

**MINUTES
PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
JULY 11, 2000**

930 TACOMA AVENUE SOUTH, ROOM 1045
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98402
(253) 798-7777 -- FAX: (253) 798-7509 -- TDD: (253) 798-4018

(Note: These minutes are not verbatim. Recorded tapes are available upon request.)

I. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Pierce County Council was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Casada.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The pledge was led by Casada.

III. ROLL CALL

Councilmembers Present: Wendell Brown, Sarah Casada, Ken Madsen, Harold Moss, Pat O'Malley, and Jan Shabro; Karen S. Biskey was excused.

Council Staff Present: Susan Long, Legal Counsel; Gerri Rainwater, Administrator/Clerks & Operations; and Tom Weber, Administrator/Research & Policy.

There were approximately 29 visitors present.

PROPOSAL NO. 2000-33, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AMENDING PIERCE COUNTY CODE TITLE 18A, THE PIERCE COUNTY DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS - ZONING, TO IMPLEMENT AMENDMENTS MADE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BY ORDINANCE NO. 99-93S2 FOR MAP AMENDMENT NO. M-7, 72ND AND WALLER ROAD, AND TEXT AMENDMENT NO. T-14, RURAL AREA OF MORE INTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT; ADDRESSING THE FINDING OF FACT NO. 31 FOR URBAN GROWTH AREA AMENDMENT NO. U-6, JASMER; AMENDING THE PIERCE COUNTY ZONING ATLAS; ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT; AND SETTING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Having voted on the prevailing side Brown moved reconsideration of Ordinance No. 2000-33; motion seconded and passed.

Brown moved that this Proposal be continued indefinitely; motion seconded and passed.

Brown moved that the Rules be suspended to change the order of business on the Agenda and advance to Section IX. RESOLUTIONS; motion seconded and passed.

PROPOSAL NO. R2000-70, A RESOLUTION OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT OF A JOINT REQUEST FROM THE CITY OF TACOMA AND THE METROPOLITAN PARK DISTRICT OF TACOMA; CALLING FOR AN ELECTION ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2000, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE AFFECTED VOTERS THE DETERMINATION OF WHETHER OR NOT TO IMPOSE A LOCAL SALES AND USE TAX FOR REGIONAL AND LOCAL PARKS AND ACCREDITED ZOO, AQUARIUM, AND WILDLIFE PRESERVES PURSUANT TO REVISED CODE OF WASHINGTON SUBSECTION 82.14.400(6), AND FOR COMMUNITY-BASED HOUSING; AND CREATION OF A ZOO AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY AUTHORITY; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF PIERCE COUNTY WITH THE CITY OF TACOMA AND THE METROPOLITAN PARK DISTRICT OF TACOMA.

The following portion of these minutes is prepared in verbatim transcript:

CASADA. Okay. All in favor of moving to Number IX, Resolutions, on hearing proposal No. R2000-70, say aye. (Response) All opposed, say no. (No response) Okay, so we are on Proposal No. R2000-70, so we need to read it into the record.

RAINWATER. Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a Resolution of the Pierce County Council acknowledging receipt of a joint request from the City of Tacoma and the Metropolitan Park District of Tacoma calling for an election on September 19, 2000, for the purpose of submitting to the affected voters the determination of whether or not to impose a local sales and use tax for regional and local parks and accredited zoo, aquarium, and wildlife preserves, pursuant to RCW 82.14.400(6); and for community-based housing; the creation of a zoo and aquarium advisory authority; and authorizing the County Executive to execute an interlocal agreement on behalf of Pierce County with the City of Tacoma and the Metropolitan Park District of Tacoma.

CASADA. Thank you very much. We have several people that have signed up to speak. One is Larry Dahl, next is Art Jordan, Al Jordan.

DAHL. Thank you, Madam Chair and Members of the County Council. I'm here before you this afternoon to ask you to support a proposal that is considerably different of what we brought to you last year. It represents nine months of hard work, cooperatively taken forward by Members of the County Council, City of Tacoma, Metropolitan Park District, Cities and Towns, and interested organizations. I think it's important that I recognize that the Council, contributors to

this whole thing were very regular attenders and leaders in this whole movement, was Councilmember Shabro, and Councilmember O'Malley, and there was interest in participation by Councilmembers Moss and Madsen, and we appreciate that. We think it's important that we move forward to get this before the public, and allow them to decide this very important issue. The issue is still the same for us. Accreditation is still the topic of great concern. September 23 is the deadline on the parks, on the zoo portion of the accreditation; and we have an accreditation team coming to Northwest Trek on the 18th of this month, and I'm sure that that investigation will hinge entirely on whether or not we have the adequate funding to move forward. We are also looking forward to the benefits that this will give everybody within the County, not just zoological, but the parks issues themselves. So we look forward to you putting us on the ballot. We want the people to have their opportunity to make their decision, and we are asking for your support, so thank you very much.

CASADA. Thank you. We have Al Jordan from the Tahoma Land Conservancy. Welcome.

JORDAN. Thank you. I am Al Jordan, President of the Tahoma Land Conservancy. As you probably know, our mission is to preserve, protect, and hopefully enhance wildlife habitat in Pierce County, and that includes all open space, and that includes parks. Last November we stood in front of you in opposition to a proposal to trade away Fairfax Forest, just exactly the kind of open space which the County, under various policies and programs such as Conservation Futures, was seeking to acquire. At that time in a letter to the TNT we suggested that this ambivalence was due to a lack of a comprehensive long-range plan for County parks which could be taken to our citizens for funding and approval. And we further said that if such a plan were properly conceived and presented to the voters, the very citizens who were so vocal in their opposition to the Fairfax trade, would line up to support the measure and work toward its acceptance at the polls. So here we are today, as promised, ready to do what we can to see that this measure passes. You can depend on our support. Thank you.

