 or 173-303-100.

"Hazardous substance processing or handling" means the use, storage, manufacture, or other land use activity involving hazardous substances, but does not include individually packaged household consumer products or quantities of hazardous substances of less than five gallons in volume per container. Hazardous substances shall not be disposed on site unless in compliance with Dangerous Waste Regulations, Chapter 173-303 WAC, and any pertinent local ordinances, such as sewer discharge standards.

"Hazardous waste" means and includes all dangerous waste and extremely hazardous waste as designated pursuant to Chapter 70.300 RCW and Chapter 173-303 WAC.

1. "Dangerous waste" means any discarded, useless, unwanted, or abandoned substances including, but not limited to, certain pesticides, or any residues or containers of such substances which are disposed of in such quantity or concentration as to pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health, wildlife, or the environment because such wastes or constituents or combinations of such wastes:

    a. Have short-lived, toxic properties that may cause death, injury, or illness or have mutagenic, teratogenic, or carcinogenic properties; or

    b. Are corrosive, explosive, flammable, or may generate pressure through decomposition or other means.

2. "Extremely hazardous waste" means any waste which:

    a. Will persist in a hazardous form for several years or more at a disposal site and which in its persistent form presents a significant environmental hazard and may be concentrated by living organisms through a food chain or may affect the genetic make-up of humans or wildlife; and

b. Is disposed of at a disposal site in such quantities as would present an extreme hazard to humans or the environment.

"Hazardous waste treatment and storage facility" means a facility that treats and stores hazardous waste and is authorized pursuant to Chapter 70.300 RCW and Chapter 173-303 WAC. It includes all contiguous land and structures used for recycling, reusing, reclaiming, transferring, storing, treating, or disposing of hazardous waste. Treatment includes using physical, chemical, or biological processing of hazardous wastes to make such waste nondangerous or less dangerous and safer for transport, amenable for energy or material resource recovery. Storage includes the holding of waste for a temporary period but not the accumulation of waste on the site of generation as long as the storage complies with applicable requirements of Chapter 173-303 WAC.

"Historic structure" means a structure that:

1. Is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the Washington Heritage Register, or the Washington Heritage Barn Register; or

2. Has been certified to contribute to the historical significance of a registered historic district.

"Hydrogeologic assessment" means a report detailing the subsurface conditions of a site and which indicates the susceptibility and potential for contamination of ground water supplies.

"Hydrologic soil groups" means soils grouped according to their runoff-producing characteristics under similar storm and cover conditions. Properties that influence runoff potential are depth to seasonally high water table, intake rate and permeability after prolonged wetting, and depth to a low permeable layer. Hydrologic soil groups are normally used in equations that estimate runoff from rainfall, but can be used to estimate a rate of water transmission in soil. There are four hydrologic soil groups: A, with low runoff potential and a high rate of water transmission; B with moderate infiltration potential and rate of water transmission; C, with a slow infiltration potential and rate of water transmission; and D, with a high runoff potential and very slow infiltration and water transmission rates.

"Hydrologically isolated wetland" means a wetland which:

1. Is not contiguous to any 100-year floodplain of a lake, river or stream; and

2. Has no contiguous surface hydrology, hydric soil or hydrophytic vegetation between the wetland and any other wetland or stream system.

"Hyporheic zone" means a saturated layer of rock or sediment beneath and/or adjacent to a stream channel that contains some proportion of channel water or that has been altered by channel water infiltration.

"Impervious surface" means natural or human-produced material on the ground that does not allow surface water to penetrate into the soil. Impervious surfaces may consist of buildings, parking areas, driveways, roads, sidewalks, and any other areas of concrete, asphalt, plastic, etc.

"Infiltration" means the downward entry of water into the immediate surface of soil.

"In-kind mitigation" means to replace wetlands with substitute wetlands whose characteristics and functions and values are intended to replicate those destroyed or degraded by a regulated activity.

"Lakes" means impoundments of open water 20 acres or larger in size.

"Landfill" means a disposal facility or part of a facility at which solid waste is permanently placed in or on land and which is not a landspreading disposal facility.

"Landslide" means the abrupt downslope movement of soil, rocks, or other surface matter on a site. Landslides may include, but are not limited to, slumps, mudflows, earthflows, rockfalls, and snow avalanches.

"Landslide hazard areas" means areas which are potentially subject to risk of mass movement due to a combination of geologic, topographic, and hydrologic factors.

"Large animal" means an animal with an average weight of 100 pounds or more.

"Liquefaction" means a process by which a water-saturated granular (sandy) soil layer loses strength because of ground shaking commonly caused by an earthquake.

"Long-term commercial significance" means the growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of land which makes it suitable for long-term commercial production, in consideration with the land's proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more intense uses of land.

"Mineral resource lands" means lands primarily devoted to the extraction of minerals or which have known or potential long-term commercial significance for the extraction of minerals.

"Minerals" means gravel, sand, and valuable metallic substances.

"Mitigation" means to avoid, minimize or compensate for adverse environmental impacts. "Mitigation" includes:

1. Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;

2. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, by using appropriate technology, or by taking affirmative steps to avoid or reduce impacts;

3. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;

4. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action;

5. Compensating for the impact by replacing, enhancing, or providing substitute resources or environments; and/or

6. Monitoring the impact and taking appropriate corrective measures.

"Natural floodplain functions" means the contribution that a floodplain makes to support habitat, including but not limited to providing flood storage and conveyance, reducing flood velocities, reducing sedimentation, filtering nutrients and impurities from runoff, processing organic wastes, moderating temperature fluctuations and providing breeding and feeding grounds for aquatic and riparian species.

"Natural resource lands" means mineral resource lands which have long-term commercial significance.

"New construction" for flood hazard purposes refers to structures for which the "start of construction" commenced on or after the effective date of the ordinance codified in this title.

"Old growth forests" means stands of at least two tree species, forming a multi-layered canopy with occasional small openings; with at least 20 trees/hectare (eight trees/acre) more than 81 centimeters (32 inches) dbh or more than 200 years of age; and more than 10 snags/hectare (four snags/acre) over 51 centimeters (20 inches) diameter and 4.6 meters (15 feet) tall; with numerous downed logs, including 10 logs/hectare (four logs/acre) more than 61 centimeters (24 inches) diameter and more than 15 meters (50 feet) long. High elevation stands (more than 762 meters (2,500 feet)) may have lesser dbh (more than 76 centimeters (30 inches)), fewer snags (more than 0.6/hectare (1.5/acre)), and fewer large downed logs (0.8 logs/hectare (two logs/acre)) that are more than 61 centimeters (24 inches) diameter and more than 15 meters (50 feet) long.

"Ordinary high water" means that mark on all lakes, streams, ponds, and tidal water that will be found by examining the bed and banks and ascertaining where the presence and action of water are so common and usual, and so long continued in all ordinary years, as to mark upon the soil a character distinct from that of the abutting upland, in respect to vegetation as that condition exists on the effective date of this chapter or as it may naturally change thereafter; provided, that in any area where the ordinary high water mark cannot be found, the ordinary high water mark adjoining fresh water shall be the mean high water.

"Oregon white oak" means the species Quercus garryana, also known as a Garry oak. All references to oak trees in this chapter refer to Oregon white oak. See also "priority Oregon white oak woodland."

"Out-of-kind mitigation" means to replace wetlands with substitute wetlands whose characteristics do not approximate those destroyed or degraded by a regulated activity.

"Perched ground water" means ground water in a saturated zone is separated from the main body of ground water by unsaturated rock.

"Permanent erosion control" means continuous on-site and off-site control measures that are needed to control conveyance and/or deposition of earth, turbidity or pollutants after development, construction, or restoration.

"Permeability" means the capacity of an aquifer or confining bed to transmit water. It is a property of the aquifer and is independent of the force causing movement.

"Permeable surfaces" mean sand, gravel, and other penetrable deposits on the ground which permit movement of ground water through the pore spaces, and which permit the movement of fluid to the ground water.

"Person" means an individual, firm, company, partnership, association, corporation, or other legal entity.

"Ponds" means naturally occurring impoundments of open water less than 20 acres in size and larger than 2,500 square feet which maintain standing water throughout the year.

"Potable water" means water that is safe and palatable for human use.

"Prairies" means open areas predominated by native, drought-resistant, grasses, forbs (flowering nonwoody plants) and herbs. In Pierce County, prairies are an unusual vegetation regime found in areas of extremely well-drained soils.

"Priority Oregon white oak woodland" means forested areas of pure oak, or of oak/conifer associations one acre or larger, and all oak trees located within, where oak canopy coverage of the area is at least 25 percent. Stands of oaks less than one acre in size may also be considered priority habitat when found to be particularly valuable to fish and wildlife (i.e., they contain many cavities, have a large diameter at breast height (dbh), are used by priority species, or have a large canopy).

"Private organization" means a nonprofit corporation organized pursuant to Chapter 24.03 RCW, which includes the planting of game fish among its purposes for organizing as a nonprofit corporation.

"Protected area" means the lands that lie within the boundaries of the floodway, the riparian habitat zone and the channel migration area. Because of the impact that development can have on flood heights and velocities and habitat, special rules apply in the protected area.

"Public services" include fire protection and suppression, law enforcement, public health, education, recreation, environmental protection, and other governmental services.

"Qualified ground water scientist" means a hydrogeologist, geologist, engineer, or other scientist who meets all the following criteria:

1. Has received a baccalaureate or post-graduate degree in the natural sciences or engineering; and

2. Has sufficient training and experience in ground water hydrology and related fields as may be demonstrated by state registration, professional certifications, or completion of accredited university programs that enable that individual to make sound professional judgments regarding ground water vulnerability.

"Recessional outwash geologic unit" means sand and gravel materials deposited by melt-water streams from receding glaciers.

"Recharge" means the process involved in the absorption and addition of water to ground water.

"Regolith" means any body of loose, noncemented particles overlying and usually covering the bedrock.

"Regulated activities" include, but are not limited to, any activities which are directly undertaken or originate in a regulated critical area or resource land or their buffer that require any of the following entitlements from the City: building permit, commercial or residential; binding site plan; boundary line adjustment; conditional use permit; franchise right-of-way construction permit; site development permit; master plan development; right-of-way permit; shoreline conditional use permit; shoreline environmental redesignation; shoreline substantial development permit; shoreline variance; large lot subdivision, short subdivision; special use permit; subdivision; unclassified use permit; utility and other use permit; variance; zone reclassification; or any subsequently adopted permit or required approval not expressly exempted by this chapter. Regulated activities also include those specific activities listed in LMC 14.142.060.

"Regulatory floodplain" means the area of the special flood hazard area and all protected areas within the jurisdiction of the City of Lakewood.

"Restoration" means the reestablishment of ecological and/or habitat resources and features from a previously disturbed or degraded critical area site.

"Riparian" means of, adjacent to, or living on, the bank of a river, lake, pond, ocean, sound, or other water body.

"Seismic hazard areas" means areas subject to severe risk of damage as a result of earthquake induced ground shaking, slope failure, settlement, or soil liquefaction.

"Short subdivision" or "short plat" means the division or redivision of land into four or fewer lots, tracts, parcels, sites or divisions for the purpose of sale, lease, or transfer of ownership.

"Site" means a lot, parcel, tract, or combination of lots, parcels, or tracts where a development is proposed.

"Slope" means an inclined earth surface, the inclination of which is expressed as the ratio of horizontal distance to vertical distance.

"Slump" means the downward and outward movement of a mass of bedrock or regolith along a distinct surface of failure.

"Snag-rich areas" means forested areas which contain concentrations of standing dead trees, averaging 10 snags or greater per acre, and averaging greater than 15 inches in diameter at breast height.

"Soil survey" means the most recent National Cooperative Soil Survey for the local area or county by the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

"Sole source aquifer" means an area designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, Section 1424(e). The aquifer(s) must supply 50 percent or more of the drinking water for an area without a sufficient replacement available.

"Special flood hazard area (SFHA)" means the land subject to inundation by the base flood. Special flood hazard areas are designated on flood insurance rate maps with the letters "A" or "V," including AE, AO, AH, A1-99, and VE. The special flood hazard area is also referred to as the area of special flood hazard or SFHA.

"Species of local importance" means species that are of local concern due to their population status or their sensitivity to habitat manipulation.

"Start of construction" for flood hazard purposes includes substantial improvements, and means the actual start of construction, repair, reconstruction, rehabilitation, addition, placement or other improvement that occurred before the permit's expiration date. The "actual start" is either the first placement of permanent construction of a structure on a site, such as the pouring of a slab or footings, the installation of piles, the construction of columns, or any work beyond the stage of excavation; or the placement of a manufactured home on a foundation.

Permanent construction does not include land preparation, such as clearing, grading and filling; nor does it include the excavation for a basement, footing, piers, or foundations or the erection of temporary forms; nor does it include the installation on property of accessory structures not occupied as dwelling units or not part of the main structure. For a substantial improvement, the "actual start of construction" means the first alteration of any wall, ceiling, floor or other structural part of a building, whether or not that alteration affects the external dimensions of the building.

"Stockpiling" means the placement of material with the intent to remove it at a later time.

"Subdivision" or "formal subdivision" means the division or redivision of land into five or more lots, tracts, parcels, sites, or division for the purpose of sale, lease, or transfer of ownership.

"Substantial damage" for flood hazard purposes means damage of any origin sustained by a structure whereby the cost of restoring the structure to its before damaged condition would equal or exceed 50 percent of the market value of the structure before the damage occurred.

Substantial damage also means flood-related damage sustained by a structure on two separate occasions during a 10-year period for which the cost of repairs at the time of each such flood event, on the average, equals or exceeds 25 percent of the market value of the structure before the damage occurred.

"Substrate" means the soil, sediment, decomposing organic matter or combination of those located on the bottom surface of a wetland.

"Temporary erosion control" means on-site and off-site control measures that are needed to control conveyance or deposition of earth, turbidity or pollutants during development, construction, or restoration.

"Toe of slope" means a distinct topographic break in slope at the lowermost limit of the landslide or erosion hazard area.

"TPCHD" means the Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department.

"Unconfined aquifer" means an aquifer not bounded above by a bed of distinctly lower permeability than that of the aquifer itself and containing ground water under pressure approximately equal to that of the atmosphere. This term is synonymous with the term "water table aquifer."

"Underground tank" means any one or a combination of tanks (including underground pipes connected thereto) which are used to contain or dispense an accumulation of hazardous substances or hazardous wastes, and the volume of which (including the volume of underground pipes connected thereto) is 10 percent or more beneath the surface of the ground.

"Urban governmental services" include those governmental services historically and typically delivered by cities, and includes storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, street cleaning services, and other public utilities associated with urban areas and normally not associated with nonurban areas.

"Urban growth" refers to growth that makes intensive use of the land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of such land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources. When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services. "Characterized by urban growth" refers to land having urban growth located on it, or to land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth.

"Utility line" means pipe, conduit, cable or other similar facility by which services are conveyed to the public or individual recipients. Such services shall include, but are not limited to, water supply, electric power, gas, communications and sanitary sewers.

"Vadose zone" is the distance between the land surface and the uppermost aquifer. This distance is also defined as the "depth to water" zone or unsaturated zone.

"View corridor" means an area which affords views of lakes, mountains, or other scenic amenities normally enjoyed by residential property owners.

"Water table" means that surface in an unconfined aquifer at which the pressure is atmospheric. It is defined by the levels at which water stands in wells that penetrate the aquifer just far enough to hold standing water.

"Water typing" means a system for classifying water bodies according to their size and fish habitat characteristics. The Washington Department of Natural Resources Forest Practices Water Typing classification system defines four water types:

1. Type "S" = Shoreline: streams that are designated "shorelines of the state," including marine shorelines.

2. Type "F" = Fish: streams that are known to be used by fish or meet the physical criteria to be potentially used by fish.

3. Type "Np" = Nonfish Perennial streams.

4. Type "Ns" = Nonfish Seasonal streams.

"Well" means a bored, drilled or driven shaft, or a dug hole whose depth is greater than the largest surface dimension.

"Wellhead protection area" means the surface and subsurface area surrounding a well or well field that supplies a public water system through which contaminants are likely to pass and eventually reach the water well(s) as designated under the Federal Clean Water Act.

"Wetland" or "wetlands" means areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas. Wetlands generally do not include those artificial wetlands intentionally created from nonwetland sites, including, but not limited to, irrigation and drainage ditches, grass-lined swales, canals, detention facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, farm ponds, and landscape amenities. However, wetlands may include those artificial wetlands intentionally created from nonwetland areas created to mitigate conversion of wetlands, if permitted by the City.

"Wetland specialist" means a person with experience and training in wetlands issues, and with experience in performing delineations, analyzing wetland functions and values, analyzing wetland impacts, and recommending wetland mitigation and restoration. Qualifications include:

1. Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Arts or equivalent degree in biology, botany, environmental studies, fisheries, soil science, wildlife, agriculture or related field, and two years of related work experience, including a minimum of one year of experience delineating wetlands using the Unified Federal Manual and preparing wetland reports and mitigation plans. Additional education may substitute for one year of related work experience; or

2. Four years of related work experience and training, with a minimum of two years' experience delineating wetlands using the Unified Federal Manual and preparing wetland reports and mitigation plans.

The person should be familiar with the Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands, the City Site Development Regulations, the City wetland management policies, and the requirements of this title.

"Wildlife biologist" means a professional with a degree in wildlife, or certification by the Wildlife Society, or with five years' professional experience as a wildlife biologist. [Ord. 758 § 2 (Exh. A), 2021; Ord. 726 § 2(Exh. A), 2019; Ord. 630 § 11, 2015; Ord. 362 § 3, 2004.]

The Lakewood Municipal Code is current through Ordinance 767, passed December 20, 2021.

Article III. Tree Preservation

18A.70.300 Purpose.

This article promotes tree preservation by protecting the treed environment of the City of Lakewood by regulating the removal of significant trees and providing incentives to preserve trees that, because of their size, species, or location, provide special benefits. Tree preservation is an essential strategy for meeting Lakewood's citywide goal of 30% tree canopy cover by the year 2050. Tree preservation protects and enhances critical areas, facilitates aquifer recharge, reduces erosion and storm water runoff, and helps to define public and private open spaces. [Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.70.310 Tree removal applicability/exemptions.

The requirements for tree preservation shall be provided in accordance with the development standards of each individual zoning district and the provisions of this section, and are applicable to all zoning districts. The following exemptions do not apply to Oregon white oaks or trees located within the shoreline buffers subject to the shoreline master program (SMP). Refer to LMC 18A.70.330 for Oregon white oak protection standards. Refer to Chapter 3, Section B.8 Shoreline Vegetation Conservation of the SMP for tree protection standards within shoreline buffers.

A. Lots of less than seventeen thousand (17,000) square feet in single-family residential zones are exempt from this chapter, except:

1. ~~i~~In the case of a short subdivision or subdivision per LMC 18A.70.320.C.3.b.i., or
2. F~~f~~or those lots that contain Oregon white oak trees where specific tree preservation is required in LMC 18A.70.330, or
3. W~~w~~here specific tree preservation is required as a mitigation measure under SEPA, or~~.~~
4. ~~In~~ in the event a permit is not required for the establishment of a use.~~, the standards of this section shall still apply.~~

B. Removal of nonsignificant trees that are not protected by any other means is exempt from this chapter.

C. *Removal of Trees in Association with Right-of-Way and Easements.* Tree removal by a public agency or a franchised utility within a public right-of-way or upon an easement, for the purpose of installing and maintaining water, storm, sewer, power, gas or communication lines, or motorized or nonmotorized streets or paths is exempt from this chapter. Notification to the City by the public agency or franchised utility is required prior to tree maintenance or removal within City rights-of-way.

