

## **GIG HARBOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 9, 2007**

**PRESENT:** Councilmembers Ekberg, Young, Franich, Conan, Dick, Payne, Kadzik and Mayor Hunter.

**CALL TO ORDER:** 6:00 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

### **CONSENT AGENDA:**

These consent agenda items are considered routine and may be adopted with one motion as per Gig Harbor Ordinance No. 799.

1. Approval of the Minutes of Council Retreat of February 28, 2007, Visioning Worksession on Gig Harbor North, March 24, 2007, Joint City Council and Planning Commission Meeting of March 19, 2007, and City Council Meeting of March 26, 2007.
2. Receive and File: Comcast Annual Report.
3. Proclamation: Parks Appreciation Day.
4. Escrow Agreement for Retainage - Rosedale Street – Tucci & Sons Construction.
5. Outdoor Concert Contracts: Don Miller, Swing Reunion Orchestra; Gary Dewhirst, Dewgrass; Michael Oneill; Tim Noah; Danny Smith; Billy Shew; Rebecca Sharrett, 133rd ARMY BAND; Linda Casperson, GHSNO; Dean Zelikovsky, Machine Entertainment; Dave Sederberg, Pacific Stage.
6. Resolution - Surplus Property.
7. Olympic/56<sup>th</sup> Street Improvement Project – Right-of-Way Dedication and Temporary Slope Easement.
8. Wilkinson Barn / Historic Structures Report - Consultant Services Contract.
9. Downtown Parking and Beautification Plan - Consultant Services Contract.
10. Gig Harbor Arts Commission - Re-appointment of Betty Willis for One Additional Year.
11. Resolution – Authorizing Grant Application Assistance – WA State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.
12. Approval of Payment of Bills for April 9, 2007:  
Checks #53257 through #53377 in the amount of \$280,205.58.
13. Approval of Payment of Payroll for March:  
Checks #4608 through #4649 and direct deposit entries in the amount of \$459,838.45.

Mayor Hunter said that there had been a Council request to move items number nine and 10 to New Business.

**MOTION:** Move to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.  
**Franich / Conan** - unanimously approved.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. Second Reading of Ordinance – Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process. Carol Morris, City Attorney, presented this ordinance that describes the process for applicants to request Comprehensive Plan Amendments. She suggested an amendment to the submission deadline in 19.09.030 in order to accommodate the year 2007. It was discussed and decided that the amendment to the ordinance would read: “Applications received by August 15, 2007 will be considered during the current annual review period. Thereafter, applications received by the last working day in February will be considered during the current annual review period, subject to GHMC 19.09.010 and 19.09.020 above.”

**MOTION:** Move to approve Ordinance No. 1074 as amended.  
**Kadzik / Young** - unanimously approved.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. First Reading of Ordinance – Grease Interceptor/Trap Rules and Regulations. Rob Karlinsey, City Administrator, explained that this ordinance would provide additional criteria for when grease interceptors are required. He introduced Darrel Winans, Wastewater Treatment Plant Supervisor.

Mr. Winans explained that the last time a change was made in the City Code was in 1974. A common theme in inspection reports throughout the years is the need for re-inspections due to lack of maintenance or cleaning of the interceptors by those businesses that generate the grease. Since that time, there has been an increase in the numbers of generators, which has resulted in the amount of grease discharged into the collection system. This means higher disposal costs. He said that there is a need to reduce the amount of fats, oils and greases entering the treatment system. This ordinance is designed to help enforce that process.

Mr. Winans continued to explain that approximately 55% of the businesses who generate the problem show any concern with complying with the regulations to maintain their grease traps or interceptors. This ordinance is both informational and more stringent in an attempt to gain compliance. The impacts to the business will be negligible to those who are performing adequate maintenance. Mr. Winans then said that this ordinance will outline guidelines and imposes fees if the generators are not willing to comply. He said that if this is adopted, it will be a major undertaking and will require additional staff time.

Mr. Winans gave an overview of recommended amendments to the draft ordinance. The first would be to Section 13.30.040, paragraph A-1, to exempt Coffee Shops with three or less fixtures. The second amendment in the same Section, paragraph B, to insert “with occupancy of twelve or more” and the final amendment to Section 13.30.110 on page 19, paragraph A, to add: “Any facilities using five or more fixtures shall install a minimum 750 gallon grease interceptor.”