CASADA. Thank you. Sally Larsen, from Tahoma Audubon. Good afternoon.

LARSEN. Good afternoon. My name is Sally Larsen, and I am co-chair of the Audubon Society Conservation Committee, and I am speaking for 1,700 members in Pierce County. The Audubon Society endorses this regional park funding

Pierce County Council Meeting
July 11, 2000

proposal. We would like to thank you, all of the Councilmembers, who have worked so hard to make this possible. Audubon members know the criticism that many of you withstood last year when several of you suggested that the sales tax money should be shared with County and City parks alike. And we appreciate the Council withstanding that criticism and making regional park funding possible. Additionally, we especially thank you for the vision that you had to include all the parks in Pierce County, not just zoo and wildlife parks. To think when this regional park funding proposal was suggested last September many said that you would never get it done and get it through the Legislature. You did, albeit with lots of work. It has taken almost a year to turn the initial proposal for zoo and trek funding into a proposal that works for everyone in Pierce County, and more. You have really created a long-term solution that will bring some \$90 million to parks in the next 10 years. So let me say thank you, to each of you, from the Tahoma Audubon Society, for making this possible. Tahoma Audubon wants to help the Council build on this success, and help you pass regional park funding. Let this be one of many cooperative efforts between Audubon and the Council, and use this model for how other contentious issues can be resolved, from salmon to criminal justice to school funding. Thank you.

CASADA. Thank you. We have Ken Batker who wishes to speak.

BATKER. Hi Councilmembers. My name is Ken Batker and I'm from the area out in Pierce County I guess currently known as Parkland. So I'd first just like to say that I strongly support this measure. It's really, I'd like to congratulate you for your good work and commend you for it. The one thing that maybe you can clear me up a little on too, is this idea of supplantation, supplanting. Is that the idea that I saw in here? I, that's frightening, and I realize it doesn't apply to the County, but I did, well let me read a little thing. I got my copy of Webster's New World College Dictionary, and it told me that supplant means, quoting, 1) to take the place of, supersede, especially through force or plotting, and 2) to remove or uproot in order to replace with something else. The etymology of the word is from the Latin supplantary, which means to put it under the sole of the foot, or trip up, and what I'm afraid of, unfortunately, is that the supplanting will do just that. I mean it will trip up the

passage of this otherwise good and excellent bill and funding measure for our regional parks. In the current atmosphere toward taxation I can only see that the electorate will view this supplanting business as a way to cloak an arbitrary City tax with the respectability of the Zoo, Northwest Trek, and regional parks. So the reason I am here sort of speaking to you this way today is to request that the Council speak to, implore, reason with, whatever else you might do to your colleagues on the Tacoma City Council to vehemently deny that they will use these funds for anything except these intended park functions. In fact, they should pass an ordinance prohibiting the use of these funds for anything but the intended park funding. I realize that the County doesn't have the supplantation clause, but that this will only, I'm afraid this will only give the perception to the County voters that if the County is bound up with this kind of an effort, that it will be seen as an effort to give the City of Tacoma a bundle of tax money to do with as they wish. And so I can only really see this supplantation clause as the, at best presenting a great difficulty to surmount in the passage of the ballot measure and at worst as a catastrophe for our parks. So you can use me and/or this testimony as an example of the pressure that you as a Council are feeling from your voting constituency regarding this issue of supplantation. And that actually, I mean I feel that adequate park funding is just vital to this paramount service for our County, and it's immeasurably better to keep our kids and young people in parks than in jails, and to provide our citizens with trails and with open space and facilities for both active and passive recreation, rather than having them hang out on street corners. I really want this measure to pass, and if I can do anything to help in some manner of that, by all means I stand ready to and please give me a call, I'll be happy to do anything I can. Thank you.

CASADA. Thank you. I just have a question from our Counsel, Susan Long. The language he was speaking about is not in the Pierce County portion of it.

LONG. Well, the language I believe he was speaking to is from the Bill itself that prohibits the money received by the County from being used to replace or supplant existing per capita funding.

CASADA. But it does not include Tacoma. Is that what you're pointing out?

LONG. That is correct.

(Inaudible comments from Batker, not at the podium)

CASADA. I understand, I understand.

BROWN. Well, I don't think that's possible.

CASADA. And this is an agreement between the Metro parks and Pierce County and Tacoma, so our Pierce County is covered.

(Inaudible comments from Batker, not at the podium)

CASADA. I understand, I understand, sir. Would you come back up to the podium. Okay. O'Malley, is there anything we can do about that?

BATKER. Yeah, it's, I'm very happy with the Council. I'm very happy with this bill with that single exception. But that seems to me to be a rather truck-sized loophole here that the City of Tacoma should announce publicly to the voting constituency that they are not going to be using these funds for any other kind of City project that just happens to come up and that they think is better than the parks. This is a parks initiative.

CASADA. I think your message has come through loud and clear.

BATKER. Great. Wonderful.

CASADA. We have Gary Giddings, Metro Parks, Tacoma. You're not speaking? Okay.

MADSEN. Great testimony.

CASADA. All right. Great testimony, I'm not speaking. Randy Boss, and then we have Peter Noel, Normal.

BOSS. Good afternoon Madam Chair, Members of the Council. My name is Randy Boss, I'm surprised Madam Chair that you are unfamiliar with the supplant language that the last speaker spoke of.

CASADA. I am familiar with it. I just wanted our Legal Assistance to explain it to the public, Mr. Moss, not Moss, Boss.