D. *Emergency Removal.* Any number of hazardous protected and nonprotected trees may be removed under emergency conditions. Emergency conditions include immediate danger to life or dwellings or similar stationary and valuable property, including the presence of a target. Emergency removal may occur and all the following conditions shall be met:

1. The City is notified the following business day of the unpermitted action;
2. Visual documentation (i.e., photographs, video, etc.) is made available; and
3. The felled tree remains on site for City inspection.
4. Replacement required.

a. Nonsingle-family use: The property owner will be required to provide replacement trees as established in LMC 18A.70.320(~~G~~I), Replacement.

b. Single-family use: The property owner will not be required to provide replacement trees.

5. Should the City determine that the tree(s) did not pose an emergency condition, the owner shall be cited for a violation of the terms of this chapter. [Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.70.320 Significant tree preservation.

A. *Standards.* Significant tree preservation shall be required for any project permit.

1. A significant tree is an existing tree which:

a. When measured at four and one-half (4.5) feet above ground, has a minimum diameter of nine (9) inches for evergreen trees and deciduous trees;

b. When measured at four and one-half (4.5) feet above ground, has a minimum diameter of four (4) inches for Oregon white oaks (also known as Garry oaks); and

c. Regardless of the tree diameter, is determined to be significant by the Director due to the uniqueness of the species or provision of important wildlife habitat.

2. *Tree Measurement.* For the purposes of this section, existing trees are measured by diameter at four and one-half (4.5) feet above ground level, which is the usual and customary forest standard. Replacement trees are measured by diameter at six (6) inches above ground level, which is the usual and customary nursery standard.

3. *Damaged or Diseased Trees.* Trees will not be considered "significant" if, following inspection and a written report by a registered landscape architect, certified nursery professional or certified arborist, and upon review of the report and concurrence by the City, they are determined to be:

a. Safety hazards due to root, trunk or primary limb failure;

b. Damaged or diseased, and do not constitute an important wildlife habitat. At the discretion of the City, damaged or diseased or standing dead trees may be retained and counted toward the significant tree requirement, if demonstrated that such trees will provide important wildlife habitat and are not classified as a safety hazard.

Damaged or diseased trees oak shall comply with LMC 18A.70.310.D.4 and LMC 18A.70.330.B.1.a.1.iii replacement requirements.

4. *Preventive Measure Evaluation.* An evaluation of preventive measures by an arborist in lieu of removing the tree and potential impacts of tree removal may be required. If required, this evaluation shall include the following measures:

a. Avoid disturbing tree: Avoid disturbing the tree at all unless it represents a hazard as determined by an arborist;

b. Stabilize tree: Stabilize the tree, if possible, using approved arboricultural methods such as cable and bracing in conjunction with other practices to rejuvenate the tree such as repairing damaged bark and trunk wounds, mulching, application of fertilizer, and improving aeration of the tree root zones;

c. Pruning: Remove limbs from the tree, such as removing dead or broken branches, or by reducing branch end weights. If needed, remove up to one-quarter (1/4) of the branches from the canopy and main trunk only in small amounts, unless greater pruning is needed by approval of the arborist;

d. Wildlife tree: Create a wildlife tree or snag, or cut the tree down to a safe condition, without disturbing the roots, where the tree no longer poses a hazard. To create snags, remove all branches from the canopy, girdle deciduous trees, and leave the main trunk standing. Wildlife trees or snags are most appropriate in City parks, greenbelts, vacant property, and environmentally critical areas;

e. Steep slopes: Removal of tree roots on steep slopes may require a geotechnical evaluation;

f. Creeks and lakes: Trees fallen into creeks and lakes are to remain in place unless they create a hazard; and

g. Provide professional recommendations on:

i. The necessity of removal, including alternative measures to removal;
ii. The lowest-impact approach to removal;
iii. A replacement tree plan, if required.

B. *Trimming.* Trimming of tree limbs and branches for purposes of vegetation management is permitted, provided the trimming does not cause the tree to be a safety hazard.

C. *Preservation Criteria.* All significant trees shall be preserved according to the following criteria:

~~1. *Perimeter Trees.* All significant trees within twenty (20) feet of the lot perimeter or required buffer, whichever is greater, shall be preserved; except that significant trees may be removed if required for the siting and placement of driveway and road access, buildings, vision clearance areas, utilities, sidewalks or pedestrian walkways, or storm drainage facilities and other similar required improvements, subject to the discretion of the Director.~~

~~This requirement shall not apply to single-family residential lots less than seventeen thousand (17,000) square feet in size, where no specific tree preservation is required~~

~~2~~1. *Maximum Tree Removal on Developed Properties.* Significant trees on existing single-family lots may be removed with a tree removal permit and without tree replacement, except Oregon white oaks which are regulated by LMC 18A.70.330, based on the following~~Existing single-family lots: Except for Oregon white oaks which are regulated by section 18A.70.330, significant trees may be removed with a permit based on the following~~:

Maximum Tree Removal on Existing Single-Family Lots ~~no permit required~~		
Lot Size	Maximum number of significant trees allowed to be removed in 1 year ~~without a permit~~	Maximum number of significant trees allowed to be removed in 5 years ~~without a permit~~
*Lots up to 17,000 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A
Lots 17,001 to 30,000 sq. ft.	2	4
Lots 30,001 sq. ft. or greater	4	8
*~~Section~~LMC 18A.70.310(A) states that single-family lots up to 17,000 sq. ft. are exempted from tree preservation requirements.		

2. *Perimeter Trees.* All significant trees within twenty (20) feet of the lot perimeter or required buffer, whichever is greater, shall be preserved; except that significant trees may be removed if required for the siting

and placement of driveway and road access, buildings, vision clearance areas, utilities, sidewalks or pedestrian walkways, or storm drainage facilities and other similar required improvements, subject to the discretion of the Director.

3. *Interior Trees.* A percentage of all significant trees within the interior of a lot, excluding the perimeter area, shall be preserved within the applicable zoning district.

a. For new single-family residential development including a single-family dwelling on an individual lot, multifamily residential development, and public/quasi-public institutional development, fifty (50) percent of the significant trees located within the interior area of the lot shall be retained.

b. For new residential short subdivision or subdivision~~s~~, all significant trees shall be retained and preserved except those required to be removed in order to construct streets, utilities, or other on-site improvements. Tree retention shall thereafter be provided on a lot-by-lot basis as the individual lots are developed. A tree survey shall be included as part of the subdivision application and a tree retention plan shall be recorded on the face of the plat to require compliance with this provision.

i. For any site proposed to be developed or cleared, at least 50 percent of significant trees located outside the net buildable area plus any approved development footprint of the lot shall be retained if they are rated in good condition or better by an ISA Certified Arborist.

c. For commercial and industrial development, ten (10) percent of the significant trees located within the interior area of the lot, or individual lots in the case of subdivisions, shall be retained.

d. In Open Space and Recreation zones, ninety-five (95) percent of the significant trees located within the interior area of the lot shall be retained unless otherwise determined by the Director.

4. *SEPA Requirements.* Additional or specific tree retention may be required as SEPA mitigation in addition to the requirements of this section.

D. *Tree Removal Permit Required*. Approval is required prior to the removal of any significant tree (as described in ~~Section~~LMC 18A.70.320.A) in accordance with the following:

E. Tree Permits for Single-Family Residential Land Uses or Any Use When Not Associated with a Project Permit/Plan.

1. Criteria:

a. The applicant shall submit a complete application using the form provided and kept by the City.

b. The applicant shall confirm that the proposal complies with the requirements of Article III. Tree Preservation.

2. Permit review process:

a. Applications and all submitted information will be verified and approved by City staff administratively.

b. If an application does not comply with any requirement in this section, the permit is subject to additional review by an ISA Certified Arborist and/or City staff. A Tree retention plan may be required.

i. The Director shall review and may approve, approve with modifications, or deny a tree retention plan subject to the provisions of this section.

F. Tree Permits for Non-Single-Family Residential Land Uses or Any Use When Associated with a Project Permit/Plan.

1. Submit a tree retention plan that consists of a tree survey that identifies the location, size and species of all significant trees on a site and any trees over three (3) inches in diameter at four and one-half (4.5) feet above ground level that will be retained on the site.

a. The tree survey may be conducted by a method that locates individual significant trees, or

b. Where site conditions prohibit physical survey of the property, standard timber cruising methods may be used to reflect general locations, numbers and groupings of significant trees.

c. Oregon white oaks that are to be retained on the site shall be indicated on the site plan with critical root zone protection per LMC 18A.70.330.

d. All other trees required to be preserved based on the preservation criteria in LMC 18A.70.320.C shall be indicated in the site plan.

2. The tree retention plan shall also show the location, species, and dripline of each significant tree that is intended to qualify for retention credit, and identify the significant trees that are proposed to be retained, and those that are designated to be removed.

3. The applicant shall demonstrate on the tree retention plan those tree protection techniques intended to be utilized during land alteration and construction in order to provide for the continued healthy life of retained significant trees.

4. If tree retention and/or landscape plans are required, no clearing, grading or disturbance of vegetation shall be allowed on the site until approval of such plans by the City.

G. Heritage Tree Removal. The following criteria pertains only to those trees designated under LMC 2.48.040 D. Heritage Trees

1. A tree removal permit is required for removal of any heritage tree(s);

2. City Staff and an ISA Certified Arborist shall evaluate any heritage trees prior to a decision on the removal permit. Permit approval will be granted if an arborist report demonstrates that alteration or removal is necessary for health and safety, infrastructure operation, protection of existing buildings, or to accomplish reasonable use of property per state law. Recommendations for care, other than removal, will be considered.

H. *Construction Requirements.*

1. An area free of disturbance, corresponding to the dripline of the significant tree's canopy, shall be identified and protected during the construction stage with a temporary three (3) foot high chain-link or plastic net fence. No impervious surfaces, fill, excavation, storage of construction materials, or parking of vehicles shall be permitted within the area defined by such fencing.

2. At Director's sole discretion, a protective tree well may be required to be constructed if the grade level within ten (10) feet of the dripline around the tree is to be raised or lowered. The inside diameter of the well shall be at least equal to the diameter of the tree spread dripline, plus at least five (5) feet of additional diameter.

3. The Director may approve use of alternate tree protection techniques if the trees will be protected to an equal or greater degree than by the techniques listed above. Alternative techniques must be approved by a registered landscape architect, certified nursery professional or certified arborist, with review and concurrence by the City.

4. If any significant tree that has been specifically designated to be retained in the tree preservation plan dies or is removed within five (5) years of the development of the site, then the significant tree shall be replaced pursuant to subsection ~~(G)~~I of this section.

I. *Replacement.* When a significant tree subject to this section cannot be retained, the tree shall be replaced as a condition for the removal of the significant tree, in accordance with the following:

1. *On-Site Replacement.*

a. *Based on DBH Size.* Significant trees shall be replaced at a ratio of two to one (2:1) of the total diameter inches of all replacement trees to the diameter inches of all the significant trees removed.

b. *Based on Canopy Coverage*. The applicant may choose to plant fewer replacement trees than required by option (a) if an ISA Certified Arborist determines in a written report that they will compensate for the canopy lost when they reach maturity.

c. Based on Carbon Reductions. The applicant may choose to plant fewer replacement trees than required by option (a) if an ISA Certified Arborist determines in a written report that the trees planted and preserved on the property meet the following criteria:

i. Tree species to be planted on the site are selected for their optimal ability to sequester carbon and store it over the course of their lifetime, according to the latest and best science. The following list contains the top 10 species for carbon sequestration and storage in Lakewood, as calculated by the i-Tree Species tool in 2022:

Optimal Species for Carbon Sequestration in Lakewood, WA	
Scientific Name	**Common Name**
Sequoia sempervirens	Coast redwood
Sequoiadendron giganteum	Giant sequoia
Quercus petraea	Durmast oak
Quercus suber	Cork oak
Nothofagus dombeyi	Coigüe, Dombey's beech
Nothofagus obliqua	Roble, Patagonian oak
Quercus falcata	Southern red oak
Quercus shumardii	Shumard oak
Quercus garryana	Oregon white oak
Nyssa aquatica	Water tupelo
Source: https://species.itreetools.org/	

ii. Trees are planted in the optimal locations on the property, relative to the structures, to reduce energy use and therefore avoid CO2 emissions.

c. Replacement trees shall be no smaller than three (3) inches in diameter at six (6) inches above ground;

d. Existing healthy trees anywhere on the site which are retained to support the remaining significant trees can be counted against the on-site replacement requirements on a one to one (1:1) basis of the total diameter inches of all replacement trees removed, provided it meets the following criteria:

i. The tree does not present a safety hazard; and

ii. The tree is between three (3) and nine (9) inches in diameter at four and one-half (4.5) feet above ground.

2. Each significant tree that is located interior to the twenty (20) foot perimeter area, and which is in excess of the ~~fifty (50) percent of~~ significant tree percentages ~~that are~~ is required to be retained, may be credited towards replacement on a one and one-half to one (1.5:1) basis of the total diameter inches for any perimeter trees required to be removed for development, provided the interior tree is between nine (9) inches and twenty-four (24) inches in diameter for evergreen trees, or between nine (9) inches and thirty (30) inches in diameter for deciduous trees.

3. Each significant tree that is located interior to the twenty (20) foot perimeter area, and which is in excess of the ~~the fifty (50) percent of~~ significant tree percentages ~~that are~~ is required to be retained, may be credited towards replacement on a two to one (2:1) basis of the total diameter inches for any perimeter trees required to be removed for development, provided it meets one of the following criteria:

a. The tree exceeds sixty (60) feet in height, or twenty-four (24) inches in diameter for evergreen trees, or thirty (30) inches in diameter for deciduous trees.

b. The tree is located in a grouping of at least five (5) other significant trees with canopies that touch or overlap.

c. The tree provides energy savings, through wind protection or summer shading, as a result of its location relative to buildings.

d. The tree belongs to a unique or unusual species.

e. The tree is located within twenty-five (25) feet of any critical area or required critical area buffers.

f. The tree is eighteen (18) inches in diameter or greater and is identified as providing valuable wildlife habitat.

4. *Off-Site Replacement.* When the required number of significant trees cannot be physically retained or replaced on site, the applicant may have the option of:

a. The planting of the required replacement trees at locations approved by the Director throughout the City. Plantings shall be completed prior to completion of the project permit requiring tree replacement.

b. Payment in lieu of replacement may be made to the City Tree Fund for planting of trees in other areas of the City. The payment of an amount equivalent to the estimated cost of buying and planting the trees that would otherwise have been required to be planted on site, as determined by the City's Tree Replacement Cost Schedule. Payment in lieu of planting trees on site shall be made at the time of the issuance of any building permit for the property or completion of the project permit requiring the tree replacement, whichever occurs first.

[Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

J. *Incentives for Preservation*. Significant tree preservation is incentivized as outlined in the following chart. All projects utilizing the following preservation incentives shall demonstrate compliance with LMC 18A.70.320(F) and LMC 18A.70.320(H) to ensure protection of the tree during site construction.

Tree Preservation Incentives			
Incentive	Code Sections	Description	Code Language

Parking Reduction	18A.80.060 Parking Incentives 18B.600 Parking 18C.600 Parking	Allow for alternative standards to protect significant trees, e.g., alter parking dimensional standards or rates.	*Credit for Preservation of Significant or Heritage Trees*. For every significant tree and/or heritage tree preserved within the property, the required number of parking spaces may be reduced by 0.5 spaces, provided the total reduction does not exceed five (5) percent of the total required parking spaces, when combined with all parking incentive credits.
Density Increase	18A.60.110 Density standards 18B.200.230 District-Wide Development Standards 18C.200.230 District-wide development standards	Increase density if retaining significant trees, with special attention given to areas experiencing the urban heat island effect and/or low tree equity.	For multi-family uses, maximum density may increase by 1 unit for each significant tree preserved on a property that is located in the Downtown District (not to exceed of more than 20% of the total allowable units) Bonus density, where applicable, shall be computed by adding the bonus units authorized by LMC 18A.90.050 to the base units computed under this section. For multi-family use types, maximum density may increase by 1 unit for each significant tree preserved on a property that is located in a census tract with a tree equity score of under the City's average score of 69 (not to exceed of more than 20% of the total allowable units)
Master Plan Flexibility	18B.700.720 Master Planned Development – Town Center Incentive Overlay	Allow flexibility in a master plan if retaining significant and/or heritage trees, with special attention given to areas experiencing the urban heat island effect and/or low tree equity.	Master Planned Development allows flexibility and variation design as long as there is a net benefit to the City. Significant and heritage tree preservation shall be included as a benefit under the Master Planned Development required net benefit findings in LMC 18B.700.720(G)(3)

Landscaping Reduction for Oregon White Oak Preservation	18A.70.150 Landscaping types	Allow for a reduction in the Type I, Vegetative buffer landscaping requirements for the preservation of Oregon white oaks.	A credit of one and one-half square feet of vegetative buffer shall be given for every square foot of area devoted to new or the preservation of Oregon white oak tree use.
Building Setback Reduction	18A.60.030 Residential area and dimensions 18A.60.070 Open space area and dimensions.	Allow for a reduction in the rear yard and/or side yard building setback requirements for the preservation of significant trees.	The Director may reduce a rear yard and/or side yard building setback to compensate for significant or heritage tree preservation provided that the setback is not reduced more than five (5) feet, is no closer to the property line than three (3) feet, is the minimum reduction required for tree preservation, and complies with LMC 18A.60.100 Building transition area
Impervious Surface Bonus	18A.60.030 Residential area and dimensions 18A.60.040 Commercial area and dimensions 18A.60.070 Open space area and dimensions.	Allow an increase in allowable impervious surface on a site where a significant tree is being preserved. Impervious surface cannot be located within the critical root zone of the preserved tree(s)	The Director may increase the amount of allowable impervious surface by 5% to compensate for the preservation of a significant or heritage tree.

K. Enforcement

a. Failure to comply with any lawful order issued under the authority of this title, constitutes a Class 2 civil infraction, as defined in Chapter 1.48 LMC. Any violation of this title which is deemed to be a public nuisance or a danger to the public health and/or safety shall be addressed as specified in Chapter 1.44 LMC.

b. Malicious Cutting. Malicious cutting may result in tripling of the amount of replacement value as provided in ~~code Section~~LMC 18A.70.320(G)(d).

18A.70.330 Oregon white oak preservation.

The Oregon white oak, *quercus garryana*, also known as Garry oak, is a native tree designated by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife as a priority habitat. In Lakewood, individual trees and stands of trees are protected as critical fish and wildlife habitat area under Chapter 14.154 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Areas.

The requirements for Oregon white oak tree preservation shall be provided in accordance with the development standards of each individual zoning district and the provisions of this section and are applicable to all zoning districts.

A. Priority White Oak Woodlands (as defined in LMC 14.165.010) or trees located within a critical area or buffer, including shoreline buffers subject to the shoreline master program, are subject to the critical areas ordinance LMC Chapter 14.154 and/or Shoreline Master Program.

B. Permits for Oregon white oaks ~~and all trees within critical areas~~

1. Permits for removal, topping and trimming

a. *Removal or Topping*. Regardless of diameter, a permit for removal or topping may be granted when it is determined by the Director that the Oregon white oak tree is so diseased or damaged that it presents a danger to the public or adjacent property and trimming is inadequate to ameliorate the danger. Wherever feasible, dead Oregon white oak trees shall be left as snags for their habitat value.