Councilmember Franich asked for the cost of a grease interceptor. Mr. Winans explained that they run about \$5000 - \$6000 dollars. The smaller grease traps are about \$2000. If two traps are required, then it is more cost effective, and better for the system to install the interceptor. He said that there were 83 businesses being inspected last year. He added that there should be no grandfathering of businesses because there is already existing language requiring an upgrade if necessary.

Mayor Hunter said that no one would be required to upgrade unless they are remodeling or if they are in violation of the discharge limits.

Mr. Winans answered questions on how this ordinance would be administered, explaining that the burden of proof of violation would be on city staff through follow-up inspections. The first inspection is no charge. If needed the business would be given a 30 day notice before re-inspection. If not clean, there would be a \$250 fine and another thirty day notice. After the re-inspection, if it is still not clean, there would be another \$250 fine and another thirty day notice. If the violation still exists, then an outside entity would be brought in to clean the interceptor which would be charged to the business. He stressed that the main focus is to educate the businesses to avoid these charges.

Councilmember Dick voiced support for this ordinance and encouraged placing a lien on the property to ensure compliance.

Councilmember Ekberg asked for clarification on how many inspections would be required in the future and if a new staff position is being created. Mr. Winans explained staff is behind already, and they do need additional staff. He then explained that the staff is willing to work with what they have if they know that there will be a way to ensure compliance. He said that the inspections are a necessity, adding that he doesn't believe it would require another full-time position. He said that they do need help in catching up.

Councilmember Young asked if there is a way to quantify the impact of the smaller businesses on the system. Mr. Winans said it would be tough, adding that for the most part, the small businesses are better at taking care of maintenance than the larger ones.

Councilmember Payne asked for an estimate of the cost if this process isn't put in place and the impact on the equipment. Mr. Winans responded that approximately \$10,000 annually. In addition to that, if there is property damage as a result of a sewer backup caused by grease, then that could result in clean-up costs and a possible increase in insurance premiums. He continued to explain that the grease content hinders the dewatering of the biosolids, resulting in a higher cost for disposal. He then said that maintenance is one of the biggest expenses that would be over and above the \$10,000 estimated cost he mentioned before. The grease residual causes foam that creates odor and so it has to be continually maintained by staff.

Councilmember Payne then asked for clarification on the frequency of maintenance to maintain a grease interceptor. Mr. Winans explained that this is defined in the draft ordinance. He said that the recommendation is to clean an interceptor every 120 days

and a grease trap weekly. He stressed that staff would work with each individual generator to adjust and establish a schedule which would be part of their grease permit. He then explained that basically, everyone has an ordinance similar to this.

Councilmember Kadzik commented on the readability and format of the ordinance. He recommended clarifying a definition of the term “entrepreneur.” He also recommended that the definition of nursing homes and convalescent homes is redundant, and that the same terms utilized by the Design Manual be used throughout. He asked where the exemptions would be listed. Mr. Winans responded that the exemptions would be listed in the exceptions section of the ordinance.

Mr. Karlinsey thanked Darrel Winans and recognized Joe Pominville, Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator, who accompanied Mr. Winans.

This will return for a second reading at the next meeting.

2. First Reading of Ordinance – Budget Amendment for Drug Investigation Fund. David Rodenbach, Finance Director, presented this ordinance that would allow expenditure of an unexpected distribution of \$76,653 from the Westsound Narcotics Enforcement Team as the city’s share of a drug investigation and enforcement action. He explained that the funds can be spent on any drug-connected enforcement.

Mayor Hunter recognized Chief Davis for his effort in going after the city’s share. Councilmember Young added that Detective Fred Douglas was very instrumental in his role on the Enforcement Team.

3. Public Hearing and First Reading of Ordinance – To Allow Zoning Code Text Amendments by City Council. Rob Karlinsey presented the background on this ordinance that allows certain text amendments and area-wide rezones to be considered by Council without being first sent to the Planning Commission. He said that the items that can be considered are limited to those listed in Section A-1 and A-2 of the ordinance.