BOSS. Thank you. I have submitted several e-mails to this Council regarding that specific issue, as well as to the City of Tacoma, as well as to the Metro Parks Department. The last speaker is exactly right, this bill will create one-tenth of one percent sales tax on every resident on every sale in the County of Pierce to create a fund of about \$9 million. The advertising campaign that will go out to the community, to all the members of the County, of which you are their Council, is that we will raise \$9 million for Pierce County parks. That's a disingenuous advertising campaign because we will not raise \$9 million for parks because the City of Tacoma, and all the other Cities, with the exception of Pierce County, have the ability to use this park money in any way that they want. \$4.5 million is dedicated to the Trek and the Zoo to help fund those two entities, but as soon as they get the \$4.5 million from the sales tax revenue, the City will cut off \$4.5 million of the revenue that they are currently sending to the Zoo and Trek, so there will be no new net gain in Zoo and Trek out of this one-tenth of one percent sales tax. The gain will be to the City of Tacoma who will gain \$4.5 million of general fund revenue that they can use to spend anyplace else that they want to. In fact, the only good part of this bill is the supplant language that is attached to the County portion. That requires that the County will not be able to take any of the current \$4 million plus that they are spending annually on parks and use the \$2 million that they will get in from the sales tax revenue to replace the \$4 million that they are spending. Therefore, the County will actually receive a net gain in revenue to parks of about \$2 million per year. That's a good thing, except there is a loophole in the bill. The County's portion, the \$2 million that the County gets, they will only receive that money through December 31, 2005. At that point, there is a two-for-one match required in the bill. That requires the County, Pierce County, to come up with an additional \$1 million in order to put in another \$1 million into parks in order to continue to receive the \$2 million that we should be receiving from the sales tax revenue. If the County Council is unable to find an additional \$1 million in revenue, and I challenge any of you now to earmark or think of where you might come up with \$1 million, on December 31, 2005, then the \$2 million that the County gets as their share of the sales tax revenue goes away. The County won't continue to receive the \$2 million. That money would probably then go back into the pot for redistribution back to the City, back to all the Cities, who have the ability to take the funds that they received and spend it anyplace that they want to. So with all of the accolades that are being presented on this bill, I have spent the last couple of months trying to convince the Council that there is a simple answer to this question. The

Resolution has to be approved by the Council, by the City Council, and by Metro Parks. All the County Council has to say is, we're not going to approve this unless the City of Tacoma puts the supplant language into the Agreement, into the Interlocal Agreement, which you are here today to approve. If the City is not intending to divert these funds to sources other than parks, then there shouldn't be any problem for the City putting supplant language into this Agreement. And it's incumbent on you, the Councilmembers, to go back to the City and say, we're not going to approve this Interlocal Agreement until you agree to put some supplant language in here. The City was the prime sponsor of this bill in the legislature. The City is the one who put the supplant requirement on the County. Now it's disingenuous for the City to put that restriction on the County, and not include the same restriction on themselves. Today what I'm asking you to do is to table this motion, go back to the City and tell them what your constituents are saying, that you want supplant language in here, and you won't agree to approve this Resolution, and it requires the three-member approval before this Resolution can go to the voters, that you will not approve this until they put supplant language in here to guarantee that the \$9 million that will be advertised to the people of Pierce County that will be raised for parks out of this one-tenth of one percent sales tax revenue will actually and honestly go to sales, go to parks and recreation in Pierce County. May I answer any questions? Thank you very much.

CASADA. Councilmember Shabro.

SHABRO. I don't have a question of Mr. Boss, but I do, he did raise an issue that I would like either Jan Wolcott or Fran McNair to address, and that is after the year 2005, the \$1 million required match money that the County must have in order to receive the annual \$2 million-plus at that point, portion of the sales tax, because we did discuss that during our negotiations and I think there is an answer to that. So if one of them would come up and address that, I would appreciate that.

BOSS. I'm done?

SHABRO. Yeah.

BOSS. Thank you.

MC NAIR. Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Council, Fran McNair, Deputy Executive. Yes, we did discuss that, and we have funds that we can use. We have our impact fees that are available. We can use grants. We have a tremendous amount of

flexibility. We can use the general fund that we have. What we have to do is basically match two-to-one in order to be able to utilize the dollars, but we have those dollars available, and often-times when we are funding park projects we have a grant, or we have a match scenario, so this is not new for us. It will not be a problem.

SHABRO. Yeah, it, we really thoroughly discussed that because there's no way that we wanted to relinquish our ability to get these funds, and it'll be there.

MC NAIR. Right.

CASADA. Councilman Moss.

MOSS. And also the second REET is available. I have an enormous fear, and that is that we have, we have been very, very fortunate as a community, and as a political body, to have undergone something that could have been a catastrophe. We fail sometimes to remember exactly why we got in the swamp. We're in the swamp because the taxes available to Metropolitan Parks shrank to the point where they could not function. The threat is the loss of accreditation to the Zoo. The threat is the loss of the Northwest Trek. That threat has not gone away. We took an enormous chance in defeating the bill that was before us, but it brought us really to our senses, and said that yes, you are right, we ought to be a broader-based use of that tax, because after all, if we pass this tax, we foundation our parks for a long, long time. As was mentioned some ten years at \$90 million. That means that we will be able to use that money. It's not restricted to capital improvements. It's not restricted to land acquisition. It is not restricted to maintenance and operation. You can perform all of the above. We have really literally worked like crazy to make sure that we got that together, then went to the Legislature, an extremely difficult situation with our own delegation, to get them to go back in, reopen this thing, and pass it so that we could have the authority to include the County parks. The danger that I am looking at now is letting something like the City Council, and every last one of them are elected and just as responsible as anybody else, letting that issue of supplanting so rise up and divide the people that we end up losing, losing the passage of that bond. And if we do, you'd better believe it, we're right back to where we were. The Trek, the Zoo, and the Aquarium will lose. And so somewhere along the line, we had to, as a Committee, come to the trust level. If the City feels that they've got to have this piece, and we feel that as a County Council we were able to get the parts out that we needed to make sure that our parks

benefited, if the City does no worse than use half of it, they then will be in a much better position to handle and save those parks. And I'm just afraid that it will take one issue and destroy a great opportunity.

