I. CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Neil Johnson

A. Flag Salute:

B. Roll Call: [A1.3]

Elected Officials: Mayor Neil Johnson, Deputy Mayor Dan Swatman, Councilmember David Bowen, Councilmember Phil DeLeo, Councilmember Mark Hamilton, Councilmember Dave King, Councilmember Cheryle Noble and Councilmember Jim Rackley.

[Staff expected to be in attendance: City Administrator Don Morrison, Planning & Community Development Director Bob Leedy, Public Works Director Dan Grigsby, Community Services Director Gary Leaf, Administrative Services Director/City Clerk Harwood Edvalson, Chief Financial Officer Beth Anne Wroe, Interim Police Chief Buster McGehee, Judge James Helbling and City Attorney Jim Dionne.]

C. Announcements, Appointments and Presentations: [A3.6.9]

1. Announcements:
   a. Proclamation: Lieutenant Tom Jenkins.

2. Appointments: None.

3. Presentations:
   a. AB06-139 – Eastown ULID Update – Dan Grigsby
   b. AB06-146 – Planning Commission Recommendations On The Utilities Element Of
      the Comprehensive Plan.
   c. AB06-147 – Planning Commission Recommendations On The Transportation
      Element Of The Comprehensive Plan.

D. Agenda Modifications:

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS, CITIZEN COMMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE:

B. Citizen Comments: [A1.5]

You may address the City Council on matters of City business for up to 5 minutes. Those commenting about ordinances or resolutions on the “Consent Agenda” should limit their comments to one minute per item. When recognized by the Mayor, please state your name and address for the official record. Designated speakers representing a group may take up to 10 minutes on matters of general City business.

C. Correspondence:

III. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS: [A3.6.4]

A. Finance Committee
B. Community Development Committee
C. Public Safety Committee
D. Other Reports

IV. CONSENT AGENDA: [A3.6]

The items listed below may be acted upon by a single motion and second of the City Council. By simple request to the Chair, any Councilmember may remove items from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration after the adoption of the remainder of the Consent Agenda items.

A. Checks/Vouchers: Accounts payable checks/voucher #44142 thru #44297, (voided check #44292) and wire transfer #2008391 in the amount of $2,060,981.72. [F4.9]
B. Payroll: Payroll for June 1-15, 2006 for checks 24994-25044, including Deposits and Electronic Transfers in the amount of $282,953.52. [F4.9]

V. FINANCE COMMITTEE ISSUES:

A. AB06-140 – Resolution 1586 - A Resolution Of The City Council Of The City Of Bonney Lake, Pierce County, Washington, Authorizing the Use of Special Purchasing Procedures for the 2006 Bonney Lake Days Celebration. [F4.8]

VI. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ISSUES: None.

VII. PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE ISSUES:


VIII. FULL COUNCIL ISSUES:

A. AB06-145 – Discussion Regarding July 8th Special Meeting and Workshop [A1.1.2]

IX. PUBLIC OPEN DISCUSSION AND DISPLAYS
X. ADJOURNMENT

For citizens with disabilities requesting translators or adaptive equipment for communication purposes, the City requests notification as soon as possible of the type of service or equipment needed.

THE COUNCIL MAY ADD AND TAKE ACTION ON OTHER ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA
CITY OF BONNEY LAKE
PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the City of Bonney Lake was originally incorporated as a City in 1949 and as such has become one of the fastest growing communities in the State of Washington; and

Whereas, during a significant portion of Bonney Lake’s history the City has had the good fortune of employing Thomas H. Jenkins as a Reserve Police Officer, Police Officer, K-9 Officer, Detective Sergeant and, for the last two years, as a Police Lieutenant; and

Whereas, Lieutenant Jenkins has guided the Police Department through an astonishing number of accomplishments during his tenure as a Police Officer, not the least of which was being the department’s first K-9 unit and receiving twenty seven letters of commendation; and

Whereas, Lieutenant Jenkins will be retiring on June 30, 2006, after twenty six years with the City; and

Whereas, the City of Bonney Lake owes a deep debt of gratitude to Lieutenant “Tommy” Jenkins for the years of service he has provided and, therefore, the City is honoring Lieutenant Jenkins by presenting him his badge which signifies both the responsibility and authority of his position; and

Whereas, no matter how many times we read the name “Thomas Jenkins”, he will always be “Tommy” to us; now, therefore

In recognition of the contributions he has made, we the City Council of the City of Bonney Lake, do hereby proclaim, Friday June 30, 2006 as

Thomas H. “Tommy” Jenkins Day

in the City of Bonney Lake and urge citizens to join in recognizing his contributions to our community and wish him well in his retirement after twenty six years with the City.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hand this 27\textsuperscript{th} day of June, 2006.

______________________________  ______________________________
Neil Johnson Jr., Mayor                  Dan Swatman, Deputy Mayor

______________________________  ______________________________
Councilmember Cheryl Noble            Councilmember Phil DeLeo

______________________________  ______________________________
Councilmember Dave King                Councilmember Mark Hamilton

______________________________  ______________________________
Councilmember James Rackley            Councilmember David Bowen
City of Bonney Lake, Washington
Council Agenda Bill (C.A.B.) Approval Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Staff Contact:</th>
<th>Council/Wrkshp Mtg Date:</th>
<th>Agenda Bill Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Grigsby – PW Director</td>
<td>June 27, 2006</td>
<td>AB06-139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance Number:</th>
<th>Resolution Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Committee Dates:</th>
<th>Commission Dates:</th>
<th>Board/Hearing Examiner Dates:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee:</td>
<td>Planning Commission:</td>
<td>Park Board:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Committee:</td>
<td>Civil Service Commission:</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development &amp; Planning Committee: 06-05-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Meeting: 05-17-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop: 04-18-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Summary:** Discussion on the East Town LID Update.

Presentation
- Public meeting survey results
- Updated maps.
- Cost estimates for the formation of the LIDs.

Questions for Council
- Extent of sewer LID, water LID, and traffic LID?
- How should each LID be formed, by Council Resolution or Petition from property owners?
- Costs for the formation of the LID. As Public Works continues towards the formation of each LID, how should the costs be covered?

**Administrative Recommendation:**

**Agenda Subject:**
East Town ULID Update

**Council Action:**
Council Call for Hearing: Council Hearings Date:
Council Referred Back to: Workshop: Committee
Council Tabled Until: Council Meeting Dates:

**Signatures:**
[Signature]
Mayor
Date City Attorney reviewed Standard
Memo

Date : June 21, 2006
To : Dan Grigsby
From : Doug Budzynski, Public Works
CC : John Woodcock
Re : EASTOWN SURVEY RESULTS

Dan I gathered some additional numbers resulting from our Eastown Public Meeting and Survey Results.

Contacted for Public Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Eastown parcels in city limits</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Eastown area parcels outside city limits but in Traffic service area</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveys received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys received the night of the Public Meeting</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys received by mail after the Public Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys received for Eastown parcels inside city limits</td>
<td>24 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys received for area parcels outside city limits but in water service area</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1  Surveys not picked up a the night of the public meeting were mailed to parcel owners asking for response.
2  Only 1 survey was sent to those owning multiple parcels.

Sewer LID Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels in Eastown Sewer LID</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels with a survey response that are in Eastown Sewer LID</td>
<td>23 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Yes responses in Eastown Sewer LID</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of acres in Eastown Sewer LID</td>
<td>165 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of acres with Yes response in Eastown Sewer LID</td>
<td>127 acres (77%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Survey done by Ray Frey's group would include an additional 11 parcels with a yes response to the LID.
## Water LID Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels in Eastown Water LID</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels outside of city limits but in water service area</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels with a survey response that are in Eastown Water LID</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Yes responses in Eastown Water LID</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of No responses in Eastown Water LID</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of acres in Eastown Water LID</td>
<td>217 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of acres with Yes response in Eastown Water LID</td>
<td>32 acres (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Traffic LID Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels in Eastown Traffic LID</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels with a survey response that are in Eastown Traffic LID</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Yes responses in Eastown Traffic LID</td>
<td>19 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of No responses in Eastown Traffic LID</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of acres in Eastown Traffic LID</td>
<td>245 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of acres with Yes response in Eastown Traffic LID</td>
<td>108 acres (44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

Date : June 21, 2006
To : Dan Grigsby
From : Doug Budzynski, Public Works
CC : John Woodcock
Re : EASTOWN FORMATION ESTIMATED COSTS

As we move towards the formation of an LID for Eastown, the question of how to cover the costs incurred during the LID formation is at hand. During my last discussions with Judy Andrews of Gottleb, Fisher and Andrews, and Jim Nelson of Martin Nelson, and Co, the work needed for the LID formation was given in more detail. This included the engineering work needed during the formation process.

As we move through the formation of an LID, a Special Benefits Study is done by a third party. This study determines the value gained by the land parcels for the improvements made by the LID and determines the cost share for those parcels. To support what the cost share will be for each parcel prior to the final LID formation, engineering support is needed. This requires an accurate engineering cost and construction cost estimate. Often the engineering work needed for this cost estimate is near a 30% design effort. Therefore, this work needs to be included in the costs estimates for the effort needed to the formation of the LID. To address the needed engineering work, I contacted both RH-2 and Parametrix and received costs estimates for 30% design effort during the formation of the LID. Below is a cost estimate of what should be expected during the LID formation and a recap of the estimated construction costs I did previously.