Councilmember Franich said that the language is broad and gives Council a lot of discretion. He asked if language could be added that the Planning Commission would have an opportunity to request that they be able to hear the issue first.

Mr. Karlinsey explained that this is the policy and Tom Dolan, Planning Director, is working on a procedure that will include notification of the Planning Commission when there is direct consideration by Council.

Councilmember Young said that the Planning Commission would be invited to give input, but ultimately, it is a Council decision. Councilmember Dick explained that in the Joint Worksession it was discussed and decided that if Council is to take direct action, the decision would be preceded by public notice, giving opportunity for anyone to come to Council and comment. He added that deference would be given to any concerns

voiced by the Planning Commission. In addition, they would be given notice of any proposal if they wish to comment.

Mayor Hunter opened the public hearing at 7:26 p.m. No one came forward to speak and so he closed the public hearing. This will return for a second reading at the next meeting.

4. Public Hearing and First Reading of Ordinance – Traffic Impact Fees Update. Steven Misiurak, City Engineer, presented this ordinance to update the city's Traffic Impact Fee schedule. He noted that this update is an interim update to consider growth over the next six years. He said that City Staff will do a twenty-year future analysis which will be brought back to Council as an amendment to the Impact Fees Ordinance by the end of the year. He added that representatives from David Evans and Associates are present to assist him in addressing questions.

Councilmember Ekberg commented that the Operations and Public Projects Committee has met many times on this subject and worked closely with Steve to bring this forward. He encouraged other Councilmembers to ask questions.

Councilmember Young said that this is more appropriate than the fee than was first presented adding that he appreciated the effort. Councilmember Kadzik asked to go through a couple of line items to help clarify how the fees are calculated.

Mr. Misiurak explained the calculation formula. He then addressed Council's questions by explaining how the ITE trip rates used in these calculations were developed. He added that these ITE Trip Rates are the industry standards, but they could be modified if someone brought in additional information.

Councilmember Franich voiced concern with the inequity of these numbers. He said that one superstore in an urban area would generate more traffic than one with nearby competitors.

Mr. Misiurak responded that it has to do with the surrounding area and the network of roads that serve the store. He said that it would have to be considered on an individual basis to determine any variation.

Councilmember Young stressed that you have to start with some numbers or else a traffic analysis would have to be done on every single project. Councilmember Ekberg said that this is an option for a business to present. He said that he would prefer to keep the ITE code intact and allow this option. Councilmember Kadzik agreed, adding that the burden of proof would lie with the applicant.

Councilmember Franich responded that our stores generate more trips than in other urban areas. Staff should be trying to investigate whether or not there is credence to the ITE Trip Rates.

Rob Karlinsey suggested that Victor Salemann, David Evans and Associates, may be able to address these concerns.

Mr. Salemann said that the figures reflect the p.m. peak hour trip rate and so the variation on trip generation is not nearly as big during the p.m. peak than during the daily trips. The other piece of data is a study that calibrates the current ground trips along Borgen Boulevard to the ITE trip rates being used. Mr. Salemann further explained that with regional retail centers, people tend to “cross-shop” with on trip, but you don’t seem to get the same amount of p.m. peak increase because they are in one store for the first hour, and the next hour is outside the time being adjusted for. He said that variations do occur on the data and that is why they recommend letting the applicant provide their own, unique information. He then addressed the regional center verses the isolated center concern. He explained that daily, the two behave differently, but during the p.m. peak hours, they are very similar.

Mayor Hunter opened the public hearing at 7:03 p.m. and asked those speaking to limit comments to three minutes.

John Alexander – Master Builders Association of Pierce County. Mr. Alexander said that he submitted written comments and wanted to touch on some of the points. He expressed appreciation for the city’s leadership in studying the issue and obtaining input from all concerns. He said they philosophically oppose impact fees, which have an accelerating affect on home prices. He said that this proposal, in its current form, is the result of careful planning and a good effort by the city to seek funding for needed improvements while minimizing the affect on housing costs. He said that they appreciate the effort to balance impact fees with other funding sources. Because of the high housing prices, a lower impact fee is in the best interest of those wishing to locate within the city. The low fee sends a positive message to the surrounding jurisdictions, to new home buyers and to the development community that you care about quality growth as well as providing for new facilities. Mr. Alexander then asked for clarification between the difference in fees for the six-year model and for the twenty-year model. He said that the City of Fife recently adopted a twenty-year model with the highest impact fee in the Pierce County area of just under \$7000 per single family residence. He also asked which projects from the improvement list have priority and what affect will they have on the areas they are meant to serve. He offered continued support in helping the city to facilitate future growth.