CASADA. Peter

NORMAN. Thank you, Madam Chairman, Members of the Council. My name is Peter Norman. I appreciate the reference to Peter Normal. That was very kind of you. Approximately a year ago, I appeared before you and I urged you to make a decision to approve this and put it before the voters. And in the interim, I have had an opportunity, as all of us have had, to think about decision processes and so on. I am in business and I don't enter a business transaction that I don't want to know the costs, I don't want to know who the benefits, if there are benefits, and I don't do it unless I know where the control is. I asked you people to disregard all three of those items and just go ahead and pass this thing a year ago. I'll have to admit I wasn't real happy with some of you, and in mentioning that I ask you to disregard that, I'm not throwing any mud on Commissioners Madsen, and Brown, and Moss who were supportive of it at that time.

CASADA. Are you throwing mud on us? Point of order.
(laughter)

NORMAN. Just so that doesn't get out, subliminally,

CASADA. Point of order. Could you please stay on the issue.

NORMAN. In any event, I just want to urge you to approve this and put it before the voters on the 19th. I want to add that although some of you might be aware, Grant Jones, who is a world-renowned zoological designer and so on, has done a lot of work with Trek in the past, and has also worked with us at Trek, particularly on the Foundation Board, on which I serve now. And we have recently been identified officially as the only indigenous wildlife park and outdoor classroom in North America. That is an official designation, and consistent with the accreditation that Councilman Moss referred to, would be lost if this doesn't get before the voters and doesn't get an approval. I thank you for your diligence and your hard work in the past year, and I urge your support. Thank you very much.

CASADA. Thank you. These sheets don't have numbers on them, so I may get them out of order. I sort of shuffled them after the Clerk gave them to me. Will Baker.

(tape change, to side B)

BAKER. ... County Council, my name is Will Baker, and my website address is Pierce County Insider.com. Number one, I am here tonight, or this afternoon, speaking for myself and also on behalf of Jackie Chunti, who is the founder of YGEN, the Washington Grass Roots e-mail network, and also former Tacoma Judge, Ralph Baldwin. Citizens of Tacoma pay the highest property tax rate in the State of Washington. The question why. One reason is because of the way the City of Tacoma funds its Parks System. In 1907, the Tacoma City Council had reached the legal limit of the money they could borrow. In order to get around the legal limit of money that the Tacoma City Council could borrow, former Tacoma Mayor Stewart Rice asked the State Legislature to pass a law that would allow cities to form a Metropolitan Park District, another taxing jurisdiction. By creating another legal taxing district, the Tacoma City Council could try to get voters to allow elected public officials to go further in debt than the current legal limits allowed. Hey guys, it's not the Tacoma City Council asking for my money, it's the Metropolitan Park Board. Today, 93 years later, no other city in the State of Washington uses this funding system to fund their parks. A couple of cities have done that in the past, they decided to disband their Metropolitan Park Districts, get rid of an extra level of bureaucracy, and they have simply city park departments. And today, 93 years later, we now have the Metropolitan Park District trying to go County-wide. It is interesting to note that this proposal would not go forward except at the request of the Metropolitan Park District. And that's interesting for a couple of reasons. Number one, if this were to pass, while all citizens of Pierce County would get to pay the taxes, only citizens who primarily live in the City of Tacoma get to vote on who sits on that Metropolitan Park District. I have a problem with that. Number two, the Metropolitan Park District has had a history of refusing to look at privatization. I should say the Point Defiance Zoo would be a classic example. In 1984, the Atlanta Zoo was listed as one of the ten worst zoos in the Nation. They privatized the day-to-day operations, their red ink disappeared almost immediately. Of course, today Ivan, our former B&I gorilla, seems to be having a good time down there, and it's considered one of the best facilities in the Nation. The Metropolitan Park District of Tacoma has consistently preferred to threaten to close down the Zoo rather than to look at privatization as an answer.

Then we have the problem with independent Performance Audits. In 1996, over 70% of the citizens throughout Pierce County voted to end a loophole that this County Council had allowed

to go on for 16 years to avoid doing independent performance audits as the Pierce County Charter requires. The Metropolitan Parks District has consistently refused to look at conducting independent Performance Audits in the way they run their operation, and yet they continue to want more money. I don't see how any legal body, legislative body, can say that they are doing everything they can to handle taxpayer's funds as efficiently as possible when they ignore independent performance audits.

The next problem that we have would be,

CASADA. Mr. Baker, the issue we have before us now is the ballot,

BAKER. Right, and I'm testifying against it. And I'm giving my reasons why I'm against it. I apologize if I haven't been clear on my position. I'll try not to use big words.

The other problem that I have is, as a couple of other speakers have already pointed out, is of course that the City of Tacoma can yank money that they are currently using to support this park district system that doesn't work very well, and use that in other areas, and then proceed to use the money coming in just to replace that, which is basically is the same as using the money for other purposes. And that is a very realistic worry considering that Tacoma Mayor Brian Ebersole has already publicly stated a couple months back that he thought that was a good idea. So this isn't anybody being paranoid. You've already got public officials on record suggesting that they are thinking about this.

Secondly, it is interesting that the, particularly here in Pierce County, we've got a long history of election manipulation. First we have of course the refusal to allow citizens public access television, while government access television has mute buttons to censor critical speech. We have the Tacoma City Council gone official policy to edit, censor, public sections testimony in their Council meetings. Meanwhile, we have Channel 12 putting on Mr. Lewis, who I see here in the back,

CASADA. Okay, how does this relate to the parks issue?

BAKER. Well, I think it's,

CASADA. Perhaps I don't understand big words, but I,

BAKER. I'm getting there. I'll try to get there. I think it's inappropriate,

CASADA. You must do it hurriedly because we

BAKER. On government access television, which is paid for by the government, it's probably illegal, to allow a City employee, because the City of Tacoma is one of the folks who have asked for this bond, to put on their Channel a City employee interviewing the Mayor and proceed to have a conversation,

BROWN. Point of order, Madam Chairman.