Estimated LID Formation Cost

- Special Benefits Study $75,000
- Legal Assistance $50,000
- Water: 30% design $45,000
- Sewer: 30% design $182,000
  - Total $352,000

Estimated Construction Costs

- Street Improvements $380,000
- Water Improvements $880,000
- Sewer Improvements (option B) $2,860,000
  - Total (+20% contingency) $4,944,000

The Eastown update following the May 17th public meeting is on the agenda for the CDC meeting on Monday, June 5th. I plan to present this information to the CDC at that time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Description</th>
<th>Initial Target Date</th>
<th>Current Target Date</th>
<th>Date Done</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Request for LID presented to PW Director and City Council from Gienger Development Inc.</td>
<td>22-Nov-05</td>
<td>22-Nov-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>VWD’s information presented at meeting showed no conflict to first concept of ULID. However, VWD’s WL improvements need further investigation relating to road and sidewalk improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PW Director Tasked to prepare ULID</td>
<td>22-Nov-05</td>
<td>22-Nov-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 HOLIDAY Break</td>
<td>24-Dec-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Meet with Valley Water District to discuss the ULID’s possible impact to their planned improvements.</td>
<td>3-Feb-06</td>
<td>3-Feb-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting is to review first concept of water and sewer ULID. Also, to discuss how will the city be covered from bearing non-recoup costs generated from study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Meet with French Property Developer to discuss scope of the project and financial aspect of study.</td>
<td>7-Feb-06</td>
<td>7-Feb-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Meet with bonding agent to discuss process</td>
<td>22-Feb-06</td>
<td>21-Feb-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gave insight to process of working thru ULID and presented a hit list of what needs to be done during petition process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Discuss ULID with other known perspective property developer</td>
<td>8-Mar-06</td>
<td>8-Mar-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developer owns 17+ acres in East Town and is moving to develop the property. During phone conversation, developer stated he may be interested in the possibility of a ULID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Contact consultant who can do a Special Benefit Study</td>
<td>3-Mar-06</td>
<td>6-Mar-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contacted Robert McCauley to present a draft cost figure to complete a special benefits study. Currently waiting for numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Staff work on scope of this project to define ULID boundaries and utility system</td>
<td>1-Mar-06</td>
<td>8-Mar-06</td>
<td>28-Mar-06</td>
<td>Water Service area has been defined because of limited benefits and Valley Water District Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Review different options for assessment methodology</td>
<td>10-Mar-06</td>
<td>8-Mar-06</td>
<td>28-Mar-06</td>
<td>Sewer Benefits will be presented to council and Geinger possibly with a couple options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Meet with French Property Developer to discuss updated scope of this project.</td>
<td>23-Feb-06</td>
<td>14-Apr-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>During casual meeting developer has mentioned the idea of leaving out the water portion of the ULID because the cost distribution maybe limited to 5 properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Meeting with new developer for street and sewer development in East Town</td>
<td>7-Apr-06</td>
<td>7-Apr-06</td>
<td>7-Apr-06</td>
<td>Meeting with developer to discuss future road and sewer in East Town. The developer has purchased several properties and is looking to develop in the southwest corner of East Town. He stated that at this time he is not interested in the ULID for the land he has purchased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Staff discuss proposed scope with City Council</td>
<td>21-Mar-06</td>
<td>18-Apr-06</td>
<td>18-Apr-06</td>
<td>Several land owners were present at workshop. The property owners were concerned that they were not familiar with the latest information presented to council. Council asked that the next step for a public hearing to the property owners be prepared soon. Though the council was aware of cost incurred during the ULID movement, there was not any direction given on how to handle those costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27-Apr-06</td>
<td>Meeting with several property owners of Eastown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-May-06</td>
<td>Discuss water availability issue in Eastown. Owner presented one option for looping water which would require City's line in Easements. The topic of water available to Eastown after the construction of the tank was raised by the owner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11-May-06</td>
<td>Meeting discussed some options the city has for financing the LID. Meeting discussed the possibility of spreading the LID outside the city boundaries. Procedures of an LID were discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17-May-06</td>
<td>The public meeting had over 70 attendees asking questions about the LID. Surveys were handed out and 26 were returned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18-May-06</td>
<td>The City's legal representative, Judy Andrews, responds to unanswered questions from the public meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19-May-06</td>
<td>Public Works mailed to the property owners the remaining surveys that were not picked up at the public meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>31-May-06</td>
<td>Public works categorized the surveys received back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5-Jun-06</td>
<td>Presented the survey results and formation cost estimates to CDC. CDC requested to move forward to present to council. Recommendations from CDC included: LID should be a complete package of water, sewer and traffic signal; Water and sewer needs to extend to the far ends to support opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>27-Jun-06</td>
<td>Present results and price estimates to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11-Jul-06</td>
<td>Decision by Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12-Jul-06</td>
<td>Work with legal council and land owner to draft petition for LID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22-Aug-06</td>
<td>Council to review draft petition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25-Aug-06</td>
<td>Formal petition distributed for signatures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26-Sep-06</td>
<td>Present formal petition to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10-Oct-06</td>
<td>Determine sufficiency of petition by Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7-Nov-06</td>
<td>Formal contract with consultants for legal and bonding efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7-Nov-06</td>
<td>Formal contract engineering consultants to perform water and sewer preliminary designs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8-Nov-06</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering for Cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>23-Jan-07</td>
<td>Update CDC, Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5-Feb-07</td>
<td>Formal contract with consultants for special benefits study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5-Mar-07</td>
<td>Conduct Special Benefits Study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EASTOWN UTILITY LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT Plan of Actions

(June 21, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Obtain financial options from bonding agent</td>
<td>5-Feb-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Update CDC. Council</td>
<td>10-Apr-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Public meeting to present LID status</td>
<td>2-May-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Address comments from public meeting</td>
<td>14-May-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Review board for creation of LID on water related issues outside city limits.</td>
<td>26-Jun-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Address decisions from review board.</td>
<td>1-Jul-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Hold public hearing for creation of LID</td>
<td>8-Aug-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>City adopts ordinance forming LID</td>
<td>28-Aug-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Set up temporary LID Bond for final design and construction</td>
<td>27-Sep-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Design LID Construction Contract</td>
<td>27-Sep-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Purchase LID Right of Ways/Easement</td>
<td>26-Nov-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Construct LID facilities</td>
<td>15-Apr-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Set up final LID Bond repayment plan by property owners.</td>
<td>1-May-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EASTOWN PROPERTY OWNER UTILITY SERVICE SURVEY
(17 May 2006)

Property Owner Name and Address Label

______________________________
Signature

Is property within City of Bonney Lake?
Notices Mailed: Inside City = 62 and Outside City = 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.60%</td>
<td>14.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEWER SYSTEM Utility Local Improvement District
ONLY Residents of Bonney Lake

S1. CORE AREA ONLY - From Lift Station - West on 96th St to 214th Ave

S2. Core Area PLUS Gravity Lines on 96th St and 23rd Ave

S3. Core Area PLUS Gravity Lines South to SR410 and under SR410

S4. Core Area PLUS Options S2 and S3 above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inside City</th>
<th></th>
<th>Outside City</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WATER SYSTEM

ULID OPTIONS
W1. ULID - Core Area Only:

_____ A. Run water line from Home Depot East along 96th Street to French property (in Pierce County Right-of-Way (ROW)).

_____ B. Extend line south from 96th St through French Property to SR410.

_____ C. Run line west (on North Side of SR410 in State ROW) and connect to existing City 12-inch line at mini-storage company.

W2. ULID - Core Area PLUS extend down 96th St to 230th Ave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LATECOMERS AGREEMENT
(Financed by Developer Instead of a ULID funded by the City)

W3. Latecomers Agreement - Same scope of work as W1 above.

W4. Latecomers Agreement - Same scope of work as W2 above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRAFFIC SIGNAL - Install signal on SR 410

T1. Local Improvement District (LID)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Dan Grigsby  
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2006 4:47 PM  
To: Mayor Johnson; Don Morrison; Council; Doug Budzynski; Jim Nelson; ‘Judy Andrews (Judy Andrews)’  
Cc: John Woodcock; Woody Edvalson; Bob Leedy; Beth A. Wroe  
Subject: EASTOWN ULID 17 May 2006 Public Meeting

Hi Everyone;
Thank you for your participation in the meeting last night. We counted about 70-80 people who participated including Mayor Johnson, Deputy Mayor Swatman, and Council Members Rackley, Hamilton, King, Bowen, and DeLeo. It started at 6:35 and ended at 9:00 pm with some questions being asked by individuals until 9:30 pm.

Attached is a summary of the survey results. Only 19 (17.3%) of the 110 property owners who received notification were represented at this meeting and turned in survey forms. Doug is preparing a map that shows the location of the property owners who voted last night. We noticed that people voted in a confused manner for the Traffic Signal LID; so, we just showed the results in terms of yes or no to a ULID. Generally, those who said no to a LID said it was OK as a Latecomer’s Agreement.

I had been given a petition by Ray Frye; however, when I collected my papers after the meeting was over, it was missing. Did someone else pick it up or receive it?

Most questions dealt with an explanation of what the different alternatives were, how they benefited different property owners, and whether or not a person would be impacted by the ULID financially, if one was set up. Below is a summary of the key issues discussed. If I have missed any, please let me know.

QUESTIONS with answers Provided:
1. Surveys were for information to provide to City Council members. Actual votes would be done later after a Formation Hearing and Special Benefit Study are done.
2. Initial Benefit Roll determined by a Special Benefit Study. The Final Benefit Roll would be completed after all costs are obtained.
3. Assessments cannot exceed the difference between the “before” market value of a parcel and the “after improvements are made” market value.
4. All property owners who would benefit from completion of the ULID would be assessed their fair share of the cost of the improvement whether or not they voted FOR the ULID, if the ULID was approved.
5. Sewer connections can only be provided to residents inside the City or its UGA. Thus, there is no benefit to those property owners whose parcel is outside of the city limits on both sides of 96th Street; so, they would not be charged for any Sewer ULID.
6. While individual utilities could have different ULIDs with different terms, there would only be on Transition Bond to provide Interim Financing.
7. Interim Financing would be provided as a Bridge Loan to allow construction to be accomplished.
8. Why can’t the City pay for these improvements? Because the benefit would apply only to specific property owners, the City is prohibited from making a gift to private parties. Also, the City Municipal Code requires new development to pay for extension of utility systems and new roads/intersections needed to support their development.
9. Can a developer provide an alternative to Public Works Design standards if they accomplish the same goals? PW will consider all proposals; however, we will not compromise the
standards adopted by our municipal code.

10. Can a developer design their own lift station? No, Public Works will hire our own consultant to accomplish these designs. Standards used will be those commonly used in designing sewer systems in the trade. Designs will be paid for by developers. Developers will then build these lift stations as designed.

11. Are Latecomer Agreements possible; why not use them? One benefit is that developments can be accomplished faster than following the LID process. Disadvantage is that a single developer needs to provide large amounts of up-front capital. LID process takes longer to comply with state law, to ensure all impacted property owners are given adequate opportunities to voice their own opinion, to ensure costs are fairly allocated, and to ensure that legally enforceable LID documents are completed.

12. Why won’t WSDOT pay for the traffic signal? The answer is that the state does not need that traffic signal. Their priority is to move traffic as safely and quickly as possible. A traffic signal negatively impacts that goal. The only time there is a possibility that a signal is warranted, to be funded by the state, is if there is a history of accidents occurring at a specific intersection such as was done for the 233rd/234th Ave intersection. Developers must pay for the traffic signal between 214th Ave and 233rd Ave to provide for future growth caused by their projects and to provide accessibility to their project sites.

13. Can there be cost overruns in a LID?
   a. Yes, this can happen, but as we go through the LID process and update cost estimates, we try to avoid this.