Steve Misiurak responded to the questions. He said that they do not know how much higher the impact fees will be with the twenty- year model until they do the analysis. He said that the projects with high priority are the Westside Projects as well as along Burnham Drive. He added that the city is working on a pro-rata share potential SEPA mitigation cost sharing, which will be in addition to the impact fees.

Mark Dorsey – North Pacific Design – 2727 Hollycroft. Mr. Dorsey said he appreciated the efforts in getting this document prepared. He suggested that an additional column or a few examples in which you could run typical square footages would help to clarify

the document. He said that many currently allowed uses will be restricted by the impact fees, and if you could readily identify these, you may be able to go back and change the rates to prevent this.

Councilmember Young said that he had that same concern. The problem is that if you use the ITE manual, you have to use the trips outlined in the manual. If you do, you can't discount any one category. He asked the city attorney if there is a way to give a discount for a zone or for different types of businesses.

Carol Morris responded that there is a procedure that allows someone to provide their own study. Councilmember Young then asked if it was an activity that would produce that level of traffic but it is an activity that the city wants to encourage such as a high income employer. Ms. Morris answered that state law allows us to give exemptions or reductions in fees for low-income housing, and for other projects of broad public import.

Mr. Dorsey said that this is his concern. There will be certain businesses driven away because they don't have the ability to pay the fees.

Warren Zimmerman – 2717 Ryan Lane. Mr. Zimmerman said that he is representing the Gig Harbor Chamber of Commerce, adding that at the November Board Meeting, the Chamber wrote a letter to the Mayor and City Council in support of impact fees. He distributed a copy of the letter.

No one else came forward to speak and the Mayor closed the public hearing at 7:13 p.m. This will return for a second reading at the next meeting.

5. Public Hearing and First Reading of Ordinance – Clarifying the Procedures to Determine Impact Fee Credits. Mr. Misiurak presented this ordinance and offered to answer questions.

Mayor Hunter opened the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

John Chadwell – Olympic Property Group – 4423 Point Fosdick Drive, Suite 302. Mr. Chadwell said that he appreciates the intent of the ordinance, but said it contains details that are problematic. He said that his concern is on page six, Section B which sets the deadline for a request for credits at a time that has already passed for their project.

Steve Misiurak responded that their development is already in the queue, will follow the procedure currently in place. Carol Morris clarified that ordinances always operate prospectively unless they specifically say that it acts retrospectively.

Mr. Chadwell continued to say another problem that the ordinance doesn't address is the traffic improvements that OPG was required to construct. Now that they have been constructed, they are off the TIP, and so when their application is reviewed for credit, these projects don't appear.

Mr. Misiurak explained that the improvements only need to appear on the System Roadway Improvement Plan, in which Harbor Hill is included, so it meets the criterion.

Mayor Hunter closed the public hearing at 7:19 p.m.

6. Traffic Forecasting Model and Capacity Availability Report Presentation - David Evans and Associates, Inc. Victor Salemann, David Evans and Associates, presented a comprehensive overview of the summary that DEA has been working on for the past year to help the city to monitor traffic both currently and in the future. He said that the application used to do the traffic modeling is called Visum which has the capability to forecast how much traffic will be generated by new development activity. This will allow the city to plan for future improvements.

After the PowerPoint Presentation, Mr. Salemann addressed Council's questions regarding the report. He also answered questions on the software program and how it compares to what other jurisdictions use.

Mark Dorsey, North Pacific Design. Mr. Dorsey said that in general, everyone is please with the modeling that DEA is going to be doing, and that DEA is the keeper of the model. He voiced concern that the ordinance has DEA as the consultant for the model and also as the preparer of all traffic impact analysis. He said that there is an inherent danger in having them perform both duties, as the model may become myopic. There are a number of competent, qualified traffic consultants whose opinions are valuable. By allowing input from another consultant, you are allowing for a more dynamic, correct model. He suggested that the city not limit the preparation of an impact analysis to just one consultant.