CASADA. Mr. Brown.

BROWN. He's not speaking to the issue at all, and he's up here giving a speech about the Mayor of the City of Tacoma. He's criticizing the City of Tacoma,

BAKER. The City of Tacoma has requested this bond issue.

BROWN. Madam Chairman, if he's not going to stick to the issue, Madam Chairman, he should be asked to sit down.

BAKER. The City has also been in the process,

CASADA. Okay. Point of order. Okay, go ahead Mr. Brown.

BAKER. Well, I disagree. If you want to get a couple of Deputies, we can

CASADA. Well, we really would like to get on with the program.

BAKER. Well the quicker, the sooner you quit interrupting me, the sooner I'll be done.

BROWN. Madam Chairman.

CASADA. Yes, Mr. Brown.

BROWN. I think you probably need to call the Sheriff back up here, because Mr. Baker has a history of doing this kind of thing. He will not stick to the subject matter, and I think we're going to get ourselves in a situation,

BAKER. Actually, according to former Pierce County office employee, Cathy Baldwin,

CASADA. Okay, we'll just recess, we'll take a ten-minute recess. Thank you.

(The meeting recessed at 3:35 p.m.; the meeting reconvened at 3:45 p.m.)

Okay, we're back from recess, sorry about the interruptions, and on with business. We are on proposal No. R2000-70, and we have some other people who wish to speak. John, is that Holderman? Point Defiance Zoological Society. Good Afternoon.

HOLDERMAN. Thank you Madam Chair and Councilmembers. I'm the former past president of the, former past, I'm the past president of the Pointy Defiance Zoological Society and I think you probably all remember me fondly and know my passion for Point Defiance Zoo and Aquarium. I think that you probably know why I'm here, and that's obviously to support this measure being on the ballot. I'm also here today from a little different perspective, and that is as the Chair of the Pierce County Chamber this year, I've had the opportunity to learn a lot of things about economic development, and one of the things that really has surfaced in that discussion and dialog is the importance of the quality of life issues within the county or a community, when businesses choose to move here, the Zoo being a major piece of that. It actually gets points for a community that has an accredited, strong zoo. As well as parks, open areas, open parks, a strong park system is another critical piece, so this Resolution has significant, this action has significant impact on this community, and I think deserves support.

As I listened to the discussions about the supplanting issue, I guess I would ask as people come forward with that issue, that they take it to the appropriate place. The City of Tacoma, through its budget process, will have plenty of public hearings for people to bring that issue forward, and not have it muddle up this campaign. This really is critical to the future of the zoo. And we will not make it if we don't get it on the ballot in September, as Commissioner Moss to aptly noted on the accreditation issues.

So I want to thank you all for your passion, even though I didn't agree with you in some cases, I have respected, and I appreciate the fact that by coming back to the table, both parties involved, or many of the parties involved in this process, came up with a good solution that I think is going to be to the benefit of this community, so I encourage your support and I thank you for your dedication.

CASADA. Thank you. We have Linda Bird from Pierce County Cities and Towns, PCRC. Good afternoon.

BIRD. Good afternoon. I'm also a Councilmember of the City of University Place, but was asked to serve by Pierce County's Cities and Towns, and also Pierce County Regional Council as a part of the negotiating team of this interlocal agreement. And I wanted you to know that both organizations support this agreement. No piece of legislation is perfect, and they, a lot of them come out of the Legislature a lot worse than this one. And so it has, it has its faults. It has some things that we all wish were a little different. But it's certainly

the best thing we've got going, and for our City, we view this as a tremendous first step in truly regional planning for parks, and that's very important for this County, so I urge you to pass it. I urge those people who have issues to set them aside. The process to come to agreement sometimes is a little messy, and you never get everything you want. And at the same time, when you've got something that will benefit so many people and so many jurisdictions who desperately need the money to improve their parks, whether it's the County, or a small town, or a City, or even Tacoma, so I want you to know that we support this, both organizations. We will be calling for nominations for two people from the Cities and Towns, other than Tacoma, to sit on the Board that will distribute this money. We have reached consensus, both organizations, on how that will happen, and we are excited and ready to move forward.

CASADA. Thank you, Linda. Okay, I have someone but I can't read his name. So I'll just say anyone else wishing to speak to R2000-70, please come forward at this time.

BATCHELOR. Louise Batchelor, and I didn't write that because I didn't put the name on there.

CASADA. Yes, I know it doesn't look like Louise at all. Thank you.

BATCHELOR. Anyway, on this green sheet here you have, it says local sales and use tax for regional and local parks, accredited zoo and aquarium, wildlife preserves, pursuant to Revised Code of Washington subsection and so forth, anyway, and for community-based housing. How did that get in there? They just got through going to court for this 695 and saying that they couldn't have two unrelated things, and parks and community-based housing are further apart on the initiative on anything that was done before. So I think that in any mention of community-based housing should be taken out of there. That has nothing to do with the parks, and they could use that to subsidize something, that, well getting off the subject, but Tacoma wants to get matching funds for a grant that they put in for out there around Salishan, anyway, so this has, that has nothing to do with this, and it should all be completely stricken and deleted from that, any mention of it.

The Metropolitan Parks just got I believe it was a \$35 million bond issue, which was for the Zoo, maybe only, and I don't know if any of that went to Northwest Trek or not. I understand that about \$7 million of the bond issue has been issued, and there's also the idea of putting a new aquarium

in downtown. I mean, I thought this was for the Zoo, but if Tacoma puts an aquarium in downtown, then the Zoo would be less used, have less income, and more money would be needed for things than what we already don't have the money for. And what are they going to do with the \$35 million bond issue that they have already put on everybody's property tax? That needs to be dealt with. I mean they either need to take it back and say well we've issued that much, \$7 million, we're not going to issue any more because we will be getting this, or something, I mean property owners are having to pay off the bond issue, and then they're having to pay for it in sales tax too. And that's not fair, and if renters think they're not paying for it, why they are, because whenever the taxes go up and so forth, why the landlord comes around and raises the rent to cover the additional expenses, because they do have to make enough money to maintain the places and so forth. So I have a problem with that.