14. Can a property owner be included in a second LID after one is in place?
   a. Yes, if the second LID proves to add additional benefit value to the property.

15. Does not a 2-3 year process seem slow like using a pick and ax?
   a. No, this is a common time frame for LIDs. The process can move faster if the property owners are unified during in the LID process.

16. How does voting for LID work? By acreage or by single vote?
   a. If an LID is created by a petition from the property owners, then voting is by size (acreage) of the property and majority vote is needed.
   b. If an LID is created by City resolution, then it will take 60% of the property owners (single vote) to override the resolution.

17. Why does the sewer run along 96th street and not along SR410?
   a. The city wants the least number of lift stations in Eastown to maintain. To meet this criteria and the constraints of the topography in Eastown, it was determined the best location for a lift station was near 96th Street, midway between 214th and 233rd Avenues.

18. Can Bonney Lake fund a project and create a Latecomers Agreement. No, only developers are allowed to do this. Otherwise, this would be considered a gift of public funds to the development. Developers cannot build using the cities money.

QUESTIONS with answers that need to be Obtained or Confirmed:

1. Can property owners outside the City limits be forced to participate in a ULID?
   a. After many discussions last night, the apparent answer is yes they can be. If the majority of parcel owners benefitting from the utility installation approve the ULID, then all ULID parcels identified as benefitting from the ULID must pay their fair share.
   b. For instance, if a water line is run down 96th Street and a ULID is approved by voters, then would the property owners on both sides of 96th street (outside the city limits) be required to pay their fair share of the ULID cost?
   c. Legal counsel will check this out.

2. Can developers connect to the utility systems and begin using them even before the ULID is finalized? Logically, it would appear that there would be no reason why not. Legal counsel will check this out.
3. Can a Latecomers clause be included within an LID? We are not aware of this being an option. Legal counsel will check this out.

Thanks,
DAN

DANIEL L. GRIGSBY, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of Bonney Lake

6/1/2006
Hi Everyone; Below (in red) are comments from our Bond Attorney, Judy Andrews, on the meeting minutes prepared below.

Thanks,

DAN

DANIEL L. GRIGSBY, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of Bonney Lake

From: Judy Andrews [mailto:judy@goandfish.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 6:47 PM
To: Dan Grigsby
Subject: Re: EASTOWN ULID 17 May 2006 Public Meeting

Hi Dan: I have added my answers to questions 1 through 3 below as well as some commentary and corrections to the preceding questions as well. Please call me with any questions. I will be away from the office until May 31, but if you or Doug leaves a voice mail message with a phone number, I will be able to return it. Thanks, Judy (206-654-1999)
At 04:47 PM 5/18/2006 -0700, you wrote:

Hi Everyone;

Thank you for your participation in the meeting last night. We counted about 70-80 people who participated including Mayor Johnson, Deputy Mayor Swatman, and Council Members Rackley, Hamilton, King, Bowen, and DeLeo. It started at 6:35 and ended at 9:00 pm with some questions being asked by individuals until 9:30 pm.

Attached is a summary of the survey results. Only 19 (17.3%) of the 110 property owners who received notification were represented at this meeting and turned in survey forms. Doug is preparing a map that shows the location of the property owners who voted last night. We noticed that people voted in a confused manner for the Traffic Signal LID; so, we just showed the results in terms of yes or no to a ULID. Generally, those who said no to a LID said it was OK as a Latecomers Agreement.

I had been given a petition by Ray Frye; however, when I collected my papers after the meeting was over, it was missing. Did someone else pick it up or receive it?

Most questions dealt with an explanation of what the different alternatives were, how they benefited different property owners, and whether or not a person would be impacted by the ULID financially, if one was set up. Below is a summary of the key issues discussed. If I have missed any, please let me know.

QUESTIONS with answers Provided:

1. Surveys were for information to provide to City Council members. Actual votes would be done later after a Formation Hearing and Special Benefit Study are done.

2. Initial Benefit Assessment Roll determined by a preliminary Special Benefit Study. The Final
Benefit Assessment Roll would be completed after all costs are obtained and the special benefit study is updated.

3. Assessments cannot exceed the difference between the beforemarket value of a parcel and the after improvements are mademarket value.

4. All property owners who would benefit from completion of the ULID would be assessed their fair share of the cost of the improvement whether or not they voted FOR the ULID, if the ULID was approved.

5. Sewer connections can only be provided to residents inside the City or its UGA. Thus, there is no benefit to those property owners whose parcel is outside of the city limits on both sides of 96th Street; so, they would not be charged for any Sewer ULID. Pursuant to RCW 35.43.030, the City does have authority to form an LID or a ULID which includes unincorporated territory outside of City limits. However, pursuant to RCW 35.43.035, the City may be subject to the boundary review board if the creation of an LID or ULID outside of the City’s boundaries would provide water or sewer facilities to properties outside of City limits. This does not address the UGA issue however. So even though under the LID statutes the City could include the 96th street properties in the ULID, it may not be able to do so because the properties are not in the City’s UGA.

6. While individual utilities could have different ULIDs with different terms, there would only be on Transition one Bond Anticipation Note to provide Interim Financing and one issue of Bonds for the permanent financing.

7. Interim Financing would be provided as a Bridge Loan to allow construction to be accomplished.

8. Why cant the City pay for these improvements? Because the benefit would apply only to specific property owners, the City is prohibited from making a gift to private parties. Also, the City Municipal Code requires new development to pay for extension of utility systems and new roads/intersections needed to support their development.

9. Can a developer provide an alternative to Public Works Design standards if they accomplish the same goals? PW will consider all proposals; however, we will not compromise the standards adopted by our municipal code.

10. Can a developer design their own lift station? No, Public Works will hire our own consultant to accomplish these designs. Standards used will be those commonly used in designing sewer systems in the trade. Designs will be paid for by developers. Developers will then build these lift stations as designed.

11. Are Latecomer Agreements possible; why not use them? One benefit is that developments can be accomplished faster than following the LID process. Disadvantage is that a single developer needs to provide large amounts of up-front capital. LID process takes longer to comply with state law, to ensure all impacted property owners are given adequate opportunities to voice their own opinion, to ensure costs are fairly allocated, and to ensure that legally enforceable LID documents are completed.

12. Why wont WSDOT pay for the traffic signal? The answer is that the state does not need that traffic signal. Their priority is to move traffic as safely and quickly as possible. A traffic signal negatively impacts that goal. The only time there is a possibility that a signal is warranted, to be funded by the state, is if there is a history of accidents occurring at a specific intersection such as was done for the 233rd/234th Ave intersection. Developers must pay for the traffic signal between 214th Ave and 233rd Ave to provide for future growth caused by their projects and to provide accessibility to their project sites.

13. Can there be cost overruns in a LID?
   a. Yes, this can happen, but as we go through the LID process and update cost estimates, we try to avoid this.

14. Can a property owner be included in a second LID after one is in place?
a. Yes, if the second LID proves to add additional benefit value to the property.

15. Does not a 2-3 year process seem slow like using a pick and ax?

a. No, this is a common time frame for LIDs. The process can move faster if the property owners are unified during in the LID process.

16. How does voting for LID work? By acreage or by single vote?

a. If an LID is created by a petition from the property owners, then voting is by size (acreage) of the property and majority vote of the area within the proposed LID is needed.

b. If an LID is created by City resolution, then it will take 60% of the estimated assessments of the property owners (single vote) to override the resolution.

17. Why does the sewer run along 96th street and not along SR410?

a. The city wants the least number of lift stations in Eastown to maintain. To meet this criteria and the constraints of the topography in Eastown, it was determined the best location for a lift station was near 96th Street, midway between 214th and 233rd Avenues.

18. Can Bonney Lake fund a project and create a Latecomers Agreement. No, only developers are allowed to do this. Otherwise, this would be considered a gift of public funds to the development. Developers cannot build using the cities money.

**QUESTIONS with answers that need to be Obtained or Confirmed:**

1. Can property owners outside the City limits be forced to participate in a ULIID?

   a. After many discussions last night, the apparent answer is yes they can be. If the majority of parcel owners benefiting from the utility installation approve the ULIID, then all ULIID parcels identified as benefiting from the ULIID must pay their fair share.

   b. For instance, if a water line is run down 96th street and a ULIID is approved by property owners by petition and formed by the City, then would the property owners on both sides of 96th street (outside the city limits) be required to pay their fair share of the ULIID cost? Yes, assuming that the City can provide water service to these property owners, then they can be required to participate in the ULIID and pay for their share of the ULIID cost. This would be true for the sewer line as well, if the City can provide sewer service to these property owners (see answer to question above).

   c. **Legal counsel will check this out.**

2. Can developers connect to the utility systems and begin using them even before the ULIID is finalized? Logically, it would appear that there would be no reason why not. **Legal counsel will check this out.** I could not find anything in the LID statutes that would prohibit the City from permitting a property owner to connect into ULIID improvements upon their completion, but before the ULIID assessment roll is finalized.

3. Can a Latecomers clause be included within an LID? We are not aware of this being an option. **Legal counsel will check this out.** There is no clear authority under either chapter 35.91 RCW which permits latecomer’s agreements or under the LID statutes for the City to include a latecomer’s clause within an LID or ULIID.

5/25/2006
Thanks,
DAN

DANIEL L. GRIGSBY, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of Bonney Lake

5/25/2006
May 18, 2006

City of Bonney Lake  
Dan Grigsby- Public Works Director  
Doug Budzynski - Utility Engineer

RE: Proposed Eastown LID

We are the owners of the property at the southwest corner of 234th and SR 410. This letter is to support the L.I.D. for sewer. Because of our location, we support the larger scope of the proposal to reach our site.

From the more general position, we have attended several meetings and talked to many landowners the would like to develop their property or sell and move on. The only way any of them can do this is with sewers.

L.I.D. costs are entirely born by the property owners, who seem to be in majority support. This no cost to the City project is the only way to implement the Eastown plan. With no sewers, Eastown will not happen. The City annexed the area, zoned it commercial, and paid for the Eastown plan already. This is the step to make happen, what appears to be a longtime goal of the City.

By way of L.I.D., with owners paying, the area will soon support many new businesses adding to property tax rolls. Much more significantly, sales taxes generated will help the City with more needed services like expansion of police and fire services.

I attended the meeting of May 17, 2006, and left with two distinct impressions: 1) overwhelming support of Eastown property owners. 2) concerned non-supporting property owners on 96th street that are not in the city limits of Bonney Lake. Many of these owners, I feel, do not realize they cannot be assessed or served, and in fact years from now by way of growth management and annexation, could possibly get benefit of free sewers, enhancing their property values paid for by the land owners of this proposed L.I.D.