1. Individual Oregon white oak trees or stands with average DBH of > 4" but <20" may be removed subject to the following conditions:

i. The trees are not located in a critical area, in such case subject to the critical areas ordinance LMC Chapter 14.154

ii. The applicant has demonstrated no alternative siting in order to construct streets, utilities, or other on-site improvements.

iii. Tree replacement is required at a 2:1 ratio

C. Construction Operations. During building or construction operations, suitable protective measures listed below shall be implemented around significant Oregon white oak trees to prevent injury:

1. Establish a critical root zone (CRZ) for the tree which at a minimum is a circular area around the tree trunk with a radius of one foot for every one inch in diameter measured at four and one-half feet above grade.

2. Install an access deterring fence with a minimum height of three feet around the CRZ that will remain in place till final inspections have been completed.

3. Post highly visible and legible signs of caution, warning, or do not disturb, which are not less than 12 inches by 12 inches of the restrictions around the tree on the fence or restricted area to help convey the importance of CRZ to workers on site.

4. No roots greater than four inches in diameter shall be cut, even if such roots are outside the CRZ.

5. Make all necessary cuts to tree roots cleanly with sharp tools and under the supervision of a certified arborist or landscape architect.

6. Construction debris or stockpile construction material shall be done outside the CRZ and away from the tree as practically possible.

7. The soil composition in and around the CRZ shall not be disturbed or altered during project construction.

8. Change in soil grades around the CRZ and tree shall be gradual.

a. Washing equipment, vehicle maintenance and other potential soil contamination activities shall be done away from the CRZ and the tree as practically possible.

b. All measures to avoid damage to tree trunks and branches should be taken during construction activities.

D. If the protective measures listed above cannot be met due to site specific conditions, or if it is determined that the measures may not meet the intent of protecting the Oregon white oak tree, the applicant will be required to provide a tree protection plan prepared by a certified arborist.

E. No hard surface area shall be allowed within the drip line of an Oregon white oak tree to the maximum extent possible. An administrative variance may allow hard surface on up to 25 percent of the area within the drip line when there is no practical alternative and with a tree protection plan prepared by a certified arborist.

18A.70.340 City Tree Fund.

A. *Funding Sources.* All civil penalties received under this chapter and all money received pursuant to Chapter 14.02 LMC, Environmental Rules and Procedures, shall be used for the purposes set forth in this section. In addition, the following sources may be used for the purposes set forth in this section:

1. Agreed-upon restoration payments or settlements in lieu of penalties;

2. Tree permit fees and penalties

3. Donations and grants for tree purposes;

4. Other moneys allocated by the City Council.

B. *Funding Purposes.* The City shall use money received pursuant to this section for the following purposes:

1. Acquiring, maintaining, and preserving wooded areas within the City;

2. Planting and maintaining trees within the City;

3. Restoration or enhancement of native trees like Oregon white oaks, such as on public lands, private tree tracts, critical area buffers, or lands with conservation easements

4. Establishment of a holding public tree nursery;

5. Urban forestry education;

6. Implementation of a tree canopy monitoring program;

7. Scientific research; or

8. Resources to support the administration of Ch. 18A.70 Art. III Tree Preservation

9. Other purposes relating to trees as determined by the City Council. [Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.70.350 Definitions.

"ANSI A300" means the industry standards for tree care in the United States.

"Certified Arborist" means a specialist in the care and maintenance of trees who is certified by and in good standing with the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).

"Critical Root Zone" (CRZ) means the area of soil around a tree where the minimum amount of roots considered critical to the structural stability or health of the tree are located. CRZ can be determined using the dripline of the tree.

"DBH" is an acronym meaning tree diameter at breast height measured at 4.5 feet above ground. For multi-trunked trees, DBH is the total of all individual trunks added together.

"Dripline" means the outermost edge of a tree's canopy. When viewed from above, the drip line will appear as a line that follows the contour of the tree's branches. At a minimum, the drip line is a circle whose diameter is 15 times a tree's DBH.

"Malicious cutting" occurs when a person willfully and without permit removes a significant or heritage tree, or otherwise injures, cuts, or tops a significant or heritage tree to the extent that the tree's survival is compromised.

"Pruning" means removing branches from a tree to achieve a specified objective using approved practices according to ANSI A300 industry standards.

"Root Pruning" means removing roots from a tree to achieve a specified objective using approved practices according to ANSI A300 industry standards.

A "stand" of trees means two or more trees whose canopies, driplines, and/or critical root zones are adjacent, touching, or overlapping.

"Topping" means using inappropriate pruning techniques to reduce tree size that may result in unnecessary risk, tree stress, or decay.

"Tree protection plan" means an annotated and scaled drawing demonstrating compliance with tree protection specifications for construction operations as identified in this section.

"Trimming" means detaching a limb, branch, or root from a tree. Trimming shall include pruning and cutting.

Incentive Redlines- *the following code sections will be amended for consistency with the table found in revised LMC 18A.70, Tree Preservation*

18A.60.030 Residential area and dimensions.

A. *Development Standards Table.*

	Zoning Classifications								
	R1	**R2**	**R3**	**R4**	**MR1**	**MR2**	**MF1**	**MF2**	**MF3**
Density	1.45 DUA	2.2 DUA	4.8 DUA	6.4 DUA	8.7 DUA	14.6 DUA	22 DUA	35 DUA	54 DUA
Lot size	25,000 GSF	17,000 GSF	7,500 GSF	5,700 GSF	5,000 GSF /unit	3,000 GSF /unit for 2 or more units	No minimum lot size	No minimum lot size	No minimum lot size
Building coverage	35%	35%	45%	50%	55%	60%	60%	60%	60%
Impervious surface	45%	45%	60%	70%	70%	75%	70%	70%	70%
Front yard/street setback	25 feet	25 feet	10 feet	10 feet	5 feet	5 feet	15 feet	15 feet	15 feet
Garage/carport setback	30 feet	30 feet	20 feet	20 feet	20 feet	20 feet	20 feet	20 feet	20 feet
Principal arterial and state highway setback	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Rear yard setback	20 feet	20 feet	10 feet	10 feet	5 feet	5 feet	15 feet	15 feet	15 feet
Interior setback	8 feet	8 feet	5 feet	5 feet			8 feet	8 feet	8 feet
Interior setback for attached units					0 feet	0 feet			
Interior setback for detached units					5 feet	5 feet			
Building height	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	50 feet	45 feet	65 feet	80 feet
Design	Design features shall be required as set forth in Chapter 18A.70, Article I.								
Landscaping	Landscaping shall be provided as set forth in Chapter 18A.70, Article II.								
Tree Preservation	Significant tree identification and preservation and/or replacement shall be required as set forth in LMC 18A.70.300 through 18A.70.330.								
Parking	Parking shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.80.								
Signs	Signage shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.100.								

B. *Tree Preservation Incentives.*

1. The Director may reduce a rear yard and/or side yard building setback to compensate for significant or heritage tree preservation provided that the setback is not reduced more than five (5) feet, is no closer to the property line than three (3) feet, is the minimum reduction required for tree preservation, and complies with LMC 18A.60.100 Building transition area

2. The Director may increase the amount of allowable impervious surface by 5% to compensate for the preservation of a significant or heritage tree.

[Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.60.040 Commercial area and dimensions.

A. *Development Standards Table.*

	Zoning Classifications							
	ARC	**NC1**	**NC2**	**TOC**	**CBD**	**C1**	**C2**	**C3**
Density	15 DUA	22 DUA	35 DUA	54 DUA	54 DUA			
Lot size	The minimum lot size for the ARC zoning district is 5,000 gross square feet (GSF), plus 2,750 GSF for each dwelling unit over 1 unit, where applicable.	There is no minimum established lot size for the commercial zoning districts. Proposed uses and their associated densities within these zoning districts, and the applicable community design standards shall be used to establish the minimum lot size for a project.						
Lot coverage	All building coverage and impervious surface maximums stated herein may be reduced at the time they are applied, because of storm water requirements. The maximum lot coverage standards for the commercial zoning districts shall be as follows:							
Building coverage	50%	70%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Impervious surface	60%	80%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Setbacks	The minimum yard setbacks for the commercial zoning districts shall be as follows, except where increased setbacks due to landscaping and building/fire code requirements apply:							
Front yard/street setback	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet
Garage/carport setback	20 feet	20 feet	20 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet

	Zoning Classifications							
	ARC	**NC1**	**NC2**	**TOC**	**CBD**	**C1**	**C2**	**C3**
Rear yard setback	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet
Interior setback	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet
Building height	40 feet	50 feet	60 feet	90 feet	90 feet	60 feet	60 feet	60 feet
Design	Design features shall be required as set forth in Chapter 18A.70 LMC, Article I.							
Landscaping	Landscaping shall be provided as set forth in Chapter 18A.70 LMC, Article II.							
Tree Preservation	Significant tree identification and preservation and/or replacement shall be required as set forth in LMC 18A.70.300 through 18A.70.330.							
Parking	Parking shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.80.							
Signs	Signage shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.100 LMC.							

B. *Tree Preservation Incentives.*

1. The Director may increase the amount of allowable impervious surface by 5% to compensate for the preservation of a significant or heritage tree.

[Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.60.050 Industrial area and dimensions.

A. *Development Standards Table.*

	Industrial Zoning Classifications		
	IBP	**I1**	**I2**
Lot size	One acre	20,000 GSF	20,000 GSF
Building coverage	All building coverage and impervious surface maximums stated herein for the Industrial zoning districts may be reduced at the time they are applied to individual properties, because of storm water requirements.		
Impervious surface	The maximum building and impervious surface coverage and impervious surface for the Industrial zoning districts shall be 100%.		
Setbacks	The minimum distance setbacks for the Industrial zoning districts shall be as follows, except where increased setbacks due to landscaping or building/fire code requirements apply.		

	Industrial Zoning Classifications		
	IBP	**I1**	**I2**
Front yard/street setback	10 feet	0 feet	0 feet
Principal arterial and state highway setback	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Rear yard setback	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet
Interior setback	0 feet	0 feet	0 feet
Building height	60 feet	60 feet	60 feet
Design	Design features shall be required as set forth in Chapter 18A.70 LMC, Article I.		
Landscaping	Landscaping shall be provided as set forth in Chapter 18A.70 LMC, Article II.		
Tree Preservation	Significant tree identification and preservation and/or replacement shall be required as set forth in Chapter 18A.70 LMC, Article III.		
Parking	Parking shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.80 LMC.		
Signs	Signage shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.100.		

[Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.60.060 Military lands area and dimensions.

A. *Development Standards Table.*

	ML	AC II	AC I	CZ
Lot size	Lands owned by the federal government are exempt from local development standards. Otherwise, development standards for the Military-Related zoning districts shall be determined jointly by the Director and City Engineer on a case-by-case basis considering the intensity of the proposed use, adjacent uses and zoning, environmental issues, site design, and/or type and construction of buildings.			
Building coverage				
Impervious surface				
Setbacks				
Front yard/street setback				
Principal arterial and state highway setback				
Rear yard setback				
Interior setback				
Building height				

Return to Agenda

	ML	AC II	AC I	CZ
Design	Design features shall be required as set forth in Chapter 18A.70, Article I.			
Tree Preservation	Landscaping shall be provided as set forth in Chapter 18A.70, Article II.			
Landscaping	Significant tree identification and preservation and/or replacement shall be required as set forth in Chapter 18A.70, Article III.			
Parking	Parking shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.80.			
Signs	Signage shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.100.			

[Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.60.070 Open space area and dimensions.

A. *Development Standards Table.*

	OSR1	OSR2
Lot size	N/A	N/A
Building coverage	N/A	N/A
Impervious surface	20%	30%
Setbacks		
Front yard/street setback	25 feet	25 feet
Principal arterial and state highway setback	35 feet	35 feet
Rear yard setback	20 feet	20 feet
Interior setback	20 feet	20 feet
Building height	The maximum building height, not including any applicable height bonus, for the Open Space/Recreation zoning districts shall be 40 feet.	
Design	Design features shall be required as set forth in Chapter 18A.70, Article I.	
Landscaping	Landscaping shall be provided as set forth in Chapter 18A.70, Article II.	
Tree Preservation	Significant tree identification and preservation and/or replacement shall be required as set forth in Chapter	

	OSR1	OSR2
	18A.70, Article III.	
Parking	Parking shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.80.	
Signs	Signage shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 18A.100.	

B. *Tree Preservation Incentives.*

2. The Director may reduce a rear yard and/or side yard building setback to compensate for significant or heritage tree preservation provided that the setback is not reduced more than five (5) feet, is no closer to the property line than three (3) feet, is the minimum reduction required for tree preservation, and complies with LMC 18A.60.100 Building transition area

3. The Director may increase the amount of allowable impervious surface by 5% to compensate for the preservation of a significant or heritage tree.

[Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.60.110 Density standards.

D. For multi-family uses, maximum density may increase by 1 unit for each significant tree preserved on a property that is located in the Downtown District (not to exceed of more than 20% of the total allowable units).

E. Bonus density, where applicable, shall be computed by adding the bonus units authorized by LMC 18A.90.050 to the base units computed under this section.

F. For multi-family use types, maximum density may increase by 1 unit for each significant tree preserved on a property that is located in a census tract with a tree equity score of under the City's average score of 69 (not to exceed of more than 20% of the total allowable units).

~~E~~G. When calculations result in a fraction, the fraction shall be rounded down to the nearest whole number as follows:

1. Fractions of 0.50 or above shall be rounded up; and

2. Fractions below 0.50 shall be rounded down. [Ord. 758 § 2 (Exh. A), 2021; Ord. 726 § 2 (Exh. B), 2019.]

18A.70.150 Landscaping types.

A. The landscaping types are intended to provide a basic list of landscaping standards that may be applied within a proposed project as necessary to provide for the intent of the comprehensive plan.

1. *Type I, Vegetative Buffer.* A combination of landscaping, evergreen and deciduous trees, and fencing that provides a substantial visual barrier between uses and creates an impression of separation of spaces along an interior property line. The following standards shall be applied:

a. Landscaping strip shall be a minimum of eight (8) feet in width, and shall be increased to ten (10) feet in width and fifteen (15) feet in width as required by LMC 18A.70.160, Landscaping regulations by zoning district.

b. Depending on the use, a sight-obscuring barrier may be required to be placed within the landscaping strip to consist of:

i. Fence/wall five (5) feet in height, or

ii. A medium shrub barrier (hedge) which is of such a density as to provide a solid visual barrier.

c. One (1) evergreen or deciduous tree is required per twenty (20) linear feet of landscaping strip. Trees shall be spaced at intervals not greater than twenty (20) feet on center along the full extent of the landscaping strip. No more than sixty (60) percent of the trees may be deciduous.

d. The percentage of evergreen trees allowed may be further reduced at the discretion of the Director to address public safety concerns.

e. *Shrubs.*

i. Two (2) medium shrubs are required per six (6) linear feet of landscaping strip and placed no greater than four (4) feet on center.

ii. Three (3) low shrubs are required per six (6) linear feet of landscaping strip and placed no greater than three (3) feet on center.

iii. Shrubs shall be placed along the entire length of the landscaping strip as to provide vegetative cover.

f. Vegetative groundcover.

g. Landscaping shall be placed along the entire length of the landscaping strip so as to provide a vegetative buffer. These are minimum standards; additional landscaping may be

required if, in the determination of the Director, the proposed landscaping plan does not provide effective separation and screening.

h. A credit of one and one-half square feet of vegetative buffer shall be given for every square foot of area devoted to new or the preservation of Oregon white oak tree use.

18A.80.060 Parking incentives.

A. When residential uses are combined with commercial uses in the same building, parking requirements may be reduced by twenty (20) percent, except when located within the CBD or TOC zoning districts for which parking requirements are reduced by thirty-five (35) percent.

B. A structured parking space shall count as one and one-half (1.5) parking spaces towards the required number of parking spaces.

C. When affordable housing is constructed pursuant to Chapter 18A.90 LMC, Housing Incentives Program, the parking space requirements shall be calculated employing any available modifications based upon LMC 18A.90.060.

D. *Shared Use Parking.* Joint use of required parking spaces may be permitted where two (2) or more uses on the same site or separate sites in close proximity to one another are able to share the same parking spaces because their parking usage does not materially overlap (e.g., uses primarily of a daytime versus nighttime, or weekday versus weekend nature). Shared parking shall be legally encumbered and shall meet all of the applicable standards of this section pursuant to subsection (E) of this section, Off-Site Parking.

E. *Off-Site Parking.* Joint use of required parking spaces may be authorized by the Director if the following documentation is submitted in writing to the Community and Economic Development Department:

1. The names and addresses of the owners and/or tenants that are sharing the parking.

2. The uses that are involved in the shared parking.

3. The location and number of parking spaces that are being shared.

4. An analysis showing that the peak parking times of the uses occur at different times and/or that the parking area will be large enough for the anticipated demands of both uses.

5. A legal instrument such as an easement or deed restriction that guarantees continuing access to the parking for both uses which shall be subject to review and approval by the Director.

F. *On-Street Parking Credit.* Where adjacent roads are designed for on-street parking and approved by the Public Works Director, parking credit may be given for on-street parking.

G. *Electric Vehicle Charging Parking Provisions.* For every electric vehicle charging station provided, the required number of parking spaces may be reduced by an equivalent number, provided the total reduction does not exceed five (5) percent of the total required parking spaces. For example, if forty (40) parking spaces are required and two (2) electric vehicle charging stations

are provided, the total required parking may be reduced to thirty-eight (38) spaces, yielding thirty-six (36) “regular” parking spaces and two (2) electric vehicle charging parking spaces. Note that in this example the total reduction may not be in excess of two (2) spaces (40 × 5% = 2), so if three (3) electric vehicle charging stations were provided instead, the total reduction in required parking would still be two (2) spaces, yielding thirty-five (35) “regular” parking spaces and three (3) electric vehicle charging parking spaces.

H. *Credit for Tree Preservation*. For every significant tree and/or heritage tree preserved within the property, the required number of parking spaces may be reduced by 0.5 spaces, provided the total reduction does not exceed five (5) percent of the total required parking spaces, when combined with all parking incentive credits.

~~H~~I. *Phased Reduction of Maximum Parking Standards.* One technique for transportation demand management (TDM) is to reduce maximum allowable parking spaces. This reduction in parking can be accomplished by slowly phasing down the maximum allowable number of parking spaces over a period of years. This procedure has advantages of reducing vehicle trips and conserving urban commercial land that can be used for other purposes. However, TDM has the potential to have a significant adverse impact on the jurisdiction’s economic development if other reasonable forms of alternative transportation are not available. This technique should be periodically revisited to consider its viability but should not be implemented until its feasibility for Lakewood is established.

18B.200.230 District-Wide Development Standards.

Unless otherwise specifically modified by an adopted development agreement or master plan, in addition to the regulations and requirements contained in other sections of this title, the following property development standards apply to all land and buildings in the Downtown District:

A. *Density.*

1. Maximum density is 100 units per acre, except where other conditions are met in subsections (A)(2) through (A)(4) of this section. To qualify for 100 units per acre density, the residential uses shall be part of a mixed-use development, or added to a commercial site, or provide a first-floor height of 16 feet for at least a 30-foot depth that allows for future commercial occupancies.

2. On sites allowed a density of 100 units per acre under subsection (A)(1) of this section, density may be increased up to 125 units per acre for affordable housing according to the provisions of LMC 18A.90.050, Inclusionary density bonuses, only if the affordable housing is part of a mixed-use development.

3. Density shall not exceed 80 units per acre for residential-only developments that are not added to or associated with existing commercial sites, or that do not provide a first-floor height that allows for future commercial occupancies.

4. No density limit may be allowed in the Town Center Incentives Overlay if a master plan is approved per LMC 18B.700.720; provided, that the total number of dwellings is consistent with the planned action ordinance (Ordinance No. 696) and allowable height and bulk per this title's design parameters.