7. First Reading of Ordinance – Contract with State Treasurer L.O.C.A.L. David Rodenbach presented this ordinance that would allow the city to execute the contracts and documents to allow the city to participate in the state's financing program for equipment purchases; in this case, for the police vehicles. This will return at the next meeting for a second reading.

8. Public Hearing and First Reading of Ordinance – Amendments to the City's Transportation Concurrency Management System. Steve Misiurak explained that currently, any required impact analyses are prepared by a private traffic engineering retained by the developer. This ordinance amends the process to require that the impact analysis be done by the city's on-call consultant, David Evans and Associates who would also provide a plan for mitigation for the proposed development and a concurrency test. This ordinance has been before the Operations and Public Projects Committee, who were supportive. He offered to answer questions.

Councilmember Franich asked when staff would begin to run the traffic model in-house, adding that he has some of the same concerns as voiced by Mr. Dorsey. He said that he has problems with the assumptions that go into these models.



Mr. Misiurak responded that due to the complexity and staffing, it would take approximately a year before this would occur. He added that staff will encourage developers to collaborate in developing the traffic model.

Councilmember Payne clarified that he has reservations on this ordinance, some of which are related to having the same consultant running the model and doing the analysis. He said he prefers city staff to run the model. He then said he would like more information on the software as the city is hanging its future on this traffic model. He said he wants to make sure we are choosing the right model, in case someone challenges the data.

Mr. Misiurak said that someone could challenge the results of the model with their own independent analysis. A CD of the database is currently available that has been given to traffic engineers who have requested the information. In addition, there is a written list of assumptions that were used when the model was created.

Mayor Hunter said that a main goal is to get staff up to speed to be able to run the models. Councilmember Ekberg suggested that Victor could supply information from other jurisdictions using the program. He then said that staff will be monitoring the model as it is used, and these tools allow more accuracy and an ability to make corrections than what we have done in the past.

Mayor Hunter stressed that you have to make every effort to keep on top of the traffic issue to prevent what is happening now, using the out of date impact fees as an example.

Councilmember Young asked if there would be a way to conduct a more extensive "back-testing" to determine if the modeling is accurate in predicting the city's unique situation.

Mr. Misiurak responded that one of the calibration checks that Victor discussed is a comparison of the model results to existing traffic counts taken on the city streets. He said that city-wide traffic counts will be taken on a routine basis to compare with the output of the model.

Councilmember Dick asked if these traffic counts are a budgeted item. Mr. Misiurak explained that we are developing a system to routinely do traffic counts in-house.

Mayor Hunter opened the public hearing at 8:10 p.m.

John Chadwell – Olympic Property Group. Mr. Chadwell agreed that someone needs to be the keeper of the model, but it is problematic to tell the development community that they have to use the city's consultant to do the traffic impact analysis. He explained that during the Gig Harbor North Traffic Options Committee meetings, his consultant came in with suggestions for different ways to fix the interchange that weren't even considered until just recently. He said that it is healthy to have different

traffic consultants evaluating the model. Mr. Chadwell then said that a model that is consistent from one project to the next is great, but he cautioned against requiring the use of the same consultant contracted through the city. He explained that for a large project, this is problematic because a developer needs the traffic consultants with them during the design phase. He suggested the following solutions: Staff could create a common format for the report, clearing defining the format and content making it easy to review and to verify in the model. Another suggestion would be to allow profession design consultants to utilize the city's traffic model during their analysis, as Mr. Misiurak indicated is going to be done. He then suggested that the city should allow the option for developers to have the city prepare the traffic report, but also give the option to allow a developer to use their own traffic engineer to do the report using the city's model.

Mr. Chadwell stressed that there is more than one way to solve a problem, and with changes, this ordinance could give the same desired outcome without burdening the development community. He said that it might result in fewer arguments. Another benefit of allowing developers to do their own study would be a free traffic update every so often. He referred to the process used by the City of Lacey which allows you to submit a scoping memo for the city's traffic engineer to run through the model. Mr. Chadwell finalized by saying that the city may not want to stray this far into untested waters on an ordinance that strays so far from the norm.