That people who cannot be assessed or served were the only negative comments and set the tone for the meeting is unfortunate. I believe letters to all parties on the 96th street corridor explaining that they cannot be assessed would greatly relieve their concerns.

The sum of the proposed L.I.D. is:
- free sewers to the City  
- implementing the comp plan of the City  
- enhancing the 410 corridor  
- adding to the tax base

Again, we support the L.I.D. and thank you for your efforts.

Thank you,

Bob Stobie  
Auburn Commercial Development, Inc.

Phone & Fax #253-833-4177
May 17, 2006

Halsan Frey LLC
12356 Northup Way, Ste 119
Bellevue, WA. 98005
Phone: (425) 885-4205
FAX: (425) 885-4548
Cell: (425) 466-1813

Attn: Ray Frey

RE: Latest Numbers and Information on Eastown Bonney Lake ULID.
(presented for tonight’s Public Meeting at 6:30 P.M.)

Dear Mr. Frey,

First, congratulations on the acquisition of the Smith 3.49 acre land parcel adjoining you to the east.

Enclosed and attached is my (3) page letter on the “Historical and Accounting Data for Eastown Bonney Lake Commercial Land on SR410”. The data therein helps us understand the strength in numbers we have due with our united efforts of the last few months. This information is mostly private and confidential to your and our groups. Also enclosed are:

1. Greeting to Mayor & City Council for presentation at tonight’s meeting.
2. Copy of Petition Signers for presentation at tonight’s meeting.

Then, here are the latest calculations for dissemination tonight (if needed):

   Number of Eastown Property Owners Party to ULID ............(45)

   Total Acreage in Eastown ULID ........................................(162.86) acres

   Number of Property Owners Favoring ULID ......................(34)

   Percentage of Property Owners Favoring ULID ................(75%)
Total Acreage in Eastown favoring ULID ......................... (153.64) acres

Total Property Owners Not Yet Signed (not contacted) ............... (11)

Percentage of Property Owners Not Yet signed (not contacted) .... (24%)

Percentage of Property Owners in acreage favoring ULID ........... (94.30%)

So that is it for now! Let's now get City of Bonney Lake officials and personnel to agree to spend the $155,000. needed for the preliminary study, with final costs to all of us involved provided at a later time by them to us. THEN, we can all formally agree to the ULID, and get it done.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

DAVID A. KONSMO

P.S. We need to schedule a post Eastown ULID meeting to go over what we have learned, and develop a united game plan for the next steps.
May 18, 2006

City of Bonney Lake
Public Works Department
8720 184th Ave. E.
P.O. Box 7380
Bonney Lake, WA 98391-0944
Phone: (253) 447-4347
FAX: (253) 826-1921

Attn: Dan Grigsby, Public Works Director.

RE: Comments on Eastown ULID Meeting Last Evening.
   Request for File Addition on Property Notices for Besola Parcel.

Dear Mr. Grigsby,

Thank you for the time and effort that your department undertook for the presentation of the factual matters on the Eastown ULID. We look forward to having this process formally undertaken at the earliest possible time.

Hopefully you understood that most all the negative comments publicly aired last evening were from non-Eastowners or City of Bonney Lake residents. With over 90% of the property owners signing on, we are aware that “complete infrastructure construction” is what is desired by the overwhelming majority.

I am the minority owner of the (5) acre land parcel commonly known as 22911 SR 410 East, Bonney Lake, WA., with Mark L. Besola. I am also the managing partner who is working on Mr. Besola's behalf to have the ULID completed ASAP. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you would add me to the City's list for notifications on all matters pertaining to this land parcel. Please send them to me at the P.O. Box listed above.

Also, I will be interacting with you a great deal on future matters on the Eastown ULID (along with Raymond Frey and a couple others). We look forward to quickly getting through this ULID process, through construction, then full operation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
DAVID A. KONSMO
May 18, 2006

City of Bonney Lake
19306 Bonney Lake Blvd.
Bonney Lake, WA. 98390-0944
Phone: (253) 862-8602
FAX: (253) 826-1921

Attn: City Council Members.

RE: Eastown ULID Meeting and Direction for ULID.

Dear City of Bonney Lake Council Members,

Thanks you to all of you who were in attendance at the meeting at Bonny Lake High School last evening.

It has been my pleasure to work with Raymond Frey on the obtaining of over 90% of the acreage owned by property owners in the Eastown ULID area. Hopefully those of you in attendance realize that the only verbal opposition was from persons either not within the ULID area, or not even residents of the City of Bonney Lake.

Appropriate land owners in Eastown want the complete development of the sewers, water, and improvements to SR 410 to occur ASAP. So please encourage the personnel in the Public Works Department to work with us "to get the ULID undertaken at the earliest possible time with the least amount of cost to us property owners".

Mr. Frey, myself, Larry Leasure, and Bob Stobie are knowledgeable professionals in the design, build, real estate, and property development field. Together, we own and/or control over 60% of the Eastown Commercial land parcels. We are desirous of assisting the City in every way possible to complete this ULID project ASAP.

Please feel free to contact me and/or Mr. Frey at any time.

Sincerely,

David A. Konsmo
May 19, 2006

City of Bonney Lake
Public Works Department
8720 184th Ave. E.
P.O. Box 7380
Bonney Lake, WA 98391-0944
Phone: (253) 447-4347
FAX: (253) 826-1921

Attn: Dan Grigsby, Public Works Director.

RE: Eastown U Lid Survey Results as Presented.

Dear Mr. Grigsby,

So there is no misunderstanding to anyone, I want to correct the record on the number of property owners and the amount of acreage represented by our attendance at the Wednesday evening meeting at Bonney Lake High School.

I am personally aware of the following property owners being in attendance:

- Linda Letney for White-Leasure/Clark .................. (15.44) acres
- Ray Miller ............................................. (2) acres
- Mark Clinkingbeard .................................... (5) acres
- Verlin Magruder ....................................... (10) acres
- David Konsmo for Mark Besola .......................... (5) acres
- Roger Watt ............................................. (5.52) acres
- David Bowen .......................................... (5.54) acres
- Rick Gienger-Ray Frey for French & Smith ............ (24.23) acres
- Bob Stobie for Kaelin .................................. (11.04) acres
- David Ambrose for multiple parcels .................. (34.03) acres
- Freehie property ....................................... (18.12 acres)

Total ..................................(136.01) (83.5%)
It is also our understanding that there are (45) property owners in Eastown who are a party to the ULID. We presented a petition showing (31) signatures favoring, with (3) yet to be turned in to the City, for a total number favoring of (34). A list showing (110) invitations to the meeting does not mean that there are in fact (110) property owners who are party to this ULID (when there are a total of (45).

Again note for the record, the majority of negative respondent speakers at the meeting were either not a party to the ULID, or, not even residents of the City of Bonney Lake.

If you have any questions, or if you do not concur with our accounting, please inform me ASAP. Ray Frey and I would meet personally with you to review and correct the record.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

DAVID A. KONSMO

c.c. Bonney Lake City Council @ FAX: (253) 826-8538
Raymond Frey ..............@ FAX: (253) 885-4548
Rick Gienger ...............@ FAX: (253) 537-1677
Magruder Group ..........Hand Delivered

P.S. If anyone needs the list of approving ULID property owners, I am in possession of the originals. Copies can be provided by request.
May 31, 2006

City of Bonney Lake
Public Works Department
8720 184th Ave. E.
P.O. Box 7380
Bonney Lake, WA 98391-0944
Phone: (253) 447-4347
FAX: (253) 826-1921

Attn: Dan Grigsby, Public Works Director.
Utility Assistant City Engineer, Doug Budzynski.

RE: Clarifying Information on Eastown Property Owners Favoring ULID.

Dear City of Bonney Lake Public Works Officials,

Thank you for inviting Ray Frey and I to meet with you to present additional data for the City’s use in clarifying the majority of property owners favoring the ULID.

Enclosed first is a copy of the body of the Informal Petition we used to obtain the signatures. Then, the copy of (2) pages of approving signatures. Please keep in mind that (3) signatures alone speak for more than (1) Eastown land parcel. Those signatures covering more than (1) parcel belong to:

1. David Ambrose ..... (9) parcels covering ..... 34.03 acres.

2. Raymond Frey ...... (2) parcels covering ..... 24.32 acres.

3. Larry Leasure ...... (4) parcels covering .....15.44 acres.

TOTAL .....(15) parcels totaling ..... 73.79 acres

To better understand the big picture of property owners favoring the ULID, I have put together (2) listings outlining those parcels:
There are about (45) property owners in Eastown of Bonney Lake who are a party to the ULID. Here is the listing of (13) of the largest: (in order of size downward)

1. French ........................................ 20.83 acres ...................................... #15 on map
2. Freehe ......................................... 18.12 acres ...................................... #25 on map
3. Ogle ........................................... 15.76 acres ...................................... #65 on map
4. Clark ........................................... 15.44 acres ...................................... #22, 23, 24 on map
5. Kaelin ......................................... 11.04 acres ...................................... #70, 71, 72 on map
6. Magruder ..................................... 10 + acres ........................................ #19 on map
7. Holmquist ................................... 9. acres ........................................... #45 on map
8. Besola/Konsmo ............................... 6.13 acres ........................................ #18 on map
9. Bowen .......................................... 5.54 acres ........................................ #16 on map
10. Watt ........................................... 5.52 acres ........................................ #17 on map
11. Clinkingbeard ............................... .5 acres ............................................... #20 on map
12. Kruse .......................................... .5 acres ............................................... #58 on map

Totaling ........................................ 127.38 acres ................................... (78%) of all E.T. landowners

Some of the Eastown property owners have created alliances, or are legally under contract to a purchaser. Therefore, these blocks of (6) property owners control (79%) of the property, which are aligned as follows: (in order of size downward)

1. David Ambrose Group ..................... 34.03 acres ........................................ (see list of parcels in ULID)
2. Magruder Group ............................... 28.65 acres ........................................ (see list of parcels)
3. Giengar/Frey Group ......................... 24.32 acres ........................................ (French & Smith property)
4. Freehe Property .............................. 18.12 acres ........................................ (Freehe property)
5. White/Leasure Group ...................... 15.44 acres ........................................ (Clark property)
6. Auburn Investments Group ............... 11.04 acres ........................................ (Kaelin property)

Totaling ......................................... 131.60 acres ................................... (81%) of all E.T. landowners

In earlier communications faxed to you after the ULID Town Meeting, I presented the overall numbers on this matter. Please refer to it for your reference, as it is accurately presented for your use.