And I also have a problem with this idea that the County should come up with matching funds. Apparently the City of Tacoma don't have to come up, or the Tacoma Parks don't have to come up with any kind of matching funds, and this is in addition to what everybody is already getting, and they should not be allowed to not pay what they are already paying either, what you're already collecting. But you, it needs to be fixed so that the County gets their fourth, period. That's the end of it. They get all of the money, and everything, everybody gets their own. There should be no way that somebody can keep the County parks from getting theirs, and I see this as a big loophole for the County parks if they couldn't come up with the money for whatever reason, would simply not get it and Tacoma would simply keep it. And I live in Tacoma. So, but I think the County is getting done in on it. And like I said, that Tacoma has this idea of getting funds, federal funds, which came out of my pocket too, but anyway, to do a big renovation out there at Salishan, which that idea stinks too, what they're going to do, wants to. And I got a thing from the City on this, and there was a lot of things in here, and it seems like that they want to start up a whole new board, this appointments to ZTA, that's what they're calling it, Board. And they're going to appoint the board members on this new board. They're all going to be appointed, and they have to be already, only the following shall be eligible for appointment to and service on the board: Pierce County residents who serve as County Executive, Mayors, or Members of the County, City, or Town Council. Those are the only people that can be on there, already elected officials. I thought we got to elect who was going to be on the park board. I thought we already had a park board. I thought the County already had their own park board. I

don't want to see the City of Tacoma or their elected officials which would be on there because the City of Tacoma citizens would probably feel like maybe they would get a better deal out of it if they elected the people that was already on the city, and I can see the thing being weighted pretty lop-sided as to what the County residents would end up with on the board, and I don't think we need a new board. We already have a park board. I think the County already has their own park board, and I think that's enough. I think the money should be divided up in the first place, if they get this done, that the County should get their fourth, and the County park boards and the County residents should determine where that money is going to go, not some other board. And the same for the rest of the parks too, the City of Tacoma and the other parks. And I would like to see something in there that says that one-fourth of that money will actually be spent on the other parks in the City of Tacoma. Because they still haven't finished the one over here on, at McKinley, McKinley park, as far as I know. It was never finished, and it's still sitting there half done. So, and they've been going to do that for ages. They also gave away part of the park to the State, which it was supposed to be in perpetuity when they put I-5 through there, and that wasn't allowed either, but they did it anyway. Anyway, that's off the subject too. But,

CASADA. You've got just a few more minutes, Louise. Thank you.

BATCHELOR. But I've got a lot of problems about the way this is written and it really doesn't say too much of anything in here about exactly how the money is going to be spent, or anything, but I think there should be something in there that they have open meetings and stuff as to whatever would be spent, that money would be spent on, and it would be incorporated into the other stuff and so that it can't just all go into one place and I don't think the City of Tacoma should have anything to do with the money. In no way should the City of Tacoma have any of it. They might keep track of how much money there was or something, but it should stay. It should not become part of the general fund. Let's put it that way. Nobody's general fund. Not the County's, nor the City's. It should never go into the general fund because stuff goes in there and goes who-knows-where.

CASADA. Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak to R2000-70? Please come forward at this time.

DRESSLER. Good afternoon. My name is Darin Dressler, and I'm a citizen of the City of Tacoma, and I'm also on the Executive Board for the Western Neighborhood Council in Tacoma, and these supplanting languages seem to be of concern for some. That's probably an issue that we're going to have to individually address during budget time this fall with our individual Councils, and what not, and hope that our public input and support of the measure delivers the services that we're voting for, and that's probably a concern that does reside outside of this area. I hope that we can move forward with this, and the biggest concern that I have with the whole odyssey that this subject has been on, is that the coalitions that were built to get the legislation through the Legislature is enough to materialize into voters coming to the polls and supporting it from various areas of the County that had concerns with the original legislation. I'm certain that Tacoma will be there with its share of what it is going to take to get this passed, but it's real difficult when we're out-numbered about three-to-one, that this is really necessary that you can build something that everybody can have a piece of. And I would certainly hope that this could end up being the beginning or more collaborative efforts between the County and cities and Tacoma and with transportation and all the other issues, and criminal justice and things that you are facing, it's going to be real necessary that we can find more common ground. It, I disagree with certain portions of the bill, but it's something, it's making laws is like sausage making, it doesn't necessarily mean you have to like the smell, but at least if it gets through and does what is necessary. Anyway, I urge your support of this and thank you so much for the hard work that

all of you folks do for all of us.

CASADA. Thank you. Anyone else wish to speak to R2000-70?
Okay, I think we have an amendment, Mr. Brown.

(end of public testimony on R2000-70)

Brown moved adoption of an amendment as follows: on page 3 of 6, at line 10, insert 34838 in the first blank, and June 27, 2000 in the second blank; on page 3 of 6, at line 15, R54-00 and R55-00 in the first blank and June 26, 2000 in the second blank; motion seconded and passed.