5. *Density Bonus for Tree Preservation.*

a. For multi-family uses, maximum density may increase by 1 unit for each significant tree preserved on a property that is located in the Downtown District (not to exceed of more than 20% of the total allowable units)

b. Bonus density, where applicable, shall be computed by adding the bonus units authorized by LMC 18A.90.050 to the base units computed under this section.

c. For multi-family use types, maximum density may increase by 1 unit for each significant tree preserved on a property that is located in a census tract with a tree equity score of under the City's average score of 69 (not to exceed of more than 20% of the total allowable units)

18B.600.610 Parking.

B. *Parking Reductions or Increases.* The amount of required parking may be reduced or eliminated, or increased above the maximum, based on a site-specific parking study that demonstrates one or more of the following:

1. *Reduction Due to Shared Parking at Mixed-Use Sites and Buildings.* A shared use parking analysis for mixed-use buildings and sites that demonstrates that the anticipated peak parking demand will be less than the sum of the off-street parking requirements for specific land uses.

2. *Reduction Due to Public Parking Availability.* The availability of public parking to accommodate the parking demand generated by the site or building. The City may approve a reduction in the amount of required parking by up to 50 percent for any parking stalls that will be open and available to the public. On-street parking may be considered for the reduction; any new on-street parking provided will be counted toward the required parking availability.

3. *Reduction Due to Lower Parking Demand or Increase Based on Greater Parking Demand.* Demonstrating that anticipated parking demand will be less than the minimum parking required, or greater than the maximum allowed, based on collecting local parking data for similar land uses on a typical day for a minimum of eight hours.

4. *Credit for Tree Preservation*. For every significant tree and/or heritage tree preserved within the property, the required number of parking spaces may be reduced by 0.5 spaces, provided the total reduction does not exceed five (5) percent of the total required parking spaces, when combined with all parking incentive credits.

18B.700.720 Master Planned Development – Town Center Incentive Overlay.

G. *Required Findings.* A master planned development shall only be granted after the Hearing Examiner has reviewed the proposed use and has made written findings that all of the standards and criteria set forth below have been met or can be met subject to conditions of approval:

1. The master planned development is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and

2. The master planned development is consistent with the vision and objectives of the downtown plan in LMC 18B.100.110; and

3. The master planned development, by the use of permitted flexibility and variation in design, is a development practice that results in better urban design features than found in traditional development. Net benefit to the City may be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

   a. Placement, type or reduced bulk of structures; or

   b. Interconnected usable open space; or

   c. Recreation facilities; or

   d. Other public facilities; or

   e. Preservation of significant and/or heritage trees; or

   ~~e~~f. Conservation of natural features; or

   ~~f~~g. Conservation of critical areas and critical area buffers beyond; or

   ~~g~~h. Aesthetic features and harmonious design; or

   ~~h~~i. Energy efficient site design or building features; or

   ~~i~~j. Use of low impact development techniques; and

18C.200.230 District-wide development standards.

Unless otherwise specifically modified by an adopted development agreement or master plan, in addition to the regulations and requirements contained in other sections of this title and LMC Title 15, the following property development standards apply to all land and buildings in the Station District:

A. *Density.* Maximum density is based on the standards in the base zoning districts.

1. *Density Bonus for Tree Preservation.*

   a. For multi-family uses, maximum density may increase by 1 unit for each significant tree preserved on a property that is located in the Station District (not to exceed of more than 20% of the total allowable units)

   b. Bonus density, where applicable, shall be computed by adding the bonus units authorized by LMC 18A.90.050 to the base units computed under this section.

   c. For multi-family use types, maximum density may increase by 1 unit for each significant tree preserved on a property that is located in a census tract with a tree equity score of under the City's average score of 69 (not to exceed of more than 20% of the total allowable units)

18C.600.610 Parking.

B. *Parking Reductions or Increases.* The amount of required parking may be reduced or eliminated, or increased above the maximum, based on a site-specific parking study that demonstrates one (1) or more of the following:

1. *Reduction Due to Shared Parking at Mixed-Use Sites and Buildings.* A shared use parking analysis for mixed-use buildings and sites that demonstrates that the anticipated peak parking demand will be less than the sum of the off-street parking requirements for specific land uses.

2. *Reduction Due to Public Parking Availability.* The availability of public parking to accommodate the parking demand generated by the site or building. The City may approve a reduction in the amount of required parking by up to fifty (50) percent for any parking stalls that will be open and available to the public. On-street parking may be considered for the reduction; any new on-street parking provided will be counted toward the required parking availability.

3. *Reduction Due to Lower Parking Demand or Increase Based on Greater Parking Demand.* Demonstrating that anticipated parking demand will be less than the minimum parking required, or greater than the maximum allowed, shall be based on collecting local parking data for similar land uses on a typical day for a minimum of eight (8) hours.

4. *Reduction for Housing in Proximity to Sounder Station (RCW 36.70A.620).* When located within one-quarter (0.25) mile of the Sounder Station, an applicant may apply for an exception allowing minimum parking requirements to be reduced at least to one (1) parking space per bedroom or three-quarters (0.75) space per unit, as justified through a parking study prepared to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or their designee:

   a. Housing units that are affordable to very low-income or extremely low-income individuals;

   b. Housing units that are specifically for seniors or people with disabilities;

   c. Market rate multifamily housing.

5. *Credit for Tree Preservation*. For every significant tree and/or heritage tree preserved within the property, the required number of parking spaces may be reduced by 0.5 spaces, provided the total reduction does not exceed five (5) percent of the total required parking spaces, when combined with all parking incentive credits.

In determining whether to grant a parking reduction, the Community Development Director may also consider if the project is proposed in an area with a lack of access to street parking capacity, physical space impediments, or other reasons supported by evidence that would make on-street parking infeasible for the unit.

Return to Agenda

From: jennifer adams
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 7:51:58 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be st rictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Without trees, our planet has no future.

Thank you.

jennifer adams
jennifer.renee.adams@gmail.com
10423 Brook Ln SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Addo Aequitas
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 12:51:12 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly p rotected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Addo Aequitas
addoaequitas@protonmail.com
10506 Russell Rd SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Joan Anderson
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Tree retention
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 5:23:22 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Dear City of Lakewood,

With anything in life, balance is key. Since your current tree retention policy is in line with other local municipalities, including Tacoma, please do not change it.

I know you have a program to plant more trees so please expand that program to offset any loss of trees.

Thank you,

Joan

Return to Agenda

From: Julie Andrzejewski
To: Courtney Brunell; Briana Schumacher; Jason Whalen; Linda Farmer; Mike Brandstetter; Patti Belle; Mary Moss; Don Anderson; Paul Bocchi
Cc: Ellen Floyd
Subject: Public Comment on Tree policy from Indivisible Tacoma
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 1:37:35 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

September 5, 2022

Lakewood City Council and Mayor

Dear Lakewood City Council Members and Mayor:

I am writing because I have a Garry Oak tree in my yard. It is a stunningly beautiful tree with large overarching branches that host many species of wildlife and provide shade in my yard. Even though it was understood that it was a protected tree, when a building project was initiated in the adjacent space, little to no protection was provided. Many other large trees were removed as well with only plans to replant grass. We will not know the impact of the serious damage done to the roots of our tree for quite awhile yet. The importance of protecting trees on private and public land and across property boundaries is essential. Our tree is on our private property but its roots and branches extend beyond and are a crucial component of its life support. By giving so little regard to trees, one of the core foundations of the web of life, we are endangering ourselves.

There are unintended consequences to removing large trees. When some stands of large trees were removed from one neighborhood, the lower levels of nearby homes were flooded when there were heavy rains requiring extensive upgrades and repairs to the stormwater and drainage systems. When some trees no longer shaded their homes, some families were surprised at the increase in heat inside their homes or the cost of cooling during hot summer days.

Besides my own family, I am writing on behalf of Indivisible Tacoma and all the members we have in Lakewood and beyond. The mission of Indivisible Tacoma includes protection of our environment, trees, plants, and wildlife. We urge that:

- **The city council support the strongest possible amendments to the tree preservation code by supporting the ad hoc committee's recommendations and supporting maximum protection on both private and public land.**
- **All trees should be included – not just Garry Oaks. The economic value of tree cover has been well documented. Tree cover lowers the heat index of**

Return to Agenda

neighborhoods and cities, among many other documentable values.

- **Exemptions for industrial and residential cutting of trees should be extremely limited and protection extended to all trees.**
- **The Heritage/Historical Tree Program and Tree Fund should be established which provides tangible incentives for tree protection.**
- **Incentives for planting large canopy trees, especially native trees, should be supported.**
- **Fines for illegal tree removal should be substantial and equitable (including contractors as well as homeowners) or they will have little to no impact.**
- **Establish a 40% tree canopy goal by 2050 and provide the means to meet it.**

Every time I see a property up for development – whether industrial or residential, they take down every single tree, sometimes replanting small decorative trees that cannot possibly provide the resources of the forest that was removed; other times, just planting grass or trees that will not become mature for decades. These types of "mitigation" should not be condoned.

We urge the City Council to be leaders not stragglers. We need leaders who will take robust stands for the public good which includes strong urban tree protections.

Sincerely,

Dr. Julie Andrzejewski and Ellen Floyd, Co-Chairs
Indivisible Tacoma (including the greater Tacoma region)
507 469-2072

Return to Agenda

From: Steven Bakker
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 2:24:09 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly p rotected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Steven Bakker
bakker.steve.w@gmail.com
6917 Hillgrove Lane Southwest
Lakewood, Washington 98405

Return to Agenda

From: jennbar77@gmail.com
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 6:19:05 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks mu st be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

jennbar77@gmail.com
5627 S Puget Sound Ave
Tacoma, Washington 98409

Return to Agenda

From: Pam Beal
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 8:59:55 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Pam Beal
pambeal@gmail.com
204 Contra Costa Ave
Fircrest, Washington 98466

Return to Agenda

From: Philippa Blyth
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 5:27:59 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be st rictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Philippa Blyth
blythlimited@gmail.com
10015 , Oak Lane SW
Lakewood,, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Jeff Brown
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Lakewood Tree Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 11:21:10 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Dear Ms. Schumacher,
I am an architect and have lived and practiced in the city of Lakewood and the region for over 37 years.
I have also served on the Lakewood Planning Commission for 9 years, followed by serving on the Pierce County Planning Commission for 8 years.
After reviewing the proposed tree ordinance, I believe it promotes unnecessary new oversight over the citizens in our community and the trees on their private properties.
The ordinance we currently have in place is more than adequate to strike the right balance between promoting tree canopies and allowing our citizens reasonable latitudes.
The city should look actively towards including appropriate tree canopies in our right-of-way and public properties to set a standard.
University Place is a great example of this type of consciousness towards trees and the beauty they provide.

Jeff Brown, AIA NCARB
10903 Glenwood Dr SW
Lakewood, WA 98498

Return to Agenda

From: William Burgin
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Sunday, September 4, 2022 5:42:16 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Planning Commission:

My Family and I strong support the ad hoc tree committee's efforts and recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code.

We have lived in the Oakbrook section of Lakewood for more than 30 years. During that time we have observed the progressive loss of the lovely pine and oak trees that have made Oakbrook and Lakewood a very desirable place to live. We completely agree with the committee's recommendation that stronger regulation and enforcement is needed to protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

Further:

1). Concur that Contractors AND RESIDENTS must be held responsible for all violations of City Municipal Code pertaining to tree cutting. Tree mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees.

2). Concur that fines for Code violations must be established and not be reduced by the Court. Permits to cut down significant trees (pine or other) must not be issued as a matter of fact, and oaks must be strictly protected.

Thank you for this very important effort to ADOPT and ENFORCE sound policies and regulations that will help protect the scenic, environmental, and economic benefits of Lakewood trees. The Scenic America reference below may help in structuring the final amendment.

Very respectfully,
William and Nadine Burgin
8806 Zircon Dr SW
Lakewood, WA 98498

*Note: Scenic America (scenic.org) has created a model ordinance that may be helpful in designing a better plan for Lakewood and at scenic.org Please Take the time to read the model.

“Model Ordinance

KEY ELEMENTS

Since every community is different, every ordinance will be different as well. Communities and activists should treat this tree conservation model ordinance as a guide.

Furthermore, every community should seek the advice of its legal advisors to ensure that the ordinance is within the powers granted to communities under state law.

1. Purpose:

This section should reflect the community’s priorities in tree conservation. Does the community want to protect trees in order to protect its watershed, as Fairfax County, Virginia, did in stating that it adopted its ordinance “. . . to alleviate erosion, siltation, and other harmful effects of land-disturbing activities . . .”? [1] Or is it to protect historic trees? From a legal standpoint, it is most important that communities clearly state what they want the ordinance to accomplish. Scenic America strongly urges towns to prominently state the aesthetic benefits they hope to realize with their ordinance. If someone challenges the ordinance in court, the courts will look very closely at this section to determine whether or not subsequent sections serve this purpose.

2. Authority:

It is also useful to cite the state enabling legislation that allows communities to protect trees. In doing so, the community acknowledges that they have the authority to do so and that they have verified that their ordinance does not exceed that authority.

3. Definitions:

Depending on the scope of the ordinance, these can range from defining a “tree,” which every ordinance should do (for example, does it cover large, woody plants with a height that will exceed ten feet or does it cover understory vegetation?), to defining “a heritage tree” (i.e. trees with some combination of age, historical connotations, etc., that the community finds particularly valuable), to defining more technical terms such as “mitigation,” “dripline,” and “afforestation.” Outstanding sources of definitions include the aforementioned Tree Conservation Ordinances and U.S. Landscape Ordinances: An Annotated Reference Handbook, by Buck Abbey.

4. Inventory/Information Requirements:

There are two elements to this section. First, communities can and should, regardless of whether they are developing their first ordinance or refining an existing one, conduct their own inventories of trees, including assessing species, the health of trees, and information about where the trees are in relation to other resources, such as watersheds. Second, where the ordinance protects trees on private property, the ordinance should require developers to perform an on-site tree inventory. Outstanding examples of provisions doing this are found in the ordinances of Austin, Texas [2] and Prince Georges County, Maryland. [3]

5. Identification of Protected Trees:

This section clearly delineates the characteristics of trees the community wants to protect. Some communities use a simple size measure, protecting only trees, for example, with a diameter at breast height of 30 inches. Others, recognizing that an oak of that size is common while a dogwood that large would be extremely rare, set different size limits for different species. Still others use factors such as age, location and general condition. Some

communities also promote the protection of durable or aesthetically pleasing trees while offering less protection to trees unusually prone to breakage during wind or ice storms or trees that drop messy fruit (such as Bradford Pears).

6. Identification of Who Must Comply with the Ordinance:

This section identifies the activities that trigger the ordinance and who must and must not comply with it. Some communities do not require tree preservation measures if only small parcels are affected or if small numbers of trees are involved. Tampa, Florida, for example, exempts expansion of single and two family dwellings that do not increase the total floor area on a parcel by more than 15 percent or exceed a cost of $15,000. Gibbsboro, New Jersey, allows individual lot owners to remove fewer than two trees at any one time or six in any one year.

In addition to protecting trees from disturbance during the development process, many communities also protect trees from excessive or improper pruning. Chesapeake, Virginia [4] contains an extensive section on tree preservation and implementation in its ordinance. At the same time, San Juan Capistrano, California targets the practice of “topping,” in which tree owners reduce major branches to stubs. Specifically, no property owner in certain zones may have his trees “severely trimmed,” which the ordinance defines as “the cutting of the branches and/or trunk of a tree in a manner which will substantially reduce the overall size of the tree area so as to destroy the existing symmetrical appearance or natural shape of the tree in a manner which results in the removal of main lateral branches, leaving the trunk of the tree in a stub appearance.” [5]

7. Administration:

This section identifies the agency or individual responsible for ensuring compliance with the tree ordinance. Most communities assign the job to one of four types of agencies: planning and zoning; parks and recreation; public works; or environmental resources. Many communities also have shade tree commissions that, in addition to reviewing and updating the ordinance and related guidelines, may also review applications for permits.

At some point or at some level of discussion, communities will need a professional arborist or forester to assess compliance and provide technical expertise. While only the larger and wealthier cities tend to have such a professional on staff, most communities can retain one in their area.

8. Standards:

Somewhere, either in the ordinance or in related regulations, the community should make some reference to the standards to which they intend to hold developers and property owners. Communities may either adopt comprehensive standards on their own or refer to accepted professional standards. For example, Alachua County, Florida, requires compliance with the National Arborist Association Standards for Pruning of Shade Trees when trimming trees on public or private property except in cases of emergency. [6]

9. Enforcement:

Ultimately, after all the decisions of what to protect and how to protect it have been made, to be of any value the ordinance must contain some provisions for penalizing violators. Small fines might just be seen as a cost of doing business. However, such measures as linking fines and penalties to the actual value of trees destroyed, considering each tree damaged or

removed a separate violation, and invoking penalties for each day the violations persist can have a significant impact on the attitudes of potential violators. [7]

With careful planning, with an ordinance containing all of the above ordinances, and most important of all, with vigorous enforcement and implementation, every community can protect its trees and enjoy the environmental, economic, and aesthetic benefits of tree conservation.

REFERENCES

The most comprehensive review of individual landscaping ordinances is U.S. Landscape Ordinances: An Annotated Reference Handbook, by Buck Abbey. This book can be ordered directly from the publisher, John Wiley & Sons, www.wiley.com.

Several organizations also concern themselves with community tree preservation and landscaping. National organizations include the American Society of Landscape Architects, the National Arbor Day Foundation, the National Tree Trust, and the Society of Municipal Arborists.

_____

1 Fairfax County, Virginia, Erosion and Sedimentation Control and Conservation Ordinance, Pt. 3, Ch. 104-1-1.

2 Austin, Texas, City Code, Chapter 13-2A (Zoning) Section 5187.

3 Prince George's County, Series No 9058201522, A Manual for Tree Preservation in Development Areas, c. 1982.

4 Chesapeake, Virginia, Land Use Code, Section 22.20-520.

5 San Juan Capistrano, California, City Code, Section 9-3.625.

6 Alachua County, Florida, Ordinance, 91-14, Section 4 (1991).

7 Duerksen, Christopher J. and Richman, Suzanne, Tree Conservation Ordinances, American Planning Association and Scenic America, Washington, DC 1993. "

Respectfully,
William Burgin

William Burgin
weburgin@msn.com
8806 Zircon Dr S W
Lakewood, Washington 98498

Return to Agenda

From: Cynthia Carmichael
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 8:10:40 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be st rictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Cynthia Carmichael
cynthia5k@hotmail.com
2 alderwood ct sw
Lakewood , Washington 98498

Return to Agenda

From: Bunchy Carter
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 1:45:35 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be st rictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Let me add that we have actively watched the City Council dismiss the desires of the people in favor of boosting the bottom line. Until you truly take the concerns of the people who give your paper thin authority relevance, you are destined to fail the people, the city, and yourselves perpetually.

Thank you.
Bunchy Carter
Minister of Defense
The Black Panther Party

Bunchy Carter
bunchycartermod@protonmail.com
6000 Main St SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Katy
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Lakewood Trees
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 5:45:47 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites.
When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Hello,

I am a resident of Lakewood and active in environmental preservation. I recently reviewed the current Tree Preservation Code and was impressed with the policy as it stands. The current policy allows for necessary community development while maintains and protects natural resources such as trees. Under the current policy, there is no risk at depleting our natural resources and the beautiful trees that Lakewood is known for. It's my understanding that parties are speaking out to create a change in the current policy. These speakers are not well informed, nor invested in the community of Lakewood nor in the environmental health of this community, but rather campaigning under the guise of being pro-environmental. These voices deserve to be heard but only with the understanding that they are not looking at the greater good of this community or speaking from research, reason or a place other than their narrow "environmentalist" single-sightedness. Please keep the current policy, it's what is best for the community of Lakewood.