Hopefully with this information, you can formally present the required data to the Mayor and City Council for their affirming approval. Then send it quickly along to the ULID legal team for immediate undertaking. If you have any further comments or questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

DAVID A. KONSMO

c.c. Raymond Frey

PAGE 2 OF 2 CITY OF BONNEY LAKE PUBLIC WORKS DEPT. 5-31-2006
CITY OF BONNEY LAKE

PLEASE READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE SIGNING
THE ATTACHED INFORMAL PETITION

This is an informal petition for a Local Improvement District ("LID"). Therefore upon signing this petition you do not become obligated to participate in the LID if it is accepted by City Council. The purpose of this informal petition is to determine the extent of Eastown landowner support for the LID and encourage the City Council of Bonney Lake to proceed with formation of the LID post haste.

WARNING: To insure the integrity of this petition, please use your true name and insure that you are legally qualified to sign.

Signatures shall be in ink or indelible pencil, and signed by the record owner as determined by the records of the Pierce County Recorder (spouse’s signature unnecessary). See special instructions below regarding mortgaged property, property purchased on contract, corporations and deceased persons.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS WHEN PETITIONS ARE REQUIRED TO BE SIGNED BY OWNERS OF PROPERTY:

(a) The signature of a record owner, as determined by the records of the County Recorder, shall be sufficient without the signature of his or her spouse.

(b) In the case of mortgaged property, the signature of the mortgagor shall be sufficient, without the signature of his or her spouse.

(c) In the case of property purchased on contract, the signature of the contract purchaser, as shown by the records of the County Recorder, shall be deemed sufficient, without the signature of his or her spouse.

(d) Any officer of a corporation owning land within the area involved who is duly authorized to execute deeds or encumbrances on behalf of the corporation, may sign on behalf of such corporation, and shall attach to the petition a certified excerpt from the bylaws of the corporation showing the officer’s authority.

(e) When property is held in the name of a deceased person or any person for whom a guardian has been appointed, the signature of the executor, administrator or guardian, as the case may be, shall be equivalent to the signature of the owner of the property.
INFORMAL PETITION FOR THE FORMATION OF
A LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT ("LID")

TO: THE HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BONNEY LAKE:

We, the undersigned, being owners of property aggregating a majority of
the area within the proposed district as shown on the LID maps marked Exhibit "A" and
"B", which are attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference, do hereby put forth
this informal petition to request and encourage the City Council of the City of Bonney
Lake, Washington, to order a local improvement under the petition method (Chapter
35.43 RCW).

The nature of the improvement shall be the construction and installation of
sanitary sewer and water improvements and a signalized intersection at 224th with related
improvements for turning movements, in the area known as Eastown, generally bounded
by 214th Avenue E on the west, 96th Street E on the north, a north-south line
approximately 300 feet east of 234th Avenue E on the east, and 106th Street E as extended
on the south, located in Section 02 Township 19 Range 05, and Section 01 Township 19
Range 05 in the City of Bonney Lake, Washington, (however, only those portions which
are within the City Limits of Bonney Lake), as follows:

Eastown: Construct and install sanitary sewer and water improvements
and a signalized intersection at 224th with related improvements for
turning movements, as attached hereto as Exhibit A and B and by this
reference incorporated herein.

The local improvement district to be formed hereunder shall include all
that property within the City of Bonney Lake adjoining, abutting, vicinal or proximate to
said improvements, as shown on said Exhibit A and B, to the depths of the lots and
parcels described on Exhibit A and B and in this informal petition, and the cost and
expense of the improvements shall be determined and assessed by a method or
combination of methods which may be deemed to fairly reflect the special benefits to the
properties being assessed in relation to all other properties within the local improvement
district pursuant to all legal requirements of Chapter 35.44 RCW and the City Council in
its discretion may determine.

The cost and expense of the improvements set forth herein and the final
assessments therefore, in addition to the construction and engineering costs as provided
in RCW 35.44.020, and all other expenses incidental thereto as required or provided by
the laws of the State of Washington and ordinances of the City of Bonney Lake.

It is understood that by signing this informal petition the owners and their
signatories do not obligate themselves and their successors and assigns to participate in
this LID, but rather do so to determine the extent of Eastown landowner support for the
LID and further to encourage the City Council of Bonney Lake to proceed with the
formation of the LID post haste.
FROM: Majority Property Owners of Eastown, in Bonney Lake, WA. Favoring ULID.

Greeting To: Mr. Mayor, City Council Members, Public Works Personnel, and other Distinguished Guests.

We are pleased to present the attached signed copies of Eastown land parcel owners favoring the ULID at this time. These signatures represent (32) owners totaling over (150) acres of Eastown land. Therefore, before you now are requests from 75% of the landowners who own 94.30% of the land desiring and requesting that the City of Bonney Lake immediately begin the process to formalize and begin the sewer ULID project for Eastown.

Please be advised that some signatures represent multiple land parcels and/or property owners.

Therefore, we request that you let us know what further assistance we may be to the City to get this process completed at the earliest possible time.

Respectfully submitted.

The Majority Owners of Eastown Bonney Lake Commercial Property on SR 410.
* Hazel B. Freehe  
(Print name) 6917 166th Ave E. Sumner WA 98390  
(Address) Bonney Lake, WA 98391  
Parcel # 0519012.03 Acres 18.12  
(Signature)

* Auburn Commercial Dev  
(Print name) 3240 8th NW Auburn WA 98001  
(Address) Bonney Lake, WA 98391  
Parcel # 0519012.03 Acres 9 (11.04)  
(Signature) 3/30/06

* 7XN Group LLC  
(Print name) 2311 67th Place NE. Bellevue WA 98011  
(Address) Bonney Lake, WA 98391  
Parcel # 0519028.03 Acres 1.04  
(Signature) Fabin F. Ihsani

* William E. Freeman  
(Print name) 917 16 1/2 St NW. Bonney Lake  
(Address) Bonney Lake, WA 98391  
Parcel # 0519025.02 Acres 1.04  
(Signature)

* William Parrott  
(Print name) 10011 221st Ave E.  
(Address) Bonney Lake, WA 98391  
Parcel # 0519025.01 Acres 1.25  
(Signature)

* Dan Jensen  
(Print name) 9920 221st Ave E  
(Address) Bonney Lake, WA 98391  
Parcel # 0519026.02 Acres 1.25  
(Signature)

* Dan Jensen  
(Print name) 9920 221st Ave E  
(Address) Bonney Lake, WA 98391  
Parcel # 0519026.03 Acres 1.25  
(Signature)
PROPOSED EASTOWN SEWER LID
Option B

LEGEND

- Lift Station
- Bonney Lake City Limits
- Existing Gravity Sewer and Manhole
- Existing Force Main
- Proposed 4" Force Main
- Proposed 8" Gravity Sewer Main
- Future and Existing Eastown Roads
- Core Sewer Service Area
- South Sewer Service Area
- Wetland
- Proposed Sewer LID Area

Interest in Sewer LID Survey Results

- Yes Response
- No Response
- Yes Response from Private Survey Addition

Scale

400 0 400 800 Feet
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<table>
<thead>
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<th>Council Meeting Date:</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>June 27, 2006</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Public Works (Grigsby /</td>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance Number:</th>
<th>Resolution Number:</th>
<th>Councilmember Sponsor:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 06-146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2006 Budget Amount**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 Budget Amount</th>
<th>Required Expenditure</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Remaining Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:**
Preparation of the Sewer and Water Comprehensive Plans have been funded from the sewer and water utility funds. Adoption per se requires no further expenditure. The Utilities Element guides future improvements in the sewer, water, and stormwater systems.

**Agenda Subject:**

**Administrative Recommendation:**
Hear Planning Commission recommendation to adopt.

**Background Summary:**
See attached staff report.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Committee Dates:</th>
<th>Commission Dates:</th>
<th>Board/Hearing Examiner Dates:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee:</td>
<td>Planning Commission: 5/3/06</td>
<td>Park Board:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Committee:</td>
<td>Civil Service Commission:</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Dev. &amp; Planning Committee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Action:**
Council Call for Hearing:
Council Hearings Date:
Council Referred Back to: Workshop: Committee
Council Tabled Until:

**Signatures:**
Dept. Dir. Mayor/City Administrator Date City Attorney reviewed
Date: 6/22/06  
To: Mayor and City Council  
From: Steve Ladd, Planning Manager  
RE: Adoption of Utilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan

Organization of our Comprehensive Plan  
The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that local comprehensive plans contain the following elements:  
- Land use  
- Housing  
- Capital facilities  
- Transportation  
- Utilities  
- Economic development

Bonney Lake’s Comprehensive Plan contains the following elements:  
- Community Character Element  
- Land use  
- Housing  
- Economic development  
- *Transportation  
- *Parks Element  
- *Utilities  
- *Other capital facilities

The Comprehensive Plan’s table of contents states: “*These elements make up the Capital Facilities Element.” The reason for the asterisks is that transportation facilities, utilities, and parks are all capital facilities. Our Plan avoids duplication by defining all with asterisks as part of the Capital Facilities Element. “Other Capital Facilities” contains only the miscellaneous facilities.

In turn, the Utilities Element consists of water, sewer, and stormwater. When the City was required to update its Comprehensive Plan in 2004, the water and sewer plans were not done yet completed. The City inserted only a “placeholder” Utilities Element. Until the new Utilities Element is adopted the Bonney Lake Comprehensive Plan remains out of compliance with the Growth Management Act. Grants and loans are very difficult to obtain. (The Bonney Lake Comprehensive Plan complies the Growth Management Act in all other respects.)

Comprehensive Water Plan  
The document is called a Comprehensive Water Plan because it contains all planning necessary to the water system. In addition to capital facility planning it has plans for operation,
maintenance, and so forth. It meets all GMA requirements and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s other elements and with the plans of our neighboring jurisdictions. It shows how water source, storage, and distribution systems would be expanded to meet the City’s growth needs per the Land Use Element, both in terms of quantity and location.

The City’s water utility encompasses a large area not in the City or in the City’s UGA. The water service area wraps entirely around Lake Tapps, including lands in Pierce County and Auburn jurisdiction. In those areas, Bonney Lake is obligated to provide water as necessary to accommodate such development as Auburn or Pierce County may approve. Bonney Lake has no land use jurisdiction, yet must provide water. The City could seek to dispose of its “extra-territorial” water service area, but does not propose to do so. Because water is a utility, the water system must pay for itself without subsidy from the General Fund.