Following Councilmember remarks, the Proposal passed as amended on a roll call vote of six to zero.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Brown moved approval of the Agenda; motion seconded and passed.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

a. Approval of Minutes

1. The minutes of the May 9, 2000, regular Council meeting.

b. Action on Ordinances (refer, set date of hearing)

1. PROPOSAL NO. 2000-45S, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL ALLOCATING \$64,000.00 OF THE \$1,000,000.00 CRIMINAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE RESERVE, WHICH WAS APPROPRIATED IN THE PIERCE COUNTY YEAR 2000 BUDGET, AND TRANSFERRING \$60,000 OF THAT ALLOCATION TO THE PERFORMANCE AUDIT BUDGET.
Sponsored by: Councilmember Wendell Brown
Contact person: Carolyn Pendle, 798-3631
DO PASS AS SUBSTITUTED RECOMMENDATION - BUDGET AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE (Jan Shabro, Chair; Karen S. Biskey, Vice Chair; Wendell Brown; Sarah Casada; Ken Madsen/excused)
Suggested date of Council hearing: July 25, 2000
2. PROPOSAL NO. 2000-51, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AMENDING SECTION 11.02.050 OF THE PIERCE COUNTY CODE "METHOD OF CALCULATING SERVICE CHARGES," (STORM DRAINAGE AND SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT) TO REVISE THE METHOD BY WHICH CREDITS TO SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT SERVICE CHARGES ARE CALCULATED.
Sponsored by: Councilmember Harold Moss
Contact person: Shawn Bunney, 798-3388
For referral to the Budget and Operations Committee

To be heard by the Budget and Operations Committee
on July 12, 2000

3. PROPOSAL NO. 2000-52, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL APPROVING THE TRANSFER OF A CERTAIN POWER FRANCHISE OWNERSHIP FROM TENASKA WASHINGTON PARTNERS II TO BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION TO FREDERICKSON POWER, L.L.C.
Sponsored by: Councilmember Harold Moss
Contact person: Jerry West, 798-3687
For referral to the Public Works Committee
Suggested date of Council hearing: August 1, 2000
 4. PROPOSAL NO. 2000-53, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL GRANTING A NON-EXCLUSIVE FRANCHISE TO PENINSULA LIGHT COMPANY, INC., OF PIERCE COUNTY, TO LOCATE ELECTRIC LINES ON CERTAIN COUNTY-OWNED RIGHT-OF-WAYS.
Sponsored by: Councilmember Harold Moss
Contact person: Jerry West, 798-3687
For referral to the Public Works Committee
 5. PROPOSAL NO. 2000-54, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL GRANTING A NON-EXCLUSIVE FRANCHISE TO WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION TO LOCATE WATER LINES ON CERTAIN COUNTY-OWNED RIGHTS-OF-WAY; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE SAID FRANCHISE.
Sponsored by: Councilmember Harold Moss
Contact person: Jerry West, 798-3687
For referral to the Public Works Committee
 6. PROPOSAL NO. 2000-55, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AMENDING TITLE 18B OF THE PIERCE COUNTY CODE, THE PIERCE COUNTY SIGN CODE, TO MODIFY SIGN STANDARDS FOR THE KEY PENINSULA, AND TO CLARIFY THE GEOGRAPHICAL AREA COVERED BY THE VARIOUS SIGN DESIGN CHAPTERS IN TITLE 18B; CONSOLIDATING ALL SIGN REGULATIONS INTO TITLE 18B, INCLUDING NECESSARY TECHNICAL CHANGES; RECODIFYING EXISTING SIGN DEFINITIONS FROM TITLE 18A TO TITLE 18B; RECODIFYING SIGN DESIGN STANDARDS FROM TITLE 18J TO TITLE 18B; ELIMINATING REPETITIVE DEFINITIONS AND PERMIT EXEMPTIONS; SETTING AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT.
Sponsored by: Councilmember Karen S. Biskey
Contact person: Anna Graham, 798-6253
For referral to the Planning Committee
- c. Action on Resolutions (refer, set date of hearing)
 - d. Other Items

Brown moved approval of the Consent Agenda; motion seconded and passed on a roll call vote of six to zero.

VI. MESSAGES FROM EXECUTIVE/JUDGES/PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

1. A message from the Executive transmitting the following Ordinances, which were approved and signed on June 15, 2000, was read into the record:

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-18, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL CANCELING CERTAIN UNCOLLECTIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES.

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-19S, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AMENDING SECTION 4A.20.020 OF THE PIERCE COUNTY CODE, "IMPACT FEE CALCULATIONS" FOR REGIONAL PARK IMPACT FEES; CLARIFYING LANGUAGE BUT NOT CHANGING THE FEE OBLIGATION; AMENDING PIERCE COUNTY CODE 4A.20.030 A, "IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE"; CLARIFYING THE COUNCIL'S INTENT FOR THE USE OF REGIONAL PARK IMPACT FEE FUNDS; REQUESTING THAT THE COMPREHENSIVE PARK AND RECREATION PLAN RECOMMEND CHANGES TO THE LEVELS OF SERVICE INCLUDING A COMPONENT FOR FACILITIES, FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN FOR 2001; AND REQUESTING AN ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE ON THE USE OF REGIONAL PARK IMPACT FEES.

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-24, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE APPROVAL OF TIMBER LAND CLASSIFICATION UNDER CURRENT USE ASSESSMENT ON CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED BOUNDARIES OF PIERCE COUNTY, IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, AND RANGE 6 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT. (APPLICATION NO. OS(T)23-99, ROBERT AND JIMMIE WINTERS, SOUTH PRAIRIE AREA)

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-30, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE APPROVAL OF TIMBER LAND CLASSIFICATION UNDER CURRENT USE ASSESSMENT ON CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED BOUNDARIES OF PIERCE COUNTY, LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 17 NORTH, RANGE 3 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT. (APPLICATION NO. OS(T)24-99, ERIC W. HAYNES - ROY AREA)

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-31, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE APPROVAL OF TIMBER LAND CLASSIFICATION UNDER CURRENT USE ASSESSMENT ON CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED BOUNDARIES OF PIERCE

COUNTY, LOCATED IN THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 1 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT. (APPLICATION NO. OST25-99, SAM D. SMITH - ANDERSON ISLAND)