Best,

Kathryn Castleberry
(808) 333-0204

Return to Agenda

From: winning_reforms.0a@icloud.com
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Concerning Garry Oaks
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:36:29 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

September 6, 2022

Dear Lakewood City Council,

My name is Edward Chaffee and I am a lifelong resident of the city of Lakewood I would like to speak to you about Garry Oaks, and the reason they should be protected.

There is mystery around the wonder of this special tree. On earth there is a minute area where the Garry oak is indigenous. The Garry or Oregon white oak is native to the Pacific Coast of North America, indeed, a tiny area of the world. This is the only area where this oak exists in nature.

Garry oak ecosystems provide an incredibly rich habitat for wildlife. When it comes to the habitat value, Garry oaks are a species of merit. The acorns they produce provide food for wildlife, such as Western grey squirrels, turkeys, voles, various birds and deer.

Intact Garry Oak ecosystems with Garry oak trees and native plants have become rare, and, in some locations, are critically imperiled and at risk of extinction. These special trees and their eco-systems are worth planting and preserving for future generations. If not protected, this tree could become an endangered species. We would really like to help in preservation. The City of Lakewood should be committed to protecting the Garry oak within its city limits.

Thank you,

Ed Chaffee

Landscape Architect & Lakewood Resident

Return to Agenda

Gloria Chaffee

Lakewood Resident

Return to Agenda

From: Jodi Cook
To: Linda Farmer; Jason Whalen; Don Anderson; Mary Moss; Patti Belle; Mike Brandstetter; David Bugher; John Caulfield; Briana Schumacher; Courtney Brunell
Subject: Letter of support to save Lakewood mature trees
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 5:13:53 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites.
When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

To Whom it May Concern,

Please strongly consider supporting the recommendations provided to help Lakewood be a city that recognizes special protections are in place to retain the existing mature tree canopy.

Trees that are 30+ years old do the heavy lifting in cleaning our air from carbon dioxides and keeping our environment
cool as the effects of climate change are being felt regularly felt year over year. There is also the consideration for keeping our wild life healthy and all the insects who are needed to pollinate for us to survive.

Our children's future depends on sound, scientific decision making by those trained and educated in environmental sciences.

Not by those who profit from removing trees.

Make sure your decisions give the best return on investment for all species survival.

Sincerely,
Jodi Cook

Return to Agenda

From: Yanah G Cook
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:58:49 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

Most police municipalities have a motto - “To protect and Serve”. What or whom do you actually serve? For the sake of future you need to stand up and just say “No” to the promise of the almighty Warehouse-glittery dollar. I stand with the folk fighting a “city hall” that appears to lack a conscience. Instead, it has repeatedly stood up for the adage - ‘Short Term Gain - Long Term Pain’. And you all are proving to be no friend of this generation nor future generations.
I stand and join with several hundred folk to plead with you to please stop selling out to warehouse moguls and think clearly about the increased road traffic impacts, the adverse effects to mature and well-established neighborhoods. Careful research reveals that allowing the tree canopy casual destruction will also impede environmental justice and environmental health of financially stressed neighborhoods.
In addition, Garry Oak mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly protected.
This is my motivation for writing in strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. It's a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.
The Garry oaks represent a precious resource which take hundreds of years to mature! Two - three times as long as a human's average lifetime! If you condone paving over our health and heritage by Kowtowing (rubber stamping) to the *almighty* developers instead of safeguarding your constituents then you need to consider resigning!
Warehouses do next to nothing positive for our residents. They do promise bells and whistles and deliver kazoos! It’s called the bait and switch.
These majestic trees provide water management (natural flood protection), protect our aquifer and provide oxygen, and cooling in the increasing heat - which is so important as our climate temps are rising much faster than models have predicted.
These paved over cement parking lots & metal buildings are unsustainable. They will not protect our future but instead will do irreparable damage. Don’t continue to destroy established neighborhoods in the false name of “progress”.

Return to Agenda

We will remember how you Vote —for your residents— or for Big Money. We are paying attention and will remember those donating to your election and why you voted against your own constituent's health and welfare.

Thank you.

Yanah G Cook
opensayme00@gmail.com
33414 74th S Avenue PO 746
Roy, Washington 98580

Return to Agenda

From: Courtney Brunell
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: FW: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:34:32 AM

From: Byron Cregeur [info@sg.actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Monday, September 5, 2022 2:17 PM
To: Courtney Brunell
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Courtney Brunell,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fwww.lakewood.org%2ffiles%2fassets%2fpublic%2fcommunity-resources%2fparks%2fforestry%2ftree-contractor-application-packet.pdf&c=E,1,pAiH3YHWJmdnkfR4wUP3ym_Z1T9mf_734kmryoNYlCesyEAASwT5DMFsy0K19iTclkyjfltLS_EYEEEQf4p0Kw-blvlba-i4PQXongNK2yTLueU2&typo=1&ancr_add=1>). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Return to Agenda

Byron Cregeur
bcregeur@gmail.com
9506 Waverly Dr SW
Lakewood, Washington WA

Return to Agenda

From: Kimberly Cregeur
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public Comments for City Council Public Hearing on Tree Preservation Code Update
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 2:31:00 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Thank you for the opportunity to provide written comments. I regret that I am unable to attend the September 6 Council meeting in person. My absence does not diminish how important I feel tree preservation is in Lakewood.

I would like to thank the Council and City staff for being responsive to citizen concerns about the loss of our wooded spaces and heritage trees, particularly the Garry oaks. We are at a pivotal moment and I commend the Council's willingness to see beyond the false dichotomy between "preservation" and "progress" and take action that will directly contribute to the livability of Lakewood.

I would also like to commend the City for hiring BERK to assist the ad hoc committee in developing recommendations. As a member of the management consulting community that serves the public sector, I can attest that BERK work products are superior. Their staff are highly-skilled, strategic, analytical, and understand the importance of providing actionable recommendations that balance and are responsive to competing interests. For 30 years, they have earned a reputation for improving the communities in which they work and live.

I am not privy to the analysis behind the changes of the Planning Commission to the recommendations made by the ad hoc tree committee led by BERK. Although I am very grateful for the focus on Garry oak and individual heritage tree protection, I am unsure of the rationale behind other changes that dilute the recommendations and our ability to protect these rapidly dwindling natural resources. For example:

- Key Issue #1: Changing the goal of increasing the tree canopy to just 30% in 30 years when the committee's recommendation was 40%.
- Key Issue #4: Keeping the exemption (except for Garry oaks) for easements and rights of way and omitting recommendations for redefining trimming and pruning and ensuring appropriate arborist certifications.
- Key Issue #9: Omitting the recommendation on replacement of significant trees and instead opting for actions that essentially have no mitigating effect once significant trees are cut down.

I would encourage the Council to take this singular opportunity to adopt code changes that provide the strongest deterrents to the loss of our trees. Bold efforts now will reap the biggest rewards, both immediately and in the future. Thank you again for your attention and careful deliberation at this critical juncture.

Kimberly Cregeur, MPP
9506 Waverly Drive SW
Lakewood, WA 98499
kcregeur@gmail.com

Return to Agenda

From: M. Wibom
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public Comment, City Council Meeting, September 6 2022; Garry Oaks, Casey Crook
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 9:00:00 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Public Comment, City Council Meeting, September 6 2022; Garry Oaks, Casey Crook

Hello, my name is Casey. I was born and raised here in Lakewood. I am here to be a voice for our Garry Oaks, and for all the trees of Lakewood Washington--our home. I am here to respectfully urge our civic leaders to utilize their voices to speak for the **treelife** of our home, as well.

I am asking our city council leaders to use the powers of their positions to save the lives of as many Garry Oaks as is TRULY POSSIBLE. I am asking our leaders to join us in creating true and substantial plans of action which will protect and preserve the ecological health, history, and identity of Lakewood Washington--our home.

Please support the practice of positive community involvement. Please respect and take seriously the right of caring citizens to participate in the fate and future of the land they call home; the land they love. Please enable the good people of our community to TRULY DO OUR BEST and to TRULY GIVE OUR MOST in protecting Lakewood **treelife** on both public and private lands.

Our community volunteers are asking city council leaders to enable Lakewood's current 26% treetop canopy cover to flourish into 40%. Lakewood Planning Commission is asking that Lakewood's current canopy cover be nurtured **no more than an additional 4%,** at 30%. The planning commission's offer of 4% preservation is **not** a TRUE and SUBSTANTIAL plan of action; it is far from it. The future of Lakewood's natural environment **deserves** better and more. We, long-term and deeply invested citizens of Lakewood, **deserve** better and more.

A **true and substantial plan of action** must provide real and durable protections for Lakewood's **treelife**.

A **true and substantial plan of action** must not accept mitigation fees in exchange for destruction of the very natural lands and habitats we seek to serve and protect in the first place.

A **true and substantial plan of action** would certainly require contractors to be licensed in the city of Lakewood and would follow-through in TRULY holding contractors accountable when rules are disregarded and infractions occur.

We are all aware of the harsh reality that in this world of Man's making: *Money Talks*. We who value and honor the natural world and its wondrous gifts **must** be a collective voice of higher intention--and **we must talk louder**.

I would like to acknowledge the tremendous efforts of Christina Manetti and all of our friends and neighbors who work so hard on behalf of Lakewood's **treelife,** and for the precious natural environment we all enjoy and share. I would like to thank Lakewood City Council for hearing me speak.

Return to Agenda

From: Esther Day
To: Courtney Brunell; Briana Schumacher; Jason Whalen; Linda Farmer; Mike Brandstetter; Patti Belle; Mary Moss; Don Anderson; John Caulfield; David Bugher
Subject: Support of the Ad Hoc Tree Committee"s Recommendations - but we need more protections
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 10:19:45 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Dear Planning Manager, City Clerk, and Members of the Lakewood City Council and Planning Department Head and Deputy City Manager, City Manager,

I am writing in support of the Ad Hoc Tree Committee's recommendations for protecting trees. However, it needs to go further – Lakewood needs to protect all trees – whether on city property or private property. It is important to know that with Climate Change on our doorstep, all trees are needed to keep temperatures down. Reports have shown that a community with trees will maintain a cooler temperature for property owners than a property or community with no trees.

I also write to support the protection of the Garry Oaks that are in potential danger of being cut down. You, as the City Council were elected by the people to take care of their city – not to reward developers by destroying our tree canopy. Keep in mind that you are in a position of authority – but it was given to you by the voters. That carries a lot of responsibility to do what the community wants and needs to provide them – the tax payer with the comforts they paid dearly to own a home in Lakewood. Do not destroy these trees.

As the wife of a disabled Vietnam War Veteran who suffers with Agent Orange issues. I can tell you that every tree on our property is precious for providing him with the shade and coolness he needs to live comfortably in our home. My husband has not been able to go out and swim, play tennis, or golf since he came home from Nam in 1968. Think of it! You have a large number of veterans who have elected to live in Lakewood. Most of them probably have no idea of what you are planning to do unless you have made specific outreach to EVERY SINGLE HOMEOWNER in the community to let them participate. Many of us are learning just now of this.

Developers are destroying our communities. Building apartments and removing trees that families that might live in those units or homes will not have the green space for children to play and enjoy watching birds playing, squirrels chasing each other and so much more that comes from having trees on your property. My trees provide shade for my husband to be able to sit in his TV room with the cool air coming in. However, there have been days when even the sheers, miniblinds, and exterior shade and tree by his window are not sufficient to keep him from blistering.

You have no idea what trees mean to many of our families and our men who have served our country and suffer from things they were exposed to when they served. It means a peaceful enjoyment of their homes – what they served in the Military and fought for.

Developers need to build around trees. Excuses are always made of why they need to cut trees.

Return to Agenda

Don't let them cut trees down – regardless of where they are. Build around them.

Climatologists and reporters are finding that the temperature in communities with trees is cooler compared to communities with no trees. Go on the internet and do your research. IT IS A FACT.

Remember, today it is someone's trees – tomorrow IT WILL BE YOURS and you will not have a voice to speak of – WHY, because you did not take the necessary steps to protect what we had.

Trees are endangered. You just have to see how many forest fires are happening in Washington State and other states. Be the leaders that the citizenry voted for you to be – LEADERS not special interest followers.

Thank you for reading my recommendation and my plea.

Sincerely,

Esther Day

Return to Agenda

From: Esther Day
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Sunday, September 4, 2022 7:27:12 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

Return to Agenda

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Esther Day
dayesther214@outlook.com
214 S. 54th Street
Tacoma, Washington 98408

Return to Agenda

From: Vivian deZwager
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:05:57 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

Return to Agenda

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks mu st be strictly protected.
The health, well-being and quality of life of your citizens are greatly improved with trees. They cool our neighborhoods, filter the air from pollutants, control storm water, just to name a few of their many benefits. This is greater with larger, significant trees. Please protect them for your community.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Vivian deZwager
bloomnviv@hotmail.com
3831 S Alaska St
Tacoma, Washington 98418

Return to Agenda

From: todd dickens
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Sunday, September 4, 2022 9:15:17 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Lakewood City Council members:

As a fellow member of the Puget Sound ecosystem I am very glad to hear of the important opportunity that the Lakewood City Council has to show strong leadership and foresight by taking positive action to amend and update the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code in a way that will help to preserve and protect the existing and future trees of Lakewood for the benefit of our generation and the generations to follow. The positive action to be taken is to vote to amend the tree preservation code to incorporate the full and complete recommendations made by the ad hoc committee.

During these precarious times of rapid climate change it is important that we take proactive measures that will not only preserve the existing mature tree canopy, but will help expand it so that the multiple benefits that a tree canopy provides will become even greater for the citizens of Lakewood in the future.

In addition to accepting and adopting the ad hoc committee's recommendations, there are other important measures that both compliment and support the ad hoc committee recommendations that also need to be adopted and incorporated into the tree preservation code to help ensure the continued healthy growth of Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

These other measures include:
a) respecting the important critical areas so that Garry oaks are not destroyed in exchange for mitigation fees. It is the Garry oaks and other trees that are providing the positive mitigating climate impact in support of a healthy ecosystem.

b) expanding the definition of what constitutes a "significant tree" so that younger trees are protected and given the chance to become the significant trees of the future that will be needed to maintain and preserve the City of Lakewood tree canopy.

c) properly licensing tree cutters and ensuring contractors are responsible for any violations of the City of Lakewood requirements.

d) ensuring that any requested permit to cut down a designated significant tree is thoroughly reviewed to ensure that Garry oaks and other trees are fully protected.

Return to Agenda

In addition to the above measures, it is also important that the City of Lakewood conduct a thorough inventory of trees on both public and private lands so that data is available to help ensure that the goals that are established for a larger and healthy tree canopy for the City of Lakewood can be monitored and achieved.

Thank you for taking the positive steps necessary to amend the tree preservation code to adopt the ad hoc committee's recommendations and the other important measures mentioned above which are essential for supporting a healthy tree canopy for the City of Lakewood.

Thank you.
Todd Dickens

todd dickens
dickenst100@gmail.com
6215 Phinney Ave North, Apt 202
seattle, Washington 98103

Return to Agenda

From: Ross Drangsholt
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Tree Preservation code
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:21:10 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Hello,
I would like to voice my opinion **Against** the new tree preservation code changes. The current tree umbrella has increased in the current study with the existing code. The current code is in step with the adjacent municipalities and is a good middle road between property rights and preservation of trees. More restrictive codes will limit the ability of the city to allow single family home growth goals the city needs to meet for the Puget Sound regional growth plan. It also will result in more housing being build away from transit centers and will decrease the value of landowners in Lakewood. We all like or Garry Oaks, but the new changes will increase cost and decrease values with no measurable climate goals.
Ross Drangsholt resident and property owner

Return to Agenda

From: Karen Drum
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 6:54:23 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future.

Tree canopies are very important for cooling of our environment. Where would you like to be on a on our very warm days--within the canopy of trees or walking on cement or asphalt?

The City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for

Return to Agenda

example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly p rotected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Karen Drum
Karendrum@hotmail.com
9007A Dolly Madison St SW
Lakewood, Washington 98498

Return to Agenda

From: James Dunlop
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment regarding tree amendments
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 4:10:35 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Dear council members,

At the Ad Hoc Tree Committee there was much discussion about permits for cutting down trees, and possible fines for cutting a tree down without a permit. This raises a further question whether the fines would be adequate, bearing in mind that high fines can be appealed.

There should also be focus on tree contractors – the companies that homeowners and developers hire to cut down trees. It would make sense for all tree contractors to be registered with the City and that there be a system of licensing. This would mean that no company could commercially cut down or trim a tree, unless it has been licensed by the City.

The licensing procedure would cover professional qualifications, and knowledge of Lakewood's tree code, as well as having the required insurance.

The licensed contractor would have an obligation to check that any work they did was permitted. While I understand that contractors can already be fined for unauthorized tree cutting, it might be a good idea, if a contractor illegally cuts down a tree, for all or most of the onus to be one them. I suspect it would be easier to give a large fine to a contractor rather than a homeowner, in terms of the fine being upheld by a court.

For example, it would be more likely that a court would uphold a $50,000 fine on a tree contractor than on a private property owner. And these fines would help deter illegal tree-cutting and logging.

Further, I think responsible tree contractors working in Lakewood might welcome registration, because it would be a boost to their reputation.

An example of a permitting system is provided by Lakewood, Colorado:

https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf

I am not sure on its details, but it shows that the City of Lakewood, CO, takes the matter seriously. Maybe the City could reach out to its Colorado namesake, and ask how the licensing system is working in practice.

Yours sincerely,

James Dunlop

Return to Agenda

From: Tichomír Dunlop
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public Comment for tree amendments
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 5:59:29 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Hello,

I have a comment to make regarding the public hearing regarding the tree amendments, and specifically about PlanIT Geo's statements that some of the amendments were based upon.

I think you must be careful taking PlanIT Geo's statements at face value. They claim, for example, that between 2011 and 2019 Lakewood's urban canopy has grown by 0.5%.

Firstly, it is strange that they stop at 2019, when they say that they update their data every two years. This does not take into account the recent clearcutting along Nyanza and Washington Boulevard, and of course the destruction of the Woodbrook neighborhood, where some of the City's remaining oak savannah as well as other forested land has been turned into warehouses.

This just does not seem to reflect the reality that we who live in Lakewood see on the ground. We have counted more than 60 Garry oaks that have been cut down around town since 2012, for example, as well as numerous other trees. Moreover, almost all of the Western cedars in town are dead and dying now -- surely that must add up to quite a lot of canopy loss.

Secondly, the experience of Charlotte, North Carolina, indicates that PlanIT Geo's estimates may not be reliable. According to Trees Charlotte, in 2017 PlanIT Geo estimated that between 2012 and 2016 the extent of Charlotte's tree canopy had not changed. Yet a study by the University of Vermont's Spatial Analysis Lab found that between 2012 and 2018 the tree canopy fell from 49% to 45%.

Overall, I think the city should be wary of using PlanIT Geo's services, not least because they are a private company, with a commercial agenda.

I wonder if the City should consider consulting the University of Vermont.

Tichomír Dunlop

Return to Agenda

From: Courtney Brunell
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: FW: Public Comment in Support of Strong Tree Protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:35:33 AM

From: Carol Eckert [info@sg.actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:02 AM
To: Courtney Brunell
Subject: Public Comment in Support of Strong Tree Protections in Lakewood

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Courtney Brunell,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code.