Comprehensive Sewer Plan
Like the water plan, this is an extremely complete document. The City’s sewer utility has a “convoluted, contentious, and colorful” history – see page 2-2. In addition to capital facility planning it has plans for operation, maintenance, and so forth. It meets all GMA requirements and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s other elements and with the plans of our neighboring jurisdictions. The future improvements are designed to meet the City’s growth needs per the Land Use Element, both in terms of quantity and location. This plan shows how areas that are in the City but don’t have sewer yet, like Cedarview, could get sewer. See Figure 5-10.

The City’s sewer utility encompasses two large areas outside the City and its UGA. In these areas, Bonney Lake is merely a sewer provider.

The “south sewer area” extends lies in Pierce County jurisdiction, east and northeast of, but not including, Cascadia. Some of this area is on septic tanks, some is undeveloped. The plan shows two alternatives: a conventional conveyance to the Sumner plant or a local membrane bioreactor (MBR) plant. The plan recommends the MBR alternative for the reasons stated on page 5-16.

The “north sewer area” lies along the west side of Lake Tapps in Pierce County jurisdiction and in Auburn’s UGA. Some of this area is on septic tanks, some is undeveloped. Large residential developments around Lakeland Hills are creating a lot of demand. The plan suggests three alternatives: 1) conveyance to the Metro/King County plant, 2) conveyance to the Sumner plant, or 3) a local plant. The plan recommends pursuing the local plant alternative for the reasons stated on page 5-22. Also, to some extent, the City may cede the obligation to provide sewer service to the City of Auburn.

In these “extra-territorial” service areas, Bonney Lake is obligated to provide water as necessary to accommodate such development as Auburn or Pierce County may approve. The City could seek to dispose of its “extra-territorial” service area, but does not propose to do so. Because sewer is a utility, the sewer system must pay for itself without subsidy from the General Fund.
Stormwater Plan
A new Stormwater Plan is being prepared, but it isn’t complete yet. This Comprehensive Plan amendment is proceeding without it.

Consistency with other jurisdictions
Taken as a whole, the Utilities Element is consistent with the utilities planning of nearby jurisdictions.

Consistency with the Plan’s other elements
The proposed Transportation Element is consistent with the Land Use and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Criteria
BLMC 14.140.090 establishes the following criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan. Staff’s responses follow in italics.

1. Is the amendment consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan? Yes.

2. Would the comprehensive plan remain internally consistent?
Yes. The proposal would not conflict with anything currently in the Plan.

3. Is the amendment consistent with the countywide planning policies?
The countywide planning policies contain nothing that would indicate denial of this proposal.

4. Is the amendment consistent with the Growth Management Act?
The GMA contains nothing that would indicate denial of this proposal.

5. Does the amendment advance the public health, safety, or welfare and is it in the best interest of the residents of Bonney Lake?
Yes.

What pages will be swapped out in the Comprehensive Plan binders, and what documents will be adopted by reference
The sewer and water plans before us are too bulky to fit in the same binder as the rest of the Comprehensive Plan. In place of the existing two-page “placeholder” Utilities Element, staff has drafted a new two-page Utilities Element. See attached. This two-page Utilities Element adopts the sewer and water plans by reference.
SEPA
SEPA still been complied with through a Determination of Non-Significance.

Planning Commission Recommendation
On May 17, 2006, the Planning Commission recommended adoption. Staff also recommends adoption. The sooner adoption occurs, the more likely the City will succeed in current grant applications.
ORDINANCE NO. D 06-146

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BONNEY LAKE ADOPTING, AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, A NEW UTILITIES ELEMENT INCORPORATING A NEW COMPREHENSIVE SEWER PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE WATER PLAN

WHEREAS, RH2 has prepared for the City a new Comprehensive Sewer Plan and Comprehensive Water Plan Element; and

WHEREAS, said Comprehensive Sewer Plan and Comprehensive Water Plan are now adopted by reference as part of the amended Utilities Element, attached; and

WHEREAS, SEPA has been complied with by means of a Determination of Non-Significance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 3, 2006 and recommended adoption on May 17, 2006; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to state law on how frequently cities can amend their comprehensive plans, the City adopts this Utilities Element simultaneously with a Utilities Element and a budget amendment, so that further comprehensive plan amendments can occur in 2006, and,

WHEREAS, per the criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan set forth in BLMC 14.140.090, 1) the amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan, 2) the comprehensive plan would remain internally consistent, 3) the amendment is consistent with the countywide planning policies, 4) the amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act, and 5) the amendment advances the public health, safety, or welfare and is in the best interest of the residents of Bonney Lake.

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

Section 1. The attached Utilities Element is hereby adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Section 2. This ordinance concerns powers vested solely in the Council, is not subject to referendum, and shall take effect five (5) days after its passage, approval and publication as required by law.

PASSED by the City Council and approved by the Mayor this _____ day of July, 2006.
ATTEST:

Harwood Edvalson
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

James Dionne
City Attorney

Passed:
Valid:
Published:
Effective Date:
Utilities Element

CONTENTS

Water 7-1
Sewer 7-1
Stormwater 7-1
Non-Municipal Utilities 7-1
Goals and policies 7-2

Note: Though not printed in this binder, the City’s water, sewer, and stormwater plans, identified below, are integral parts of this Utilities Element. With these adoptions by reference, this Utilities Element is internally consistent, consistent with the other elements of this Plan, and consistent with the utilities plans of other jurisdictions.

Water

The City hereby adopts the City of Bonney Lake Comprehensive Water System Plan, prepared by RH2 and dated March, 2006, as part of this Utilities Element. Copies are available at City Hall or the City Hall Annex.

Sewer

The City hereby adopts the City of Bonney Lake Comprehensive Sewer System Plan, prepared by RH2 and dated March, 2006, as part of this Utilities Element. Copies are available at City Hall or the City Hall Annex.

Stormwater

The Bonney Lake Stormwater Comprehensive Plan, prepared by Montgomery Water Group, Inc. and adopted on 12/11/01 by Ordinance #906, is hereby adopted part of this Utilities Element. Copies are available at City Hall or the City Hall Annex.

Non-Municipal Utilities

Electric Power

Puget Sound Energy provides electricity to the Bonney Lake area. Puget Sound Energy has ceased operation of the White River Hydroelectric generating plant that used Lake Tapps as storage. Regional transmission lines pass through the Bonney Lake area. For information on existing and proposed electric facilities contact Puget Sound Energy, Corporate Relations, 3130 S. 38th St., Tacoma, WA 98409, (253) 476-6403.
Natural Gas

Puget Sound Energy provides natural gas to the Bonney Lake area. A natural gas transmission line passes through the Bonney Lake area. For information on existing and proposed natural gas facilities contact Puget Sound Energy, Corporate Relations, 3130 S. 38th St., Tacoma, WA 98409, (253) 476-6403.

Telecommunications

Qwest provides telephone and other data transmission services in the Bonney Lake area. Several companies provide cellular telephone service. Viacom Cablevision provides cable television. For information on existing and proposed telecommunication facilities, contact the provider.

Solid Waste

Murrey's Disposal Company is the City’s franchise collection agency for solid waste. The receiving landfills are outside the Bonney Lake area.

Goals and policies (see also policies in the plans adopted by reference)

Goal 7-1: Ensure sufficient sewer, water, and stormwater service for the City and UGA through the planning horizon.

Policy 7-1a: Coordinate with other jurisdictions to provide adequate sewer and water capacity in accordance with the growth projections of the respective jurisdictions (including Bonney Lake, for that part in the City’s current limits or UGA).

Policy 7-1b: Not allow development in the city limits in excess of the City’s ability to ensure that said development receives adequate water and sewer service.

Policy 7-1c: Meet the City’s obligations to provide water and sewer service outside the city limits and UGA.

Policy 7-1d: Require connection to City sewer when possible and on-site sewage disposal systems are failing.

Policy 7-1e: Where practical, install power and telecommunication distribution lines underground to reduce storm damage and aesthetic clutter.

Policy 7-1f: Wisely manage placement of private utilities in street rights-of-way.

Policy 7-1g: Encourage solid waste recycling.

Policy 7-1h: Coordinate with private utility providers to provide good service and to facilitate planned land development in the Bonney Lake area.
City of Bonney Lake, Washington
Council Agenda Bill (C.A.B.) Approval Form

<table>
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<tr>
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<td>Resolution Number:</td>
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**BUDGET INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 Budget Amount</th>
<th>Required Expenditure</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Remaining Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:**
Adoption per se requires no further expenditure. However, the Transportation Element guides future capital improvements in the transportation system.

**Agenda Subject:**
New Transportation Element.

**Administrative Recommendation:**
Hear Planning Commission recommendation to adopt.

**Background Summary:**
See attached staff report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Committee Dates: Finance Committee:</th>
<th>Commission Dates: Planning Commission: 5/3/06</th>
<th>Board/Hearing Examiner Dates: Park Board:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Committee:</td>
<td>Civil Service Commission:</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Dev. &amp; Planning Committee:</td>
<td>Council Workshop:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshop:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Action:**
Council Call for Hearing: Council Hearings Date: Council Referred Back to: Workshop: Committee Council Tabled Until: Signatures: Dept. Mayor/City Administrator Date City Attorney reviewed
Date: 6/22/06
To: Mayor and City Council
From: Steve Ladd, Planning Manager
RE: Adoption of Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan

Overview
The Transportation Element that currently makes up part of the Comprehensive Plan was created in 2004 as part of the Major GMA Update. That element was written in-house and lacks certain ingredients. For the current re-write, the City contracted with The Transpo Group. The same firm prepared our impact fee structure in 2002. Some of the chief advantages of the proposed element over the existing are as follows.

1. Whereas the current Transportation Element’s planning horizon matches that of the 6-Year Street Plan (six years), the proposed element matches that of the rest of the Comprehensive Plan (20 years). This accords with the Growth Management Act. It allows us to ensure that transportation facilities will be adequate to accommodate land development.

2. The new Transportation Element has the benefit of a new run of the City’s traffic model (maintained for us by Transpo).

3. The proposed element allows the City to increase its traffic impact fees. An ordinance to that effect (not yet drafted) can be adopted concurrently with the proposed element.

4. The proposed element is much richer in data and analysis.

Though the proposed element is much better, it does not significantly depart from the current element in terms of policy or strategy. It represents a steady elaboration upon past decisions.

Street classifications and extensions
Some street classifications have changed, as follows. See Figure 6.

1. Reclassified West Tapps Highway as a collector instead of a minor arterial. (The north part of the city is largely built out. Traffic volumes won’t get much higher.)
2. Reclassified 198th Ave, south of 104th Street (in Pierce County), as a minor arterial, consistent with Pierce County. This is realistic given the demand that will be placed on this corridor.
3. Reclassified 182nd Ave as a collector street.
4. Reclassified 84th Street as a collector street between 182nd Ave and Locust Ave.