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-32, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE APPROVAL OF OPEN SPACE CLASSIFICATION UNDER CURRENT USE ASSESSMENT ON CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED BOUNDARIES OF PIERCE COUNTY, LOCATED IN THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 8, TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 6 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT. (APPLICATION NO. OS10-99, DAVID P. MESHKE - BUCKLEY AREA)

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-40, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF OPEN SPACE CLASSIFICATION UNDER CURRENT USE ASSESSMENT ON CERTAIN PROPERTY WHICH IS LOCATED WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED BOUNDARIES OF PIERCE COUNTY, IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 17 NORTH, RANGE 3 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT. (APPLICATION NO. OS17-99, DAVID GOODSON - TANWAX AREA)

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-41, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE APPROVAL OF OPEN SPACE CLASSIFICATION UNDER CURRENT USE ASSESSMENT ON CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED BOUNDARIES OF PIERCE COUNTY, WHICH IS LOCATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 7, TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 4 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT. (APPLICATION NO. OS27-99, PETER AND ANNIE LANEY - PUYALLUP AREA)

ORDINANCE NO. 2000-42, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE APPROVAL OF OPEN SPACE CLASSIFICATION UNDER CURRENT USE ASSESSMENT ON CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED BOUNDARIES OF PIERCE COUNTY, LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 8, SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 9, AND NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 16, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT. (APPLICATION NO. OS26-99, M. LESLIE FOSS - KEY PENINSULA AREA)

VII. PROCLAMATIONS, AWARDS, AND/OR APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

PROPOSAL NO. R2000-78, A RESOLUTION OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL COMMEMORATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF PENINSULA LIGHT COMPANY, AND DECLARING THE DAY OF SATURDAY, JULY 15, 2000, AS PENINSULA LIGHT COMPANY DAY IN PIERCE COUNTY.

Brown moved adoption; motion seconded. The Clerk read the Proclamation into the record. The Proposal passed on a roll call vote of six to zero.

Rob Orton, General Manager for Peninsula Light Company, thanked the Council for their recognition. He invited the Council to the open house and lunch on Thursday, July 13, and encouraged them to visit the displays.

VIII. ORDINANCES

PROPOSAL NO. 2000-28, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL VACATING A PORTION OF DOGWOOD STREET, AND A PORTION OF CORNELL ROAD, WHICH ARE LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 20 NORTH, RANGE 3 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, IN THE EAST TACOMA AREA.

Brown moved adoption; motion seconded. The Clerk read the title into the record.

Staff Testimony

Jennifer Andres, Public Works and Utilities Department, stated the County has had this right-of-way since 1910. She stated it has never been used by the County, and it is not needed in the County road system.

The Chair called for public testimony; there was no response. The Proposal passed on a roll call vote of six to zero.

PROPOSAL NO. 2000-38, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL VACATING A PORTION OF CRESCENT VALLEY CUT-OFF RIGHT-OF-WAY, WHICH IS LOCATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 33, TOWNSHIP 22 NORTH, RANGE 2 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY BEING LOCATED IN THE GIG HARBOR AREA.

Brown moved adoption; motion seconded. The Clerk read the title into the record.

Staff Testimony

Andres stated this vacation request represents a 30-foot strip of property that is not being used by the County for its road system. She stated there is an agreement among the property owners that there will be an easement for those requiring one so that no property owner is landlocked.

The Chair called for public testimony; there was no response. The Proposal passed on a roll call vote of six to zero.

PROPOSAL NO. 2000-39, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL VACATING A PORTION OF RHODES LAKE ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY, WHICH IS LOCATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 8, TOWNSHIP 19 NORTH, RANGE 5 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY BEING LOCATED IN THE BONNEY LAKE AREA.

Brown moved adoption; motion seconded. The Clerk read the title into the record.

Staff Testimony

Andres stated this portion of right-of-way represents a road that was realigned during the development of the Creek Ridge Glen development. The vacation request represents a portion of road that is no longer needed or being used. In response to Shabro's request for clarification, Andres explained the difference between vacation and condemnation of property.

The Chair called for public testimony; there was no response. The Proposal passed on a roll call vote of six to zero.

PROPOSAL NO. 2000-48, AN ORDINANCE OF THE PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL CONFIRMING THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES REGARDING THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF DANGEROUS STRUCTURES FROM THE DEL RIO MOBILE HOME PARK; ASSESSING THE COSTS OF SUCH DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL AGAINST THE REAL PROPERTY UPON WHICH SUCH COSTS WERE INCURRED BY PIERCE COUNTY; AND DIRECTING THE ASSESSOR-TREASURER TO PLACE SUCH ASSESSMENTS ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLL AS LIENS AGAINST THE PARCELS OF REAL PROPERTY ASSESSED.

Brown moved adoption; motion seconded. The Clerk read the title into the record.

Staff Testimony

Tony Tipton, Public Works and Utilities Department, stated passage of this Ordinance would allow the County to collect on a lien that is on this property to recover abatement costs associated with destruction to the property related to a recent flood. He stated the storm debris caused a safety and health issue. Since the property had been taken over by squatters and drug dealing, and other activities were occurring, it became necessary for the County to abate the property.

The Chair called for public testimony; there was no response. The Proposal passed on a roll call vote of six to zero.

X. OTHER BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Brown moved to approve the request of the Board of Equalization to convene on July 17, 2000, to meet and act on timely-filed taxpayer petitions, pursuant to RCW 84.48.010; motion seconded.

Staff Testimony

Susan Long stated a request had been received from the Board, and pursuant to State statute when certain criteria is met, legislative approval is required.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

XI. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS - None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Attest:

Clerk of the Council

Approved:

Council Chair

8/15/2000
Date Approved

f:\wpfiles\cncl711.min.doc