This ensures the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists and urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission.

Our canopy already stands at 26%, and a goal of 30% would not make a significant difference. A goal of 40% would make a significant difference. It will take courage to support this but this will show your leadership in this area to future residents.

In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature trees in our canopy it already has. Not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing.

As a biologist, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's tree canopy. Cutting mature trees and replanting does not constitute an even exchange.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage.

Another issue that needs to be addressed is that tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood. This occurs in others communities for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fwww.lakewood.org%2ffiles%2fassets%2fpublic%2fcommunity-resources%2fparks%2fforestry%2ftree-contractor-application-packet.pdf&c=E,1,NB_iFnP18U8F8cCWPhbNfgnBjJnWqukxHZGc3Tg5dzdFRwH_8AW9UzlfHx4rqqbyOvO4Ytr5FWEo72hRYGY0pJsE3wsrEgwRVey2VQ9WsA,,&typo=1&ancr_add=1>).

Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. These are simple means to get our tree canopy healthy.

Fines must no longer be reduced by the courts. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued and Garry oaks must be strictly protected.

Last of all, a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands must occur. Lakewood has to know what it is protecting. While doing that inventory, residents can be educated on the value of our tree canopy.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations. I also recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments.

Thank you.

Carol Eckert
cpup6501@gmail.com
8914 41 St W
University Place, Washington 98466-1548

Return to Agenda

From: Christopher Escobedo
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 1:12:36 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Christopher Escobedo
escobedocme@gmail.com
8011 Leschi RD SW
Lakewood, Washington 98498

Return to Agenda

From: Nakanee Fernandez
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 2:29:44 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must b e strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Nakanee Fernandez
nakaneemonique@gmail.com
1506 N Defiance St. R-206
Tacoma , Washington 98406

Return to Agenda

From: Claudia Finseth
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 3:31:11 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To: The Lakewood City Council
From: Claudia Finseth
Date: 7 September 2022
Re: Garry Oak Tree Preservation

Dear Lakewood City Council,
The oldest living things, hands down, on the prairies of Lakewood, Parkland and Spanaway, which are now our neighborhoods, are the Garry Oaks, or Oregon White Oaks. The mature ones are are between 250 and 500 years old. They were saplings sometime between when Columbus discovered America and the Founding Fathers wrote the Declaration of Independence.
Nineteenth century white settlers named Parkland for the groves of Garry Oak that spread as far as the eye could see, with the blue camas flowers and pink nootka roses blooming under them in the spring. Nobody had planted them: this was nature at work.
A remnant of that great grove still remains. Look up.There's a lot to see: sky, cloud, mountain and tree. These are the elements of our skyscape. The gnarly, contorted branches of the slow-growing Garry Oak add a distinctive beauty to our lives. No other tree is as beautiful against a sunset of orange or mauve or purple.
The Garry Oak, the only native oak in western Washington, grows no where else in the world than the costal regions of British Columbia, Washington, Oregon and Northern California. Only about 7-10% of what once grew here survives. The majority have been cut down for land development. Some are junked because their shedding is seen as a nuisance to roofs and lawns. There is a great misunderstanding of their worth.
For instance, Garry Oak prairie is home for a number of wild creatures, including great horned owls, doves and wild pigeons, coopers hawk, kestrel, killdeer, woodpeckers, and dozens of varieties of song birds.
Garry Oak prairie is also home for a number of unique plants :prairie grass, pink Nootka rose, snowberry with its white winter berries, the blue camas flower and service berry. Yards planted with these natives are extra-easy to care for. They need very little water once established, are drought-tolerant, and look healthy because they are acclimated to even our glacial till.
Oak leaves are among the best of mulches. They not only keep grass and weeds from taking root, but when they decompose, they release important nutrients for other plants and eventually create excellent soil. The acorn of the oak is edible, as is the bulb of the Camas

flower.
Garry Oaks are iconic shade trees. They work to cool the earth, and they turn CO2 into fresh oxygen for all living creatures. But perhaps the most important thing Garry Oaks “do” is hidden from sight: they hold great amounts of water in their deep root systems, acting like cisterns during heavy rain times, and helping to minimize flooding.
In over a decade serving on both the Parkland-Midland-Spanaway Land Use Advisory Commission and the Pierce County Planning Commission, some of my most important goals was to preserve the Garry Oak trees that still exist--in all sizes--and see that a new generation of Garry Oak is planted far and wide. I have planted 11 on my own lot. Though our native oak prairie is greatly decimated, we can all help turn that around by protecting the oaks we have and planting new ones. I have planted acorns in my yard that are now, 30 years later, twenty-five feet tall.
Now I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. These are crucial steps towards insuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future.
In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy. In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.
There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly protected.
These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.
I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and reject the recommendations of the Planning Commission that weaken it. I urge the Lakewood City Council to do all it can to restore and protect our native Garry Oaks.
Thank you.
Sincerely, Claudia Finseth
13524 15th Ave S
Tacoma, Wa 98444
253-224-6063

Claudia Finseth
dragonflypond@gmail.com
13524 15th Ave S
Tacoma, Washington 98444

Return to Agenda

Return to Agenda

From: Joe Flansburg
To: Briana Schumacher
Cc: Jason Gano
Subject: Lakewood Tree Preservation
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 12:13:14 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image003.png

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

To the Honorable Mayor Whalen and Members of the Lakewood City Council,

My name is Joe Flansburg and I work for Rush Residential, Inc.

Preserving existing trees makes development more expensive and time-consuming, since developers must hire an arborist to do an evaluation. Once a developer has an evaluation, we then need to create a site plan around these existing trees. In some cases, this can lead to a radically compromised site layout. A developer then has two options: either go with a compromised design or clearcut the property under the Forest Practices Act and take a 6-year development moratorium. Many developers will take the latter option and clearcut the trees, which delays productive development without saving any trees in the long run. Thus, it makes no sense to carefully build around existing trees when the building is likely to dramatically outlast the tree. Additionally, significant trees tend to be among the trees most likely to fall on people or property.

In a time where we need to do everything, we can to make housing production more streamlined in this housing supply crisis, I recommend there should be no significant tree retention requirement. Instead, Lakewood should work towards its 40% canopy target by requiring new plantings. The Average building delay in Peirce County is 7 months. Cost wise that's $39,915 over 7.79 *months. That equals about $5,100 per month or $1,281 per week. Multiply that by the 6-year clear cut period and you have a $367,000 cost added on while a property sits empty. We need to do everything we can to reduce delays and costs to the construction process so that we can make homes more affordable for everyone.*

Joe Flansburg
Land Development Manager
e: jflansburg@therushcompanies.com
d: (253) 432-7087 / c: (253) 973-1919

Return to Agenda

RUSH RESIDENTIAL
(253) 858-3636
6622 Wollochet Dr. Gig Harbor, WA 98335
www.therushcompanies.com

BUILDING AN EXCEPTIONAL FUTURE, **TOGETHER.**

Statement of Confidentiality: The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for addressee. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction, or dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received the message in error and are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents.

Return to Agenda

From: Aja Fulani
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 1:22:39 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

I am going to preface this in anticipation of spam and fraud accusations. I, Aja Fulani of the Black Panther Party share my voice in solidarity with the community members and indigenous stewards of land who seek to be heard. As a result, I amplify the following without edit:

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

Return to Agenda

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be st rictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Aja Fulani
pnwpraxis@protonmail.com
3512 N 25th St
Tacoma, Washington 98406

Return to Agenda

From: Chris Fynboe
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Lakewood Tree Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 11:00:17 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana
I would like to express my concern about changing the tree ordinance in the City of Lakewood. I feel that the current tree ordinance is appropriate as written.
Sincerely
Chris Fynboe, resident and property owner in Lakewood

Return to Agenda

MASTER BUILDERS
ASSOCIATION OF PIERCE COUNTY

August 31, 2022

To the Honorable Mayor Whalen and Members of the Lakewood City Council,

My name is Jason Gano, and I am the Government Affairs Director for the Master Builders Association of Pierce County (MBAPC). The MBAPC represents over 850 businesses and their 10,000 employees. Our membership is committed to lowering the cost of housing throughout Pierce County and its cities. We love trees and understand their importance to a healthy city and ecosystem. We have no problem with requirements to plant new trees in conjunction with new development. However, retaining existing trees is unwise for several reasons.

Preserving existing trees makes development more expensive and time-consuming, since the developer must hire an arborist to do an evaluation. Once the developer has an evaluation, we then need to create a site plan around these existing trees. In some cases, this can lead to a radically compromised site layout. In these cases, the developer has two options: either go with a compromised design or clearcut the property under the Forest Practices Act and take a 6-year development moratorium. Many developers will take the latter option and clearcut the trees, which delays productive development without saving any trees in the long run.

Additionally, significant trees don't live very long in relationship to buildings, so it's short-sighted to compromise a building's design to preserve trees. The average lifespan of an urban tree is 19-28 years. In contrast, the average lifespan of a North American building has historically been 50-75 years. Modern buildings are built to a higher standard and will likely last much longer. Thus, it makes no sense to carefully build around existing trees when the building is likely to dramatically outlast the tree. Additionally, significant trees tend to be among the trees most likely to fall on people or property.

In a time where we need to do everything, we can to make housing production more streamlined, the MBAPC recommends there should be no significant tree retention requirement. Instead, Lakewood should work towards its 40% canopy target by requiring new plantings. Thank you for your time and please reach out if you have any questions I can answer.

Sincerely,
Jason D. Gano
Government Affairs Director

www.masterbuilderspierce.com

3711 CENTER STREET. TACOMA, WA 98408
T. (253) 272-2112 F. (253) 383-1047 info@masterbuilderspierce.com

Return to Agenda

From: Winfield Giddings
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of ad hoc tree committee"s recommendations strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 12:45:53 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of the tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors, or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be stric tly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Winfield Giddings
store_wg@yahoo.com
12211 C ST S
Tacoma, Washington 98444

Return to Agenda

From: Russ Gibson
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 11:01:56 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks mu st be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Please make the right decision for the health and well-being of current and future generations of residents by prioritizing the preservation these unique and ecologically valuable trees.

Thank you.

Russ Gibson
tr00per666999@yahoo.com
610 Golden Gate Ave
Fircrest, Washington 98466

Return to Agenda

From: Courtney Brunell
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: FW: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 12:16:21 PM

From: Phyllis Griggs [mailto:info@sg.actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:51 AM
To: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- *helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357*

Courtney Brunell,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

Return to Agenda

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

I am born and raised in Lakewood . I have lived here for 65 years . I am increasingly seeing our Garry Oaks cut down that we're once protected. I think it is vitally important to protect the Garry Oaks and other older trees as well. This city was called Lake WOOD FOR A REASON . WE are losing the wood part of our name . The tree canopy and the Lakes are what make Lakewood special and a great place to live . Please protect this for our future generations .
Thank you.
Phyllis W. Griggs

Phyllis Griggs
pawgriggs@gmail.com
6816 79th St West
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

James Guerrero
Architects, INC

September 6, 2022

City of Lakewood
6000 Main Street SW
Lakewood, WA 98499

RE: TREE PRESERVATION CODE

Dear Mayor Whalen and City Council Members,

This letter is written in regards to the proposed update to the Tree Preservation Code. I am a long time Lakewood resident and I have owned and operated James Guerrero Architects in Lakewood for 30 years.

I commend and thank both the Ad Hoc Committee and the Planning Commission for their significant analysis and serious consideration regarding our Tree Preservation Code. I am certain the City Council will also take a serious and thoughtful approach to how we handle our trees in Lakewood.

In reviewing the Ad Hoc Committee and the Planning Commission recommendations, I support the Planning Commissions general recommendations. These recommendations are a reasonable compromise between maintaining the lovely tree canopy and specifically the Gary Oaks that we enjoy here in Lakewood while allowing for appropriate development to occur in our municipality. Encouraging development in Lakewood (and all cities) is very important to promote development in areas where appropriate services are available while discouraging development in our rural and natural areas. The idea that we should preserve Lakewood in its current state and just push development into other areas is not good for the greater region and ultimately, not in keeping with the goal of taking significant steps to curb climate change. We need to keep our county, state and federal goals in mind as we look at these local issues.

There are two areas of the proposed code that I think are too restrictive and should be further refined. These are 18A.70.320, Item H, 2, which effectively limits development near a significant tree to 5′ outside of the dripline. The other item is 18A.70.330 Item C, which establishes a Clear Root Zone (CRZ) of 1′ radius for every 1″ of tree diameter.

Following are a couple examples of project in Lakewood that have significant Oak trees that have thrived while construction activities have taken place significantly closer that the proposed limits. These projects are my own office building located at 7520 Bridgeport Way W and the Lakewood Community located at 9112 Lakewood Drive SW. Both of these projects had buildings constructed quite close to large Oak trees and the trees are thriving. My office addition adjacent to the oak tree was built in 2007 and I

7520 Bridgeport Way W, Lakewood, WA 98499
Phone: 253-581-6000 Website: jgarch.net

believe the Lakewood Community Center was built in 1980. Note the proximity to curb cuts, building construction and retaining walls in the photos below.

I am not an arborist, but given these examples, it appears that our native oaks are quite resilient and can withstand careful construction nearby.

Sincerely,

James Guerrero

7520 Bridgeport Way W

9112 Lakewood Drive SW

Return to Agenda

From: Phil Harty
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Sunday, September 4, 2022 8:35:56 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

Return to Agenda

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must b e strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Phil Harty
philhartymusic@gmail.com
1 North Broadway apt., apt# 2, apt# 2, apt# 2
Tacoma, Washington 98403

Return to Agenda

From: Dagmar Ivanická
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:03:25 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.
Dagmar

Dagmar Ivanickï¿½
dagmar.ivanicka.di@gmail.com
1948 Palisade Blvd
DuPont , 98327

Return to Agenda

From: David Iverson
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Tree Preservation Code
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 4:42:28 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Hello,

I'm writing in response to the City's review and request for comments regarding the Tree Preservation Code. As a life long resident of Lakewood, I'd like to voice my support of the current policy. Currently it is a good compromise. It does a good job of balancing the need to protect green spaces while allowing some restricted development that is necessary for the future of the City and it's ling term plan.

Opinions in the form of templated communication from extremely vocal non residences shouldn't sway the decision makers and I urge the Council to maintain what is currently a well thought and initiated Tree Preservation Plan that is working! There has to be balance and common sense applied to community development and issues such as this.

Thank you,

Dave Iverson
--
(253)255-8557

Return to Agenda

From: Joan Jackson
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Concerning Lakewood"s Trees
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:04:05 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Dear Lakewood City Council,

I have been a resident of Lakewood for over 70 years. I have raised a family here, owned homes and tended gardens. I have swum in the lakes and sat under the trees.
Through the years, I have watched the area go through many changes, positive and negative. However, I choose to remain here.
But now, I am alarmed at what I see. Lakewood seems to be losing it's place as a city of trees and lakes. I have seen significant trees felled that are hundreds of years old, all for the sake of "progress". The city needs to remember that these trees are an invaluable resource for cleaning the air, protecting wildlife, and keeping the land cool. They cannot be replaced in my, or even 2 generations.
I know things cannot stay the same, and that progress is necessary. But can we really call it "progress" when we destroy the very thing that makes Lakewood so beautiful?
Please recognize and support the recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Tree committee. They are the representatives of Lakewood and speak for us. Please listen. Please do not let our tree canopy be further reduced, and please replant what has already been removed. If not for ourselves than for future generations.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Joan Jackson
Lakewood Resident

Return to Agenda

From: Melissa Jackson
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Tree Preservation Codes
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:20:47 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Dear Lakewood City Council,

My name is Melissa Jackson, and I am a life-time resident and home owner in our beautiful city. Recently, I had the honor of serving as “Chair" on the Ad Hoc Lakewood Tree Advisory Committee.

I have reviewed the prospective updates made by the Planning Commission to the Tree Committee’s recommendations. I have concerns I would like to voice.

Lakewood is at an important crossroads of change. The city is making improvements to roads and parks, working on a comprehensive downtown plan, and trying to create more affordable housing, among other things.
We have a unique opportunity to also address issues of climate change, tree cover inequity (and subsequent heat islands), and loss of habitat for native species.

Progress and preservation do not have to be mutually exclusive. We can move forward with projects that improve living situations and build business opportunities while protecting and maintaining Lakewood’s trees. This will take work, as it is not always “convenient” or “the path of least resistance” to maintain trees on property. However, with intelligent use of resources, creativity and forethought, Lakewood can become a leader in tree protection and preservation.

The city must keep the goal of 40% canopy by 2050. Any other number would not be forward progress. This can be achieved through education of the community, cooperation and awareness of both home and business owners, clear guidelines for prospective builders, and providing incentives and support for those with trees on their property. This is not an impossible goal. The formation of a dedicated environmental/tree committee would be a vital predictor of success.

Tree protections must include **all** significant, healthy trees, not just the Oregon white oak. Large, significant trees should be protected, regardless of the lot size where they stand. Significant trees, once removed, cannot be replaced for decades, even lifetimes. Land owners will need resources and education on how to maintain these trees, in order to increase their cooperation and understanding. The city could provide these resources through a permanent tree committee.

The Tree Advisory Committee worked hard on the current recommendations. We consulted members of the community, did considerable outside research and tried our best to represent our fellow citizens. Overall, I found that the people I spoke with were passionate about tree preservation. Many wondered if resources were available. Many did not fully understand the positive impact their trees had on climate change and the overall charm of Lakewood. Others were shocked and saddened to see how many trees were being cut down in recent years, and how many were irreparably damaged by utility companies. Some did not understand how to properly care for their trees and were interested in learning more. In a few sad interactions, community members told me they were considering moving, as Lakewood seems to be becoming an “asphalt jungle” or “warehouse district”. They were not optimistic that Lakewood would make the protections necessary to preserve our trees, natural habitats and waterways.

For all these reasons, and countless more, I ask the Council to keep the tree preservation codes that were recommended by the Ad Hoc committee intact. Our city can do hard things. We can also do what is right. With creativity, dedication and tenacity, we can find ways to maintain our significant trees, and work to replace the ones that have been removed. Future generations will look to the decisions we make today. Will they still be able to enjoy the old trees of Lakewood? Or will they only hear stories of how beautiful it “used to be? Please consider not only

Return to Agenda

us, but the future, as you consider the tree preservation codes.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Melissa Jackson
Lakewood Resident
Ad Hoc Tree Committee Chair

Return to Agenda

From: Brett Jacobsen
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Proposed Tree Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 11:41:27 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Dear Lakewood City Council and City Staff,

Just a few comments on the proposed tree code. I am all for preserving trees however would ask the council to consider the following:

1) The existing code is onerous and restrictive enough, if the desire is to protect the Garry Oaks beyond the current code then make the modification for those trees alone. A four inch tree should not be considered "significant" and people should not have to pull permits to remove one.
2) The increasing restrictions are incompatible with the Growth Management Policy and affordable housing as it minimizes the ability for dense urban development or is, in effect, a tax if you have to pay a tree removal penalty.
3) Home insurance is getting difficult and very expensive in wooded or treed locations, over fire concerns. In some places impossible. Insurance companies have begun requiring tree inspections for potential fire issues in wooded conditions.
4) It is arbitrary that lots over 17,000 must comply with the tree ordinance while smaller lots do not. The vast majority of lots within the City are less than 17,000 sq ft so wouldn't that be more beneficial to the overall for the reduction of "heat islands" referred to in the documents instead of solely regulating the larger lots. Excemptions for a house and ADU exist in the proposed code that could make this equitable regardless of the sizes of lots. If you are going to change the ordinance make it applicable to all lots, why should larger lot owners be subject to more regulations than their neighboors?
5) Tree surveys will be required to remove a tree, such surveys are expensive and time consuming.
6) The idea that permits will be issued "over the counter" will rarely happen over time.