Figure 6 also shows planned extensions. These are the same extensions as shown in the current Element.
Level of service (LOS) standard
The possible Levels of Service are A through F. Below is a summary. “Delay” means the average time lost in deceleration, stopping, and acceleration. A high LOS standard is expensive. A low standard is inconvenient but affordable.

*LOS A*: Streets have free flow, low volumes, and high speeds. Drivers are delayed no more than 40% of the time. Intersection delay is less than 10 seconds.

*LOS B*: Streets have stable flow, but operating speeds are somewhat restricted. Drivers are delayed up to 55% of the time. Intersection delay is 10-20 seconds.

*LOS C*: Streets have stable flow, but are susceptible to congestion. Drivers are delayed up to 70% of the time. Intersection delay is 20-35 seconds.

*LOS D*: Streets have unstable flow. Drivers are delayed up to 85% of the time. Intersection delay is 35-55 seconds.

*LOS E*: Streets have unstable flow. Drivers are delayed 80% to 95% of the time. Intersection delay is 55-80 seconds.

*LOS F*: Extreme congestion drops volumes below capacity. Speeds are very low. Intersection delay exceeds 80 seconds.

The proposed LOS standard remains at LOS D. The proposed Element plots a course for maintaining LOS D. However, this does not apply to SR 410 because it is a WSDOT facility. The City has no power to restrict traffic on it nor the funds to improve it.

Traffic and LOS forecasts
The traffic model is based on land development envisioned in the Land Use Element, both residential and employment growth. It indicates a need for higher highway capacity westward from Bonney Lake. This will be a bottleneck. Figure 5 shows peak hour traffic in 2025.

Street improvement projects
Whereas the current Element’s street improvement project list goes out to only 2009, the proposed Element’s list (Figure 10) is broken down into “short,” “mid,” and “long” timing. “Long” means getting built in 2019-2025. The list is a logical progression from the current Element. The projects are also broken down into roadway and intersection improvements. These projects are necessary to maintain LOS D while the City builds out according to the Land Use Element. The total cost in the current Element is $39,503,000. The total cost in the proposed Element, excluding WSDOT and Pierce County projects, is $69,830,000, but that includes projects projected further into the future.
Pedestrian and bicycle travel
Bonney Lake lacks sidewalks and paved shoulders. This is exacerbated by the disconnected street pattern. Sidewalks are a major issue for many people. A Non-Motorized Transportation Plan is being prepared separately. It will be folded into the Transportation Element later.

Funding and impact fees
Table 13 on page 70 shows proposed funding. This includes an increase in the traffic impact fee from. See the following table for examples of how this compares to the existing impact fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing impact fee</th>
<th>Proposed impact fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family residence</td>
<td>$2,701</td>
<td>$3,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 sq. ft. of supermarket</td>
<td>$16,660</td>
<td>$25,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency with other jurisdictions
WSDOT. We have one state facility: SR 410. Page 66 shows the relationship of Bonney Lake’s transportation planning to that of WSDOT. The planning for the two agencies is consistent, though the probably deterioration of LOS on SR 410 is noted.

PSRC. Consistent - see page 67.

Pierce County. Consistent – see page 67. Pierce County has jurisdiction over arterial to all around Bonney Lake. Those to the large unincorporated UGA south of Bonney Lake are particularly important.

Pierce Transit. Consistent - see page 68.

Consistency with the Plan’s other elements
The proposed Transportation Element is consistent with the Land Use and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Concurrence
The GMA requires that improvements needed to maintain the LOS standard be constructed within six years of the land development which necessitates the improvement. Bonney Lake applies the concurrency test to collectors and arterials (roadways and intersections) other than SR 410, which is exempt. See also page 65.
Criteria
BLMC 14.140.090 establishes the following criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan. Staff’s responses follow in italics.

1. Is the amendment consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan? Yes.

2. Would the comprehensive plan remain internally consistent? Yes. The proposal would not conflict with anything currently in the Plan.

3. Is the amendment is consistent with the countywide planning policies? The countywide planning policies contain nothing that would indicate denial of this proposal.

4. Is the amendment consistent with the Growth Management Act? The GMA contains nothing that would indicate denial of this proposal.

5. Does the amendment advance the public health, safety, or welfare and is it in the best interest of the residents of Bonney Lake? Yes.

How the pages would swap out in your Comprehensive Plan binder
Once the new Transportation Element is adopted, staff will completely remove the old element and insert the new. However, the appendices will not be part of the printed binder. One would have to request a copy of the appendices from the City.

SEPA
SEPA still been complied with through a Determination of Non-Significance.

Planning Commission Recommendation
The Planning Commission had several concerns with the proposal. Not all have been resolved to the satisfaction of all members. Nonetheless, on June 21, 2006, the Planning Commission recommended adoption, three for, two against.

Staff also recommends adoption. No one wants increased traffic, but it’s unavoidable. Efforts to manage the traffic will be controversial, but staff believes the proposed Transportation Element is the City’s best alternative.

M:\Everyone\Planning\Comp Plan\2006 Update
ORDINANCE NO. D 06-147

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF BONNEY LAKE ADOPTING A NEW TRANSPORTATION
ELEMENT AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, The Transpo Group has prepared for the City a new Transportation
Element; and

WHEREAS, said Transportation Element has been the subject of an open house and
several presentations and public meetings; and

WHEREAS, SEPA has been complied with by means of a Determination of Non-
Significance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 3, 2006 and
recommended adoption on June 21, 2006; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to state law on how frequently cities can amend their comprehensive plans, the
City adopts this Transportation Element simultaneously with a Utilities Element and a budget amendment, so that
further comprehensive plan amendments can occur in 2006, and,

WHEREAS, per the criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan set forth in BLMC
14.140.090, 1) the amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive
plan, 2) the comprehensive plan would remain internally consistent, 3) the amendment is
consistent with the countywide planning policies, 4) the amendment is consistent with the
Growth Management Act, and 5) the amendment advances the public health, safety, or welfare
and is it in the best interest of the residents of Bonney Lake.

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

Section 1. The attached Transportation Element is hereby adopted as part of the
Comprehensive Plan.

Section 2. This ordinance concerns powers vested solely in the Council, is not
subject to referendum, and shall take effect five (5) days after its passage, approval and
publication as required by law.

PASSED by the City Council and approved by the Mayor this _____ day of July, 2006.
ATTEST:

________________________
Harwood Edvalson
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________
James Dionne
City Attorney

Passed:
Valid:
Published:
Effective Date:
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE AND
UTILITY REFUND CHECKS/VOUCHERS

06/27/06

Accounts payable checks/voucher #44142 thru #44297, (voided check #44292) and wire transfer
#2008391 in the amount of $2,060,981.72.
Payroll for June 1-15, 2006 for checks 24994-25044, including Deposits and Electronic Transfers in the amount of $282,953.52.
City of Bonney Lake, Washington
Council Agenda Bill (C.A.B.) Approval Form

**Department/Staff Contact:** Don Morrison

**Council/Wrkshp Mtg Date:** June 27, 2006

**Agenda Bill Number:** AB06-140

**Ordinance Number:**

**Resolution Number:** 1586

**Councilmember Sponsor:**

---

**BUDGET INFORMATION**

**2004 Budget Amount:** $25,000

**Required Expenditure**

**Impact**

**Remaining Balance**

**Explanation:** Note that the City is also receiving revenues from this event.

---

**Agenda Subject:** Approval to enter into contracts and pay performers and others outside of the normal voucher approval process. This has been done the past 4 years.

---

**Administrative Recommendation:** Approve the accompanying resolution

---

**Background Summary:** The City has a prescribed procedure for paying financial obligations; usually 14-28 days after receipt of the invoice. Musicals and other performers that perform at Community Festivals are accustomed to being paid immediately after they perform. It is, therefore, necessary to have checks available upon demand. To accommodate these practices for past Bonney Lake Days, the Council passed Resolutions allowing exceptions.

This resolution provides authority to the Mayor to take care of the expenses associated with Bonney Lake Days in a timely and prudent manner, and incorporates the needed elements of the previous related Resolutions. This Resolution is similar to past resolutions relating to BL Days spending. This does not authorize persons outside the City to obligate City funds for Bonney Lake Days related expenditures.

---

**Council Committee Dates:**

- Finance Committee: June 13, 2006
- Public Safety Committee:
- Community Development & Planning Committee:
- Council Workshops:

**Commission Dates:**

- Planning Commission:
- Civil Service Commission:

**Board/Hearing Examiner Dates:**

- Park Board:
- Hearing Examiner:

---

**Council Action:**

- Council Call for Hearing:
- Council Hearings Date:

- Council Referred Back to:
- Workshop:
- Committee

- Council Tabled Until:
- Council Meeting Dates:

---

**Signatures:**

- Dept. Dir.
- Mayor
- Date City Attorney Reviewed:

---

U:\BonneyLakeDays\2006 BL-Days\AB06-140 Bonney Lake Days Special Purchasing Res 1586.doc
RESOLUTION NO. 1586

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BONNEY LAKE, PIERCE COUNTY, WASHINGTON, AUTHORIZING THE USE OF SPECIAL PURCHASING PROCEDURES FOR THE 2006 BONNEY LAKE DAYS CELEBRATION.

WHEREAS, the City Council has budgeted $25,000 to support the Bonney Lake Days community festival and celebration; and

WHEREAS, the standard method of payment for performers and other events-related contractors is to be paid immediately upon completion of the performance; and

WHEREAS, in some cases a deposit is required in advance of services performed; and

WHEREAS, the City’s purchasing and voucher approval procedure does not currently accommodate the performance and events-related industry standards for reimbursement; and

WHEREAS, purchases are planned for the Bonney Lake Days Celebration that are not part of the standard range of goods and services used by the City, or readily accommodated by the City’s current purchasing policies and practices; and

WHEREAS, The budget allocation approved by the City Council and included in the adopted FY 2006 annual budget is intended to include the purchase of goods and services generally associated with a community festival, such as advertising, power, rental of stage and tents, prizes and games, shirts, entertainment, sound engineer services, and other such goods and services generally associated with a community festival;

NOW THEREFORE, The City Council of the City of Bonney Lake, Washington do resolve as follows:

Section 1. For the Bonney Lake Days celebration, the Mayor or his designee is permitted to enter into agreements up to $6,000 using approved City contract forms, provided such agreements are substantially the same as the City’s standard Personal Services Agreement form, and to otherwise encumber, expend and disburse funds outside the adopted voucher approval procedures, such as issuing checks immediately upon provision of services, delivery of goods, or upon completion of performances, etc. In addition, the Mayor or his designee is permitted to procure minor services up to $900 in value using only a purchase order.