Councilmember Young requested that Mr. Chadwell send him an e-mail with these bulleted comments so that he could follow up with staff.

Mayor Hunter closed the public hearing at 8:15 p.m.

9. Public Hearing and Resolution Authorizing a Utility Extension Capacity Agreement – Dorland. Rob Karlinsey presented this request for 1 ERU sewer hookup for property located near the intersection of 51<sup>st</sup> and Reid Road.

Councilmembers asked for clarification on the location of the property and the existing sewer line. Mr. Misiurak described the existing system and the neighborhood it serves, and future plans for improvements.

**MOTION:** Move to approve Resolution No. 707 authorizing an outside Utility Extension Capacity Agreement.  
**Payne / Kadzik** – unanimously approved.

10. First Reading of Ordinance – Gig Harbor Arts Commission Amending GHMC Section 2.49.010. Rob Karlinsey explained that currently the Arts Commission consists of nine members; a majority of which are required to live in the city. He said that the Mayor and he met with Betty Willis, Chair of the GHAC, and Robert Sullivan, Co-Chair, to discuss the difficulty in recruitment of city residents and the lack of a quorum to hold meetings. A recommendation was made to reduce the number of members to seven

and to have a majority of the members “preferred” to live in the city rather than being a requirement.

In addition, Betty Willis has served her term limits, and is requesting to serve for one more year in the current vacant position in order to allow continuity in the commission.

Councilmember Ekberg said that this came before the Council’s Interview Committee, and they struggled with these issues. He said that they were unaware that there would be an ordinance coming before Council at this meeting, or they would have gotten a report to the Council. He explained that this is the only committee that has nine members and they discussed the requirement to live in the city. He said that there were six applicants who applied for the five open positions and they were prepared to recommend five names to the Mayor to bring before Council. The Committee concurred that with that many new members, they should move forward with a recommendation to re-appoint Betty to serve the one-year term. There was no consensus on the other issues of the number of members or residency.

Councilmember Payne agreed with reducing the size of the commission at some point. He pointed out that the requirement is to either “live or work” in the city. He said that he understands the need for a quality Arts Commission. However, his vision for the group is more than simply approving the grant money for performing arts or art shows each year. He said he would also like them to commission art pieces for our public parks. He voiced a preference for an acknowledgement in the ordinance that a specific number either reside or work within the city.

Councilmember Young said the same concerns came about with the Design Review Board. He said that it is different with the lay committees in which you look for people interested in participating and not necessarily experts in a field. With the Arts Commission or Design Review Board, you are looking for those who know what they are doing. He said that he doesn’t care whether or not they live or work in town, stressing that if the requirement is eliminated, the whole section with the word “preferred” should be struck. Let the Council at the time decide what to do.

Councilmember Ekberg asked if the Interview Committee should forward the names of the five applicants and keep the nine members at this time. If the ordinance passes, then as two terms expire, the number would naturally be reduced to seven. The other option would be to pass the ordinance and only add two people. Councilmember Kadzik commented that there is the quorum issue with nine.

Councilmember Franich said that he would like all appointments to the Boards and Commissions be city residents if possible. Councilmember Ekberg responded that of the six applicants, only one lived in the city and one worked at an art gallery. There were a lot of good quality people, but not that would fit the requirement.

**MOTION:** Move to appoint Betty Willis for the remaining unexpired term of Kit Kuhn on the Arts Commission.  
**Ekberg / Young** – unanimously approved.

Rob Karlinsey asked for clarification on amendments to the ordinance before the second reading. Councilmembers continued discussion.

Bob Sullivan – Vice Chair of the Gig Harbor Arts Commission. Mr. Sullivan explained that he will be appointed Chair at the next meeting, but they are postponing their meeting until these issues are addressed. He agreed with the comment that no matter where the commission members live, the art work will be placed in the city and Council will have the final authority. He said that in 2008, three terms will expire, and at that point the number could be reduced to seven. He said that due to illness and family issues, they have had difficulty in obtaining a quorum and with seven members, they may have an even more difficult time. Nine members seem to be working and they have quality people who have applied.