To minimize the loss of real significant trees, the City would be better off creating a program to remove invasive ivy throughout the City (ivy kills many significant trees every year).

On a separate note, I would like to thank the Council for your continued support and bolstering of crime prevention programs around the city as it is imperative for the wellbeing and future of our community.

Thank you for your consideration,
Brett Jacobsen

Return to Agenda

From: Melissa Knott
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 2:02:47 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Melissa Knott
Martialyss@gmail.com
8213 S Sheridan Ave
Tacoma, Washington 98408

Return to Agenda

From: Courtney Brunell
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: FW: Comments on Tree Committee Recommendations
Date: Monday, August 29, 2022 8:43:34 AM

From: Robb Krehbiel [mailto:robb.krehbiel@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2022 8:00 AM
To: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>
Subject: Comments on Tree Committee Recommendations

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- *helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357*

Hello Courtney,

I'm a resident of South Tacoma, member of the Tacoma Planning Commission, and a professional stormwater program manager with Pierce Conservation District. I'm writing to express my strong support for Lakewood's Ad Hoc Tree Committee's recommendations and urge the City Council to pass the recommendations unamended.

The recommendations from the tree committee set strong and ambitious goals to increase our region's tree canopy, and set stronger protections to favor tree retention. These recommendations are important to ensure that trees are not forgotten or sacrificed as the city also continues to develop.

The importance of trees in our urban spaces cannot be understated. Many people are familiar with the carbon-sequestration benefits of trees. Mature trees are also one of the best tools we have to absorb and surface water runoff, infiltrating it into the ground and preventing urban flooding. As our climate warms, trees also keep communities cool. During the heat dome a few years ago, the areas of Tacoma with the fewest trees were the hottest and deadliest.

I'm encouraged by the Tree Committee's recommendations and believe that they are important step for Lakewood to take. It is my hope that more local jurisdictions will adopt stronger tree protection regulations and value trees as an important part of the city's infrastructure and climate adaptation plan.

I urge the city council to adopt the Tree Committee's recommendations as is without further amendment or delay.

Thank you,

Robb Krehbiel
7521 E. E St.
Tacoma, WA 98404

Return to Agenda

From: Heejae Kwon
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Sunday, September 4, 2022 8:47:16 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be st rictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Heejae Kwon
heejae.kwon@gmail.com
3841 34th Ave W Unit C
Seattle , Saint Croix Island 91899

Return to Agenda

From: Jenna Lee
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Sunday, September 4, 2022 8:43:42 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be st rictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Jenna Lee
jendlee@pm.me
4725 15th Ave NE
Seattle , Washington 98105

Return to Agenda

From: Rachel Mackey
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 9:12:20 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.
A suggestion might be to replant even more trees if you are to let some be cut down. You need to balance which trees get cut and which stay so there is a mix of both young and older trees left.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be

Return to Agenda

required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks mu st be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has? If you need help finding people to do tree inventory maybe you should create a committee along with volunteers to do so

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Rachel Mackey
radrach@comcast.net
6714 Alfaretta St SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Carlo Manetti
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 4:08:52 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am a retired physician who has lived and practiced in Lakewood since 1972.

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code, and to urge you to reject the Planning Commission's revisions that would weaken those recommendations.

I ask that you implement strong tree protections as soon as possible, but also that you also continue earnestly working on an effective and professional urban forestry program. Many important issues remain unresolved. This should be an on-going effort. It cannot be mere window-dressing.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oak priority habitat, for example, cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations.

Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or property owners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees.

Such regulations would have prevented the catastrophe behind the Black Angus restaurant. I was completely shocked last year to see that two large Garry oaks, on the property of my former colleague, the orthopedic surgeon Dr. Hirz, had been severely mutilated. The code enforcement officer told my daughter that the owner told him that had just been "pruned". If you want to see photos of this case, I can send them to you.

Return to Agenda

The City's assistant attorney told my daughter they were "already showing signs of new growth" -- the mutilated trees have a gigantic infrastructure above and below ground, and a few leaves will not be able to support that. It may take decades, but those two large valuable Garry oaks, part of our rare Garry oak urban canopy, will undoubtedly die after such mutilation. I think they were not even fined.

This constitutes a clear injury in fact to me as a resident of Lakewood -- I pass those Garry oaks often on the way to the post office during my fifty years living in the City of Lakewood, and their destruction reduces my aesthetic enjoyment of my environment here, to say nothing of the ecosystem services they provide to all of us living here. At a most fundamental level, they provide us with the oxygen we breathe.

Such things are happening all over Lakewood, in addition to the outright destruction of significant trees of all species and sizes. The policies that have led to this destruction are policies that harm all of Lakewood's residents.

If there were stricter protections for Garry oaks and other trees, such situations could be avoided all together.

Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly protected.

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations now, but also to develop further protections as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Carlo Manetti
cmanetti@yahoo.com
13 Ponce de Leon Terrace SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Christina Manetti
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 5:35:17 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code.

The City Council should implement the ad hoc committee's recommendations immediately, as a just a first step towards developing a real urban forestry program that would protect Lakewood's tree assets throughout the city, on private and public land.

Because there is a huge number of issues that have been left unaddressed or unresolved, however, this process must now be on-going, requiring the participation of true experts in the fields of habitat restoration, urban forestry, botany and dendrology, for example.

Being Lakewood's single biggest asset as a city, its trees deserve the most stringent protections possible. A desert with lakes? The lakes in Lakewood need its trees, too. The water cycle and trees are of course intimately related.

This is a crucial first step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City, which will have to have a concrete plan in place in order to be realized.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

Return to Agenda

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations as an important first step in the right direction. I would also ask that a permanent working group comprised of experts be formed in order to develop a truly high quality urban forestry program as soon as possible for Lakewood, its people, trees and wildlife.

Thank you.

Christina Manetti
krysiulek@gmail.com
6925 Hillgrove Lane SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Judith Manetti
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 3:16:11 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am Judith Manetti, my family and I have lived in Lakewood for more than fifty years. I am writing today to urge you to enact the strongest possible tree protections for my city.

Please implement the tree committee's recommendations, reject any revisions by the Planning Commission, and consider this implementation only a first necessary step to a long-term process of developing effective tree protections.

I truly appreciate the suburban lifestyle, and especially the ambiance of living among gorgeous trees. Our community absolutely needs to make all possible efforts to preserve the trees for future generations. In doing so, they will have the same opportunity to enjoy the benefits currently available to residents, and visitors, in this lovely place.

Here, in the Evergreen State, it seems incongruous that there should be a any need for debate over preservation of trees. Climate change will undoubtedly negatively affect our bountiful evergreens. Coniferous forests are already in decline…more rapidly and drastically than we could ever have imagined. So, it seems logical to also support the growth of hardy hardwood Garry oak trees, which are known to have greater ability to withstand harsh weather conditions (notably droughts).

We do understand that it is sometimes necessary to remove some trees to make room for important construction. Our community needs to make arrangements to prevent unnecessary and/or excessive removal of trees. We need reasonable guidelines, perhaps mandatory, for all to follow. We NEED to preserve trees for all the many benefits they provide to make life at our particular location on the planet more sustainable, secure and pleasant.

Together with all the other community members who speak for the trees, I strongly urge you to implement the recommendations of the ad hoc committee; to reject the changes to the ad hoc committee’s recommendations that were proposed by the Planning Commission; and to continue working on the tree preservation code, for example by referring to Seattle's recent urban forestry work.

It is essential that Lakewood preserve the beauty and quality of life here which is greatly enhanced by the existence, preservation and propagation of the trees. If we are wise we will

not squander those truly wonderful gifts from nature.

I am hopeful you will each give this issue your most careful consideration, and use your influence on behalf of the preservation of the trees in Lakewood.

Judith Manetti
Lakewood, Washington

Judith Manetti
carlocm@msn.com
13 Ponce de Leon Terrace SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

2550 South Yakima Avenue, Suite C
Tacoma, WA 98405
Ph: (253) 473-0232
Fax: (253) 473-0535
www.TPCAR.org

Tacoma-Pierce County Association of REALTORS®
2550 S Yakima Ave, Suite C
Tacoma, WA 98405

Lakewood City Council
6000 Main St SW
Lakewood, WA 98499

Re: Tree Preservation Code Update

Dear Councilmembers,

The Tacoma-Pierce County Association of REALTORS® (TPCAR), representing more than 2,200 REALTOR® professionals, was pleased to have participated on the City of Lakewood's Ad Hoc Tree Preservation Committee.

As a voice for consumers and homeowners, TPCAR believes that final direction from Council regarding tree preservation must be easy to comprehend for homeowners, measured to ensure fair use of land as weighed against public desire to preserve and grow the City's tree canopy, and equitable for all homeowners regardless of socioeconomic status. We believe that the Planning Commission's recommendations largely achieves that goal.

Of primary concern to TPCAR was ensuring that homeowners were given flexibility to reasonably manage growth on their property and we're appreciative to see that remain under the Planning Commission's proposal, with new considerations given to Garry Oak protections.

As was stressed during the Ad Hoc Committee's process, TPCAR continues to advocate that the City makes a strong investment in educating the public about the City's tree preservation program to ensure that the benefits of the Planning Commission's recommended changes are not blunted by lack of public awareness. We also ask that Council explore incentives to encourage preservation of existing trees in the City as a public good.

We appreciate the interest and attention given by Council to tree preservation in the city, as well as the opportunity to have been a stakeholder in the process of helping to shape the city's environment for decades to come.

Sincerely,

Sean Martin
CEO, Tacoma-Pierce County Association of REALTORS®

Return to Agenda

From: Matthew McCarthy
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 11:25:00 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly p rotected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Matthew McCarthy
nw1320@gmail.com
6917 Hillgrove LN SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Julie Miller
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Please Support Strong Tree Protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 3:08:46 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

Hello! I think this is a very important issue so I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado:

Return to Agenda

https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you for your time.

Julie Miller
jumill038@gmail.com
11021 Park Ave S E204
Tacoma, Washington 98444

Return to Agenda

From: Christine Moody
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 10:34:34 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly prote cted.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Christine Moody
cmoody76@gmail.com
9612 108th Avenue Ct SW
Tacoma, Washington 98498-1817

Return to Agenda

From: Kristin
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Garry Oaks
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 12:39:23 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites.
When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

I support protecting the oak trees. Thank you, Dale Moultine
Sent from my iPhone

Return to Agenda

From: Kristin
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Garry oaks
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 12:39:01 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites.
When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

I am in favor of their preservation! Thank you, Kristin Moultine

Sent from my iPhone

Return to Agenda

From: Sheryl MURRAY
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 5:25:20 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks mu st be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Sheryl MURRAY
missingsilverton@yahoo.com
111 Candlewyck
Lakewood , Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Tommie Oakley
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:06:56 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I'm struggling with this recent announcement that our city was recognized by Governor Inslee for our climate change and planning policies. I'm curious if the Governor knows what our city council is trying to do with our trees. It doesn't appear as if our climate change policies are going far enough if our council is allowing developers to change the rules for that almighty dollar. This is so disturbing to me. There is no reason for any of you to make this arbitrary decision to allow our trees to be disturbed in any manner. My opinion is that our city council doesn't care what the citizens want. We have a majority vote on a topic and our council overrides our wishes anyway. I'm embarrassed by all of you that allow this to go on. You are not there to better anyone, you are there to represent the citizens and I don't appreciate being disregarded. Leave our tree preservation code in place.

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be

Return to Agenda

allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly p rotected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Tommie Oakley
tommie_oakley@yahoo.com
9111 Lawndale Ave. SW
Lakewood, Washington 98498

Return to Agenda

From: Ben Olsen
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 1:59:08 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly p rotected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Ben Olsen
ben@benolsen.com
10423 Brook LN SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Courtney Brunell
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: FW: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:40:54 AM

From: Ally Orosco [mailto:info@sg.actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 9:13 AM
To: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- *helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357*

Courtney Brunell,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

Return to Agenda

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must b e strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Ally Orosco
aorosco000@gmail.com
4515 s g st
Tacoma, Washington 98418

Return to Agenda

From: Cathryn Parks
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 1:32:48 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Cathryn Parks
catparks48@gmail.com
4820 123rd St SW #E6
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Tricia Parsons
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Garry Oak Preservation
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 11:52:20 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing in support of the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. It's for the good of our city not only for current residents but for generations of residents to come.

I do believe we should push for a 40% canopy goal and not the 30% recommended to by the Planning Commission. We should always strive to do more when it comes to the natural environment for Lakewood's citizens.

I think we're on the right path to protecting our mature trees, but I still have concerns that the public is not well enough informed on why mature trees and a strong canopy is important to our city. In my mind, the loveliest cities and neighborhoods are tree lined. Let's start making quicker progress to get there ourselves and let the public know why it's everyone's responsibility to make this a success.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Tricia Parsons
hi@triciaparsons.com
10930 Meadow Rd SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499-1316

Return to Agenda

From: Courtney Brunell
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: FW: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 12:16:03 PM

From: Docere Pharmakis [mailto:info@sg.actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 11:58 AM
To: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- *helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357*

Courtney Brunell,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

Return to Agenda

Mayor Whalen, members of the Council, I am Mark Pfeiffer, a resident and property owner in the Lake City Neighborhood.

1. For some time, I have heard and read of hand wringing over tree preservation and the effects on property rights, values, and development. Tree preservation concerns impact property values by restricting or otherwise circumscribing what can be built and where. I believe everyone in the so-called "tree hugger" camp is aware of such impacts. I also believe that, as a group, they are open to reasonable accommodation. That is, they believe that there is a design-development equilibrium that can be reached. But let us face facts. All land use zoning restrictions, through municipal and state codes, have economic consequences for property owners. They restrict uses in residential, industrial, core business, even SOB areas. And for good reason, I should add, without restating what should be obvious to everyone. I submit that tree preservation is just another property use restriction, with several similarly good reasons.

Return to Agenda

2. I believe that the ad hoc committee on tree preservation brought a reasoned, well balanced, equitable approach to its mandate. One recommendation I was specifically drawn to was that of tree canopy coverage, or TCC. The committee recommended a 40% TCC goal by year 2035. That is a lofty goal (pun intended), given the slow growth rate of all trees, but Garry Oaks in particular. Depending on soil type and other environmental factors, it takes from 10-20 years for a Garry Oak seedling to reach "significant" size of 4" DBH. The Lakewood Planning Commission has recommended a goal of 30%. I choose to be charitable and give the commission the benefit of doubt, that its recommendation to reduce the TCC was based on the difficulty of reaching the 40% goal and not to maintain its credibility with the property development community. Difficulty in reaching a desirable goal should not be mitigated by reducing the goal; we see enough of that in daily life.

Return to Agenda

3. As stated previously, the ad hoc committee did a particularly excellent job given the time constraint it was faced with. Studying the issue which has suffered deferred policy maintenance for over 20 years, was a tough task. Now, finally, that is soon to change. However, the job does not end there. The City should double-down on this, soon to be, accomplishment by establishing a Tree Preservation Advisory Board or Committee. That body should work with the Department of Community Development, providing appropriate input on tree preservation and removal issues; and should hold open meetings where residents can bring their concerns, recommendations, complaints, etc.

Return to Agenda

4. As part of the tree removal permitting process, there is a requirement for input from certified arborists. That is fine, but it does not go far enough. Property owners may commission any reports they wish, for whatever purposes, but the City should have an established peer review process, as it does for Traffic Impact Reports submitted by developers in conjunction with property development projects. Better yet, the City should consider the advisability of establishing a pool of certified arborists, to be selected at random, to review the condition of trees, the removal of which has been applied for. The cost of such service should be built into any application fee.

Return to Agenda

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly p rotected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Docere Pharmakis
Oracle0726@protonmail.com
575 NE Kamiaken St
Pullman, Washington 99163

Return to Agenda

From: Chris Piatt
To: Briana Schumacher
Cc: Christina Manetti
Subject: Public Comment To Lakewood City Council Re: Amendments To Tree Preservation Code
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 5:36:47 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

To Lakewood City Council,

My name is Christine Piatt and I am a home-owning resident of Lakewood. I am a strong advocate for our tree canopy and our beautiful natural resources here in Washington State. We humans, particularly greedy property developers, corporations and financial investors, are being allowed to destroy so much of our earth's life-supporting ecosystems. We and our children and grandchildren will be the poorer for our lack of earth care. The City of Lakewood and our government needs to stand up for the common good, and support unequivocally strong amendments to the tree preservation code. I ask the City Council to:

- fully support the ad hoc committee's recommendations and reject the Planning Commission's attempts to weaken them;
- reject the Planning Commission's reduction of the tree canopy goal to 30% from the ad hoc's goal of 40%;
- provide maximum protection for Garry Oaks, on private and public lands;
- remove tree protection exemptions on residential lots for all trees, not just Garry Oaks (all trees should be protected, and the size of the lots should not matter);
- do not allow developers to cut down trees in critical areas, including Garry Oak woodland priority habitat, in exchange for "mitigation fees."

Thank you,
Christine Piatt

Return to Agenda

From: Courtney Brunell
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: FW: Preservation of Trees!—for the record
Date: Monday, August 29, 2022 8:43:45 AM

From: Janeen Provazek [mailto:provaj@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2022 4:47 PM
To: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>
Subject: Preservation of Trees!—for the record

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- *helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357*

Hello. I am urging Lakewood City officials to take seriously the need to preserve/protect as many old growth trees as possible, including the rare, Garry Oak trees. Facing a terrible climate crisis, it is imperative that we listen to the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Tree Committee and support their recommendations unamended.

Established and old growth trees cannot be mitigated or replaced in anyway that would benefit our health or our earth. We can no longer afford to remove these carbon capturing trees that help us to survive. The biggest health threat to us is air pollution, but it is also a threat that we are able to significantly reduce if we listen to the science and do not let the developers make our health decisions for us.

We must consider people over profit to counter our escalating pollution.

Please do the right thing regarding people's health and safety.

Sincerely,
Janeen Provazek
Tacoma, WA
350 Tacoma

Get Outlook for iOS

Return to Agenda

From: Kelly Quinby
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: [POSSIBLE SPAM] Lakewood Tree Preservation
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 12:24:17 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

To the Honorable Mayor Whalen and Members of the Lakewood City Council,

My name is Kelly Quinby and I am the owner of BHAW Group LLC and Whitewatt LLC.

Preserving existing trees makes development more expensive and time-consuming, since developers must hire an arborist to do an evaluation. Once a developer has an evaluation, we then need to create a site plan around these existing trees. In some cases, this can lead to a radically compromised site layout. A developer then has two options: either go with a compromised design or clearcut the property under the Forest Practices Act and take a 6-year development moratorium. Many developers will take the latter option and clearcut the trees, which delays productive development without saving any trees in the long run. Thus, it makes no sense to carefully build around existing trees when the building is likely to dramatically outlast the tree. Additionally, significant trees tend to be among the trees most likely to fall on people or property.

In a time where we need to do everything, we can to make housing production more streamlined in this housing supply crisis, I recommend there should be no significant tree retention requirement. Instead, Lakewood should work towards its 40% canopy target by requiring new plantings. The Average building delay in Peirce County is 7 months. Cost wise that's $39,915 over 7.79 months. That equals about $5,100 per month or $1,281 per week. Multiply that by the 6 year clear cut period and you have a $367,000 cost added on while a property sits empty. We need to do everything we can to reduce delays and costs to the construction process so that we can make homes more affordable for everyone.