Section 2. All such expenditure of City funds shall be obligated only by authorized representatives of the City. Expenditures shall be accompanied by purchase orders, contracts, receipts, vouchers, or other appropriate forms of documentation.

PASSED by the City Council of Bonney Lake this ___ day of June, 2006.

__________________________
Neil Johnson, Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
Harwood T. Edvalson, City Clerk

__________________________
James Dionne, City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
City of Bonney Lake, Washington
Council Agenda Bill (C.A.B.) Approval Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Staff Contact:</th>
<th>Council/Wrkshp Mtg Date:</th>
<th>Agenda Bill Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Srvc/Edvalson</td>
<td>June 27, 2006</td>
<td>AB06-128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance Number:</th>
<th>Resolution Number:</th>
<th>Councilmember Sponsor:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D06-128</td>
<td></td>
<td>DeLeo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUDGET INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 Budget Amount</th>
<th>Required Expenditure</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Remaining Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation**
There will be a budget impact for the manufacture and installation of signs. An estimate for this cost has not been developed.

**Agenda Subject:** Council consideration of a proposed ordinance restricting parking within walking distance of the Bonney Lake High School.

**Administrative Recommendation:** Approval.

**Background Summary:** The Public Safety Committee has been working on an ordinance to limit parking in residential areas near Bonney Lake High School. It is anticipated the number of school-related vehicles will continue to increase over the next few years increasing the impact to the residential neighborhoods near the high school. The proposed ordinance provides that parking will be by permit only on the streets designated within the ordinance. It further authorizes the City to develop criteria for determining who will be eligible for a parking permit in the restricted area. The City Council forwarded the proposed ordinance for action without discussion at the Workshop. Upon receipt of correspondence from the neighborhood, Councilmember DeLeo added streets # 10, 11 and 12 to the proposed ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Committee Dates:</th>
<th>Commission Dates:</th>
<th>Board/Hearing Examiner Dates:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee:</td>
<td>Planning Commission:</td>
<td>Park Board:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Committee:</td>
<td>Civil Service Commission:</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development &amp; Planning Committee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Workshops: 06.06.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Action:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Call for Hearing:</th>
<th>Council Hearings Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Referred Back to:</th>
<th>Workshop:</th>
<th>Committee:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Tabled Until:</th>
<th>Council Meeting Dates:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.27.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signatures:**

Dir. Authorization: [Signature]
Mayor: [Signature]
Date City Attorney Reviewed: Ord. on 05/24/06 – Jeff Ganson
ORDINANCE NO. D06-128

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BONNEY LAKE ESTABLISHING RESTRICTED PARKING AREAS AND ADDING A NEW CHAPTER 10.36 TO THE BONNEY LAKE MUNICIPAL CODE.

WHEREAS, maintaining convenient parking for Bonney Lake residents and their visitors is vital to sustain livability and traffic flow; and

WHEREAS, the streets around Bonney Lake High School are expected to become clogged with student cars when school is in session, such that residents are hindered from accessing their properties; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that it is in the public interest to establish a restricted parking area within walking distance of the Bonney Lake High School;

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

Section 1. A new Chapter 10.36, entitled Restricted Parking Areas, is added to the Bonney Lake Municipal Code to read as follows:

10.36.010 Designation and posting of restricted parking zones

Restricted parking zones established pursuant to this chapter shall be posted with parking signs specifying the applicable parking restriction, as well as the time of day, and days of the week of such restrictions. Parking sign design and placement shall conform to urban parking signs and placement per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

No person shall park a vehicle in violation of posted or marked restrictions, or without a City-issued permit or other authorization where and when such permit or authorization is required.
10.36.020 Restricted parking zone established around Bonney Lake High School

Parking without a City-issued permit is prohibited in the following zones:

**Streets Within City Limits:**

(1) East and west side of 200th Ave Ct from South Prairie Road to 104th St E
(2) East and west side of 201st Ave E
(3) East and west side of 201st Ave Ct E
(4) East and west side of 201st Ave Pl
(5) East and west side of 199th Ave E
(6) East and west side of 199th Ave Ct E
(7) East and west side of 198th Ave E, North of 104th St E
(8) North and south side of 99th St Ct E
(9) North and south side of 100th St E
(10) North and south side of 100th St Ct E
(11) North and south side of 101st St E
(12) North and south side of 102nd St E
(13) North and south side of 103rd St E
(14) North and south side of 104th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(15) North and south side of 105th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(16) North and south side of 105th St Ct E, West of 198th Ave E
(17) North and south side of 106th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(18) North and south side of 106th St Ct E, West of 198th Ave E
(19) North and south side of 107th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(20) North and south side of 108th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(21) North and south side of 108th St Ct E, West of 198th Ave E
(22) North and south side of 109th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(23) North and south side of 109th St Ct E, West of 198th Ave E
(24) North and south side of 110th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(25) North and south side of 111th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(26) North and south side of 112th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(27) North and south side of 113th St E, West of 198th Ave E
(28) East and west side of 188th Ave E
(29) East and west side of 188th Ave Ct E
(30) East and west side of 189th Ave E
(31) East and west side of 190th Ave E
(32) East and west side of 191st Ave Ct E
(33) East and west side of 192nd Ave E
(34) East and west side of 196th Ave E
(35) East and west side of Wildflower Ct E
(36) East and west side of Wilderness Ct E
(37) East and west side of Springwood Drive E
(38) North and south side of Springwood Drive E from 196th to Meadowlark
(39) North and south side of Meadowlark
Streets Outside City Limits

(40) East and west side of 198th Ave Ct E, Between 104th ST E & 108th St Ct E
(41) East and West side of 200th Ave Ct E, Between 104th ST E & 108th St Ct E
(42) East and west side of 201st Ave E, South of 112th ST E
(43) East and west side of 201st Ave Ct E, South of 112th ST E
(44) East and west side of 202nd Ave E
(45) East and west side of 202nd Ave Ct E
(46) East and west side of 203rd Ave E
(47) East and west side of 204th Ave Ct E
(48) East and west side of 205th Ave E
(49) East and west side of 205th Ave Ct E
(50) East and west side of 206th Ave Ct E
(51) East and west side of 207th Ave E
(52) East and west side of 207th Ave Ct E
(53) East and west side of 208th Ave Ct E
(54) East and west side of 209th Ave E
(55) East and west side of 209th Ave Ct E
(56) East and west side of 210th Ave E
(57) East and west side of 210th Ave Ct E
(58) East and west side of 211th Ave Ct E
(59) East and west side of 195th Ave E, South of 109th St E
(60) East and west side of 197th Ave E, South of 112th St E
(61) East and west side of 198th Ave E, South of 112th St E
(62) North and south side of 104th St E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(63) North and south side of 105th St E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(64) North and south side of 105th St Ct E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(65) North and south side of 106th St E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(66) North and south side of 106th St Ct E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(67) North and south side of 107th St E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(68) North and south side of 107th St Ct E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(69) North and south side of 108th St E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(70) North and south side of 108th St Ct E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(71) North and south side of 109th St Ct E, East of 200th Ave Ct E
(72) North and south side of 111th St Ct E, East of 202nd Ave E
(73) North and south side of 112th St E, East of 202nd Ave E
(74) North and south side of Bonanza Dr E
(75) North and south side of La Paloma Dr E
(76) North and south side of La Rita Dr E

10.36.030 Permits
The City is authorized to develop reasonable criteria, including but not limited to residency in the immediate area, for authorizing certain persons to park vehicles in certain restricted zones. The City may require persons applying for permits to show proof of residency. For any restricted parking zone, the City may issue permits, decals or other means of identification, maintain lists of vehicles owned or used by residents, or adopt any other reasonable means of distinguishing vehicles that are authorized to park in restricted zones.

10.36.040  Permits not transferable - Penalty

No person shall transfer or authorize the use of any City-issued permit authorizing a vehicle to park in any restricted parking zone. Any City-issued permit may be revoked, and not renewed for a period of one year, for violation of this section.

10.36.050  Violation - Penalty

Any vehicle parked in a restricted parking zone without a valid permit will be ticketed. The ticket shall carry a fine of $25.00. The infraction form issued to violators shall comply with all applicable portions of RCW 46.63.060. The hearing requirements contained in RCW 46.63.070 through 46.63.151 shall apply to violations of this Chapter and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Section 2. Severability

If a section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is declared unconstitutional or invalid for any reason by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance.

Section 3. Annexation effects

The city will not enforce this ordinance on any streets listed above as “Streets Outside City Limits”. However, the city shall enforce this ordinance on any of the aforementioned streets thirty (30) days after said streets are annexed into the city limits.

Section 4. Effective date

This ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days after its passage, subject to prior approval by the Mayor and prior publication for five days as required by law.

PASSED by the City Council and approved by the Mayor this _____ day of _____________, 2006.

______________________________
Neil Johnson, Mayor
ATTEST:

__________________________
Harwood T. Edvalson, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
James J. Dionne, City Attorney

Passed:
Valid:
Published:
Effective Date:
City of Bonney Lake, Washington
Council Agenda Bill (C.A.B.) Approval Form

| Department/Staff Contact: Admin Svcs/Edvalson | Council/Wrkshp Mtg Date: June 27, 2006 | Agenda Bill Number: AB06-145 |
| Ordinance Number: | Resolution Number: | Councilmember Sponsor: Deputy Mayor Swatman |

BUDGET INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 Budget Amount</th>
<th>Required Expenditure</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Remaining Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Explanation

Agenda Subject: Discussion regarding July 8th Special Meeting and Workshop.

Administrative Recommendation: None.

Background Summary:
With the holiday cancellation of the July 4th Council Workshop, the Council adopted a motion to set a special meeting on July 8th for emergency management training, and a special workshop to follow the emergency training to handle normal City business. Deputy Mayor Swatman requests that the Council discuss the projected agenda and need for that special workshop.

Council Committee Dates:
- Finance Committee:
- Public Safety Committee:
- Community Development & Planning Committee:
- Council Workshops:

Commission Dates:
- Planning Commission:
- Civil Service Commission:

Board/Hearing Examiner Dates:
- Park Board:
- Hearing Examiner:

Council Action:
- Council Call for Hearing:
- Council Hearings Date:
- Council Referred Back to: Workshop
- Council Meeting Dates:
- Council Tabled Until:

Signatures:
- Dir. Authorization: 
- Mayor: 
- Date City Attorney Reviewed: 

[Signature]

[Date]