Councilmember Ekberg said that Mr. Sullivan has gone out of his way to solicit quality people and this may be a good time to utilize the nine members; get them up to speed and then look at cutting the number later on or to change the quorum requirement.

Mayor Hunter suggested leaving the number at nine, and then remove the stipulation that they live in the city. The Council agreed to remove the language. Mr. Karlinsey was asked to consult the City Attorney about lower the quorum requirement.

11. Downtown Parking and Beautification Plan - Consultant Services Contract.  
(Moved from the Consent Agenda).

**MOTION:** Move to table this agenda item.  
**Dick / Franich** – unanimously approved.

12. Gig Harbor Arts Commission - Re-appointment of Betty Willis for One Additional Year. (Moved from the Consent Agenda) This was discussed and action taken under a previous agenda item.

**STAFF REPORT:**

1. 2006 Variance and Shoreline Permitting Activity. Rob Karlinsey explained that this report is provided to Council annually for review.

2. Estuary Park Name. Rob Karlinsey said that the Historical Society came up with some recommendations to consider for this new park. Councilmember Ekberg asked that this come back as a business item in order to take action.

Councilmembers asked if this had been given to the Parks Commission. Mr. Karlinsey explained that the commission was told that the recommendation would go directly from the Historical Society to Council. He did send a copy of this memo to that they would

know the suggested names and that it would come before Council, but their input was not requested. He offered to send any comments from the Parks Commission to Council.

Councilmember Franich asked if the public had been asked for input. The response was no. Mr. Karlinsey asked Council to send him any recommendations and he would put together an agenda bill and resolution for a future meeting. He was asked to pronounce the names.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Councilmember Young suggested that the city begin negotiations on the park property identified in the meeting with OPG. He said that this would also free up trips that they could trade to another entity and would allow the opportunity to plan this area.

**MOTION:** Move to direct staff to begin negotiations for the park property identified next to the Little League fields as discussed in the meeting with OPG.  
**Young / Ekberg** – unanimously approved.

### **MAYOR’S REPORT / COUNCIL COMMENTS / COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

Pierce Transit Request for Nomination. Mayor Hunter asked for a motion to nominate one of the representatives running for a position on the Pierce Transit Board of Commissioners. Councilmember Young spoke highly of Dave Enslow, as he has been active in transit issues, and has served on the Sound Transit Board and Pierce Transit Board.

**MOTION:** Move to authorize the Mayor to vote for Dave Enslow, City of Sumner, to serve as a member of the Board of Commissioners for Pierce Transit for a three-year term.  
**Young / Dick** – six voted in favor. Councilmember Franich voted no.

### **ANNOUNCEMENT OF OTHER MEETINGS:**

1. GH North Traffic Options Committee – Wednesday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, at 9:00 a.m. in Community Rooms A & B.
2. Operations & Public Projects Committee Meeting – Thursday, April 19<sup>th</sup>, at 3:00 p.m. in the Eng/Operations Conference Room.
3. Ribbon Cutting Ceremony – Donkey Creek Viewing Platform – April 19<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 p.m. at the corner of Harborview/North Harborview Drive at Donkey Creek Park.
4. Groundbreaking Ceremony for St. Anthony Hospital – April 26<sup>th</sup>.
5. Parks Appreciation Day Celebration – April 28<sup>th</sup>.

Due to the conflict on April 19<sup>th</sup>, the Operations and Public Projects Committee Meeting was moved to Friday, April 20<sup>th</sup>. Rob Karlinsey also asked that this committee hold a second meeting on April 26<sup>th</sup> in order to address the number of items on the agenda. Councilmembers agreed to meet on both dates.

Councilmember Kadzik mentioned a Planning / Building meeting at 5:00 p.m. on Monday.

**ADJOURN:**

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn at 8:55 p.m.  
**Franich / Payne** – unanimously approved.

CD recorder utilized:  
Disk #1 Tracks 1- 26  
Disk #2 Tracks 1 – 16  
Disk #3 Tracks 1 - 6

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles L. Hunter, Mayor

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Molly Towslee, City Clerk