My best,

Kelly Quinby

206-676-2338
kelly@whitewattgc.com
www.whitewattgc.com
License No. WHITEL*791OZ

Return to Agenda

From: Christine Ridge
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 1:23:42 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly prote cted.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Christine Ridge
ridgettll@aol.com
10035 DeKoven Dr SW
Lakewood , Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Courtney Brunell
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Fwd: Garry oaks and the Tree Committee"s Recommendations
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 5:11:52 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Michelle Ryder <akkadia@gmail.com>
Date: September 6, 2022 at 5:04:50 PM PDT
To: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>
Subject: Garry oaks and the Tree Committee's Recommendations

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Hello Courtney,

Could you add my comments to the public record for the meeting tonight? I am sorry I am going to miss it, after having planned to be there.

Hello, my name is Michelle Ryder. Thank you for hearing my thoughts tonight.

I want to start by commending you for your joint City Council meeting with the Nisqually Tribal Council you all held last November. Never has a city council meeting electrified me like that.

Yes, I just used the words “electrified” and “city council meeting” in the same sentence.

But it’s true, the work you all do is so important, including your sincere efforts to collaborate with the First Peoples of this land.

In this meeting, you discussed, “landmarks, history, and environmental issues,” which brings me to why I am here tonight.

Protecting all trees is important, but I especially urge you to protect the

city's Garry oak populations because that is where "landmarks, history, and environmental issues" converge.

Garry oaks, called cəʔadᶻac in Lushootseed, are not only ecologically significant, but culturally significant. These trees are a keystone species of the historic prairie-oak ecosystem that once blanketed this area.

When the earliest foreigners visited this land, they described the oak-dotted prairies as absolutely stunning, the most beautiful landscapes they had ever seen, writing that they were more beautiful than the parks of England. And, of course, they thought they were seeing virgin wilderness, but they weren't.

These prairies and oak woodlands were the result of intensive Indigenous management of the land.

For thousands of years the, Native Americans regularly burned the prairies to cultivate hundreds of plants for food, medicine, and technology. The prairies were like an Indigenous Costco. Burning the prairies kept the landscape open, renewed the grasses, and protected the oaks, enabling them to flourish, for they are easily crowded out by other trees.

When I look at Garry oaks, I am astonished that many predate white settlement. They represent First Nation civilizations stretching back millennia, predating the great pyramids of Giza.

So, if as you said, the council prioritizes "landmarks, history, and environmental issues," protecting Garry oaks is a must. I love what Mike Brandstetter said at the joint council meeting: "We want to have a future that is informed by history. We understand that when we look to the future, the future isn't the next year, but the next generation."

Lakewood's Garry oaks tell thousands of years of history, right up to the present. They tell the story of the many nations that continue to live beneath their lush canopy – Nisqually, Puyallup, Steilacoom, American, and more.

And Lakewood is the best place in Washington to experience them. They fill Lakewood with a splendor I have seen in no other city, even cities named after this beloved tree, like Oak Harbor on Whidbey Island. You can pass through Oak Harbor without seeing a single oak. A future I don't want for Lakewood, especially for future generations.

Return to Agenda

Thank you for hearing me and I encourage you to prevent the further destruction of Garry oaks in this city and to ensure that the Tree Committee's Recommendations are passed unamended.

I’d like to close out in Lushootseed as a reminder that we are on Native Land, hawadubš cələp, tixʔixʔdubut cəxʷ. huy'.

Michelle (she/her)

Return to Agenda

From: Connie Schmidt
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Lakewood Tree Preservation Code
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 10:36:32 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Hello Briana,

Please forward my interest that we do whatever we can to preserve and promote growth of healthy trees in Lakewood. I don't think we want to make any law a noose around the necks of homeowners, businesses and landlords, but trees do so much to help filter CO2, provide cooler temperatures and make our city more beautiful. Trees need to be encouraged.

Thank you for helping to care for our city now and for the future.

Kind regards,
Connie Schmidt

--
Connie Schmidt
P.O. Box 99967
Lakewood WA 98496

Return to Agenda

Members of the City Council: 7 Sept 2022

I'm Al Schmauder, Stewardship Chair for the Chambers-Clover Cr Watershed Council

You should be commended for setting up the ad hoc tree committee.
But as you can see the recommendations need more work on how to implement them.
Balancing tree protection and restoration with economic development is a never ending process.
Trees improve air quality, sequester carbon, absorb and store stormwater and filter it.
But trees get in the way with development of the land.
As a result, Lakewood needs a holistic approach that considers the needs of all the players.

However, there is no City long-term tree management and development plan.
I was told there is money in two tree accounts that has not been programmed for use for years.

Recommend:

1. Approve the best tree policy you can at this time.

2. But in addition, set up phase 2 sustainable urban forestry study for a potential revision of the ordinance in one year.

3. Contract with an experienced urban forestry planner to work with developers, master builders and citizens to bring you additional recommendations on implementing a tree plan. The consultant would facilitate the meetings, provide professional advice and assist in report preparation.
   (Urban forestry consultant in Mt Vernon (Bartlett Consulting – 360-399-1377)

The plan should develop real incentives and an effective and efficient method to put them into play. For instance providing landowners with trees a reduction of the assessed value of their property, in effect lowering their taxes and sharing the public value of their trees with other taxpayers to encourage long-term or permanent retention of trees.

Thank you for you public service.
Al 253-202-2486

Return to Agenda

From: Gail Skar
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 9:55:05 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Gail Skar
gjsklar@gmail.com
1001 Corona Dr
Fircrest, Washington 98466

Return to Agenda

From: Colleen Smart
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 1:15:41 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must b e strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Colleen Smart
kimsmart8849@comcast.net
10 Forest Glen Lane Sw, Lakewood, WA 98499
Lakewood, Washington 98498

Return to Agenda

From: Kimberly Smart
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 1:13:37 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must b e strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Kimberly Smart
kimsmart8849@comcast.net
3125 N Mullen Street
Tacoma, Washington 98407

Return to Agenda

From: Ginny C Smith
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 10:46:07 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be st rictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Ginny C Smith
homestead299@yahoo.com
8636 Onyx Dr SW
Lakewood, Washington 98498

Return to Agenda

From: Janet Spingath
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Support for Tree Code
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 7:19:26 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites.
When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

The American Lake Improvement Club exists to improve the environmental and recreational opportunities at American Lake. Since trees serve an important function of slowing runoff and sedimentation into our lake, we are in favor of preserving tree cover in Lakewood. We support the advice of the ad hoc committee.
American Lake Improvement Club
Janet Spingath, secretary

Sent from my iPhone

Return to Agenda

From: Victoria Stanich
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 1:41:47 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

I refer you to a YouTube video: “What’s So Great About Garry Oaks?” by the San Juan Preservation Trust
Thank you.

Victoria Stanich, Lakewood resident

Victoria Stanich
vicpetric@earthlink.net
8915 Dalwyn Ct Sw
Lakewood , Washington 98498

My name is Vicky Stanich. My address is 8915 Dalwyn Ct SW, Lakewood, WA 98498. I am speaking on behalf of Indivisible Tacoma and as a Lakewood resident of 29 years.

Good evening Mayor Whalen and Members of the Lakewood City Council. Thank you for allowing me to express my thoughts about tree preservation in Lakewood, particularly with a bow to the few majestic Garry Oak trees that exist in Lakewood.

I am here to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code.

Tree Canopy
A solution to reducing air temperatures in Lakewood is to increase the tree canopy. Case studies have indicated that tree canopy in America is unequally distributed, with low-income neighborhoods and people of color unequally affected by less tree cover. The Springbrook area, as an example, ~~might be viewed as~~ in my view is at risk for becoming a heat island due to a decrease in tree canopy, if the decimation of multiple rare Garry Oaks is permitted for warehouse development.

The Garry Oak Tree

Reasons to protect the Garry Oak trees:

Habitat - 1) Garry Oaks create great biodiversity. Only about 5% of the "historical habitat " of the Garry Oak remains resulting in the Garry Oak and 100 species in its ecosystem listed as threatened, or worse, many making the red list for endangered species." Removing Garry Oaks would create loss of habitat for nesting birds, such as the western bluebird, band-tailed pigeon, Cooper's hawk, and many unique butterfly species. The Garry Oak ecosystem also includes many indigenous plant species like camas, chocolate lily, and western buttercup (Northwest Wildlife Preservation Society)

2) Drought tolerant with fire-resistant bark, it is the only native oak species in the Pacific Northwest

3) Garry Oaks grow very slowly. The average time for an oak tree to fully grow is approximately 30-35 years.

Heatwaves - "heatwaves are predicted to become more frequent and more intense. Tree inequality becomes an inequality in climate risk. Heatwaves already kill 1,300 people in a typical American summer." (Mapping Tree Inequality: Why Many People Don't Benefit from Tree Cover)

Threats - Invasive species such as Scotch broom, daphne laurel, English ivy, English holly, and snowberry. Douglas firs have also encroached on Garry Oak habitat. The largest threat has been development and urbanization.

In summary, please consider the environmental benefits and climate equality of increasing the tree canopy and please consider strong protections for the rare Garry Oaks with respect to making policy about tree removal in the city of Lakewood.

Return to Agenda

From: Heidi Stephens
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: In Support of the Ad Hoc Tree Committee"s Recommendations
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 11:52:02 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

RE: Sept. 6, 2022 Public Hearing / Tree Preservation Code

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code.

Please do not weaken the recommendations; if anything, make them stronger!

Current science indicates that tree canopy is critical for survival of plants/animals/organisms. Trees moderate heat and manage water, and maintain habitats vital to all life on earth.

Mature, established variety of trees are our best defense against the coming climate change; the loss of such trees will cause more devastating effects of global warming: seasonal/cyclical changes bringing both local and world-wide long-lasting "aridation" leading to the collapse of significant life systems.

We are reaching the point of "last-chance" for impactful change to ward-off sure devastation. This is your chance to be true leaders of a proactive plan, leaving a legacy of Lakewood as an important example to the world.

This can and must be done: protecting trees supports both economic and other sustainability, since the loss of trees will mean the loss of all stability which you have been given the power to help shape, and with this vote will decide the direction of Lakewood's future.

Thank you,
Heidi Stephens

PS ~ As noted by Lakewood's much-respected tree advocates, please welcome and apply their valid input:

Critical areas must be upheld. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they

Return to Agenda

can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks mu st be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues which need closer attention; but to start, please support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations plus recommend that further protections and actions be amended to the city's current code.

Heidi Stephens
HeidiGS@hotmail.com
South Tacoma
Tacoma, Washington 98409

Return to Agenda

From: Sue Stibbe
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 12:57:54 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must be strict ly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

This is the time to act to protect our valuable trees - once cut it can take years to replace our Garry oaks and old trees. I definitely support contractors being held accountable for violations and strong urge regulation of irresponsible cutting of trees by homeowners and utilities workers - Lakewood could loose its attraction as a beautiful community if our trees are sacrificed to industrial development. I strongly oppose reducing the tree canopy from 40% to 30%. I respectfully ask the City Council to give serious attention to this most important issue.

Sue Stibbe, Oakbrook 4th Addition, Lakewood homeowner 44 years.

Sue Stibbe
sstibbe@comcast.net
6921 TopazDR SW
Lakewood, Washington 98498

Return to Agenda

From: Tahoma Audubon
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 2:51:35 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

Please ad hoc tree committee's recommendations reject proposed changes put forth by the Planning Commission. Lakewood needs a healthy tree canopy now and will need it more in the coming years as the effects of climate change increase. 40 percent canopy is a goal that the city of Lakewood should aspire to. According to the USFS, the average city in America has only 27 percent canopy. Rather than meet a minimum of 30 percent canopy coverage, reach for 40 percent and be a model.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks mu st be strictly protected.

Return to Agenda

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Tahoma Audubon
info@tahomaaudubon.org
2917 Morrison Rd West
University Place, Washington 98466

Return to Agenda

From: bessbree@nventure.com
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: written comment re Tree Preservation Code recommendations
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 8:49:12 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites.
When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

We are writing to comment on recommendations by the Ad Hoc Tree Advisory Committee. I am Celia Warren of University Place writing for my husband Rob Warren and me. We would like to be parties of record.

We support the Ad Hoc Committee's Key Issue #1 recommendation of a 40% canopy goal by 2050 rather than the City's proposed 30%. Past development codes have allowed far too many trees to be removed, increasing heat islands. Environmental degradation literally has raised the temperature of the community, affecting the quality of life for Lakewood's citizens, its environment and larger Pierce County.

We suggest the City start by preserving trees on public property, easements and rights of way (Key Issue #4) because these do not involve the litigation concerns presented by private property development. Recently several significant trees were cut down along Phillips Road to build sidewalks. Regarding this project and past public works projects, how much thought was given to trying to preserve healthy trees? We urge the City to adopt regulations that preserve all mature, healthy Garry Oaks and non-invasive trees on public as well as private property. Leading by example, city leaders would be accepting their outsized role in decisions affecting our deteriorating environment positively or negatively. It is time for leaders to recognize that all such trees in Lakewood are a valuable asset now and for future generations. Mature trees, especially Garry Oaks, are far more drought tolerant and fire resistant than young trees.

We urge the adoption of the Ad Hoc Committee's 12 Key Issue recommendations which include a mixed incentivized approach to preserving trees on private property. If the Planning Commission weakens the Committee's recommendations by just tweaking current regulations, the number of protective trees will continue to dwindle dramatically.

We urge the City to adopt a goal of 40% rather than 30% tree canopy by 2050. We urge the City to provide bold, forward-thinking leadership starting with preserving all trees on public property. We also urge adoption of the Ad Hoc Committee's carrot and stick approach to preserving trees on private properties where an estimated 70% of Lakewood's trees exist.

Thank you for accepting our comments.
Celia and Rob Warren

Return to Agenda

From: Colleen Waterhouse
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 8:42:49 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I endorse Council member Brandstetter's amendments, and I am particularly concerned with the growth and uses of the Lakewood Tree Fund. The City should soon begin creating an inventory of the Lakewood tree canopy and maps to identify where added canopy would be most practical and effective.

While a certain amount of industrial development will necessarily involve tree removal, the City should ensure that this loss of canopy, especially Garry oaks, is minimal and should always require mitigation and/or substantial fees hat will sustain and grow the Tree Fund.

The City must be aware of the responsibilities to which it must commit in order to implement the expansion of canopy. These include the inventory and maps mentioned above, the need for suitable nursery stock, the watering demands of newly planted or transplanted trees, and a monitoring system to be carried out by staff or responsible volunteers and volunteer organizations. These obligations cannot be taken lightly or temporarily and should be an important facet of future Lakewood City management.

Colleen Waterhouse
cmwaterhouse@comcast.net
129 Candlewyck Dr W
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

Return to Agenda

From: stephenwhitlocksmith@gmail.com
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 6:46:38 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must b e strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

stephenwhitlocksmith@gmail.com
10011 Bridgeport Way SW
Lakewood, Washington 98499

Return to Agenda

From: Kurt Wilson
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Lakewood Tree Preservation
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 2:08:40 PM
Attachments: image002.png

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

To the Honorable Mayor Whalen and Members of the Lakewood City Council,

My name is Kurt Wilson and I am a principal at Soundbuilt Homes

Preserving existing trees makes development more expensive and time-consuming, since developers must hire an arborist to do an evaluation. Once a developer has an evaluation, we then need to create a site plan around these existing trees. In some cases, this can lead to a radically compromised site layout. A developer then has two options: either go with a compromised design or clearcut the property under the Forest Practices Act and take a 6-year development moratorium. Many developers will take the latter option and clearcut the trees, which delays productive development without saving any trees in the long run. Thus, it makes no sense to carefully build around existing trees when the building is likely to dramatically outlast the tree. Additionally, significant trees tend to be among the trees most likely to fall on people or property.

In a time where we need to do everything, we can to make housing production more streamlined in this housing supply crisis, I recommend there should be no significant tree retention requirement. Instead, Lakewood should work towards its 40% canopy target by requiring new plantings. The Average building delay in Peirce County is 7 months. Cost wise that's $39,915 over 7.79 *months. That equals about $5,100 per month or $1,281 per week. Multiply that by the 6 year clear cut period and you have a $367,000 cost added on while a property sits empty. We need to do everything we can to reduce delays and costs to the construction process so that we can make homes more affordable for everyone.*

SOUNDBUILT homes
BUILD HOMES NOT BARRIERS

Kurt Wilson
Soundbuilt Homes

kurt@soundbuilthomes.com

(253) 377-7147-cell
(253) 539-8116-office

PO Box 73790
Puyallup, WA 98373

Return to Agenda

From: Ovunayo X
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 4:33:27 PM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks must b e strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Ovunayo X
ovunayo@protonmail.com
2417 96th Street South Apt D42
Tacoma, Washington 98444

Return to Agenda

From: Wendy Zicht
To: Briana Schumacher
Subject: Public comment in support of strong tree protections in Lakewood
Date: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 10:17:16 AM

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.
Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.
- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Briana Schumacher,

To the Members of the Lakewood City Council:

I am writing to voice my strong support for the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations regarding amendments to the City of Lakewood's tree preservation code. This is a crucial step towards ensuring the preservation of the mature tree canopy that already exists, so that the people of Lakewood can continue to benefit from it today and in the future. The recommendations also urge the expansion of tree canopy in the City.

With this in mind, the City Council should reject proposed changes to the ad hoc committee's recommendations put forth by the Planning Commission. In particular, the Planning Commission recommended reducing the tree canopy goal from 40% to 30%, which would render the goal meaningless. Since our canopy already stands at 26%, a goal of 30% would be within the margin of error, so tantamount to no goal at all.

The Planning Commission also proposed only protecting Garry oaks that had previously been exempt from tree protection. Lakewood needs all of its trees, not just the Garry oaks, whose situation just happens to be the most pressing. In order to expand the canopy, the City has to protect the mature tree canopy it already has.

In addition to the recommendations that already exist, however, I would like to urge even stronger amendments that would further protect Lakewood's vital tree canopy.

In particular, critical areas should be respected. The destruction of Garry oaks cannot be allowed in exchange for mitigation fees that in no way replace the ecosystem functions of large Garry oaks.

The concept of what constitutes a "significant tree" should be reassessed. Younger trees -- especially younger Garry oaks -- should be protected at a much earlier stage, because if they can be cut down, they will never have the chance to become a significant tree. Today's "insignificant trees" are tomorrow's significant trees, after all.

There are other issues that need more careful consideration as well. Tree cutters must be required to be licensed by the City of Lakewood, as is the case in other cities. (See for example the City of Lakewood, Colorado: https://www.lakewood.org/files/assets/public/community-resources/parks/forestry/tree-

contractor-application-packet.pdf). Contractors must be held responsible for violations. Mutilation must not be allowed by utilities, contractors or homeowners, and ivy should not be allowed to cover trees. Fines must not be reduced by the court. Permits to cut down significant trees must not be issued as a matter of fact, and Garry oaks mu st be strictly protected.

Finally, in order for there to be meaningful change, there will have to be a thorough tree inventory on both public and private lands. How can Lakewood know what it is protecting if it doesn't know what it has?

These above are just a few of the many issues that need closer attention. My mailing address is my law office in Tacoma. However, relocated my personal residence to Lakewood, drawn to the apparent preservation of trees and lakes. We have nesting eagles, osprey, and owls in our area.

I urge you to support the ad hoc tree committee's recommendations and recommend that further protections and actions be included in the current amendments as well.

Thank you.

Wendy Zicht
attyzicht@earthlink.net
2207 North 30th Street
Tacoma, Washington 98403