

GIG HARBOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 10, 2004

PRESENT: Councilmembers Ekberg, Young, Franich, Conan, Dick, Picinich, and Mayor Wilbert. Councilmember Ruffo was absent.

CALL TO ORDER: 7:03 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

SWEARING IN CEREMONY: Mayor Wilbert performed the ceremony for Officer Cabacungan. Lt. William Colberg gave a brief background on Officer Cabacungan, who served as an officer in Los Angeles for the two years prior to coming to Gig Harbor.

20-YEAR AWARD CEREMONY: Lt. Colberg gave an overview of Detective Kevin Entze's service history with the City of Gig Harbor Police Department as well as the many community service organizations in which Kevin has participated. Lt. Colberg said that he was proud to present Detective Entze with a 20-year Service Pin in appreciation for his years of service to the city. Detective Entze's wife, Vicki, joined him in the ceremony.

CONSENT AGENDA:

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

1. Approval of the Minutes of City Council Meeting of April 26, 2004.
2. Correspondence / Proclamations: a) Letter from Salvation Army
b) Proclamation - Native Plant Appreciation Week.
c) Letter from Encore!Theater.
3. Agreement with IAC for Funding Assistance – Skansie Brothers Park Property Acquisition.
4. Resolution No. 624 – Authorizing Application to the IAC for Funding Assistance – Skansie Park Property Acquisition Phase II.
5. Rotary Centennial Project.
6. Liquor License Renewals: Harbor Humidor; Puerto Vallarta Restaurant; Round Table Pizza.
7. Approval of Payment of Bills for May 10, 2004:
Checks #43149 through #44094 in the amount of \$233,702.37. Check numbers 43162 through 44000 were destroyed due to change of banks.
8. Approval of Payroll for the month of April:
Checks #3139 through #3180 and direct deposit entries in the amount of \$240,790.04. Payroll check #3153 was voided and replaced with #3158.

Councilmember Dick asked that items number three and four be moved to New Business for further clarification.

MOTION: Move to approve the consent agenda as amended.
Picinich / Dick – unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. First Reading of Ordinance – Regulating Beekeeping. Steve Osguthorpe, Planning / Building Manager, explained that after the April 26th Council meeting, staff had been directed to bring back just one ordinance regulating bees under Title 6, and to change the minimum lot size requirements to reflect those in the Pierce County Ordinance. Mr. Osguthorpe gave an overview of the lot size standards modeled after the Pierce County ordinance, explaining that it also includes an exemption from the lot size standards if the lot is adjacent to an open area of at least two acres in size. He recommended further consideration of the open space exemption, as there are a number of very narrow lot configurations that might negate the impact of a large open space. Mr. Osguthorpe recommended that this exemption be eliminated in the proposed ordinance.

Councilmember Young asked if there would be a way to address this concern without eliminating the open space provision. He asked staff to give this further consideration and to come with a recommendation at the next reading.

Councilmember Picinich asked if there was a way to measure compliance with the allowed number of hives. Mr. Osguthorpe said that compliance would rely upon getting the word out and then follow-up on any complaints.

Marilyn Owel – 6844 Mainsail Lane. Ms. Owel said that this ordinance is an important step in addressing this public safety issue. She said that parcel size does not remedy the current problem and recommended that 6.10.040(B) be eliminated along with the paragraph about lot size limitation shall not apply when a parcel is contiguous to an open area. She explained that we are not a rural area, and urban environments pose different challenges. She discussed the language regarding wetlands, stressing that bees need a consistent water source. She said that the real issue is how to provide remedy to someone adjacent to beehives and what can be done when the bees swarm. Providing remedy through nuisance abatement is a good solution.

Councilmember Ekberg asked what would be an appropriate way to limit the number of hives if parcel size is eliminated. Ms. Owel explained that you would rely on the goodwill of the beekeeper to act in a competent manner. She said that parcel size shouldn't matter if you have adequate remedy provided to abate a public nuisance when someone isn't properly keeping bees.

Councilmember Franich asked if Ms. Owel didn't think that hive limits make more sense to avoid overcrowding. She replied that a competent beekeeper would not raise bees in a crowded area, adding that the swarms that her friends have experienced was much larger than the typical swarm, and posed a genuine hazard. She said that it has not happened since, adding that she hopes that lessons have been learned.

Councilmember Franich said he had not heard information stating that the quantity of bees on a property has anything to do with the potential for agitation. Ms. Owel said that

the limitations proposed in the ordinance would not have solved the problem at that time.

Howard Bowles – 3612 44th St. Ct. Mr. Bowles thanked Council for amending the ordinance, but mentioned that there were a few phrases that were overly broad. He asked that in Section 6.10.070 (B), the word “honey” be inserted in front of “bee sting” and to strike “higher than normal death threatening or hospitalization event” and replace it with “certain or near-certain life-threatening systemic reaction” to reflect the correct medical terminology. He continued to recommend that the word “staff” be changed to “city attorney” in paragraph “C” of the same section due to the perceived predisposition of staff to eliminate bees in the city limits. Further on in paragraph ‘C’, he recommended removing the word “perceived” from the last sentence, as it is a very objective term.

Mr. Bowles said that he wanted to make sure that he has a fair understanding of the complaint process. He said that if an individual has a problem with honeybees, they would have to make a formal complaint to the city; the City Council would then hold a public hearing to address the complaint. If it is a nuisance complaint, there has to be a substantiated case. If it involves an allergy, there has to be a doctor’s statement to the effect that the person has a life-threatening, systemic reaction if stung by a honeybee. Each party has an opportunity to speak at the hearing, and then Council would make a decision within 30 days. Staff agreed that it was a fair assessment of the process.

Steve Osguthorpe said that a reference to a RCW in the ordinance needed to be corrected to read RCW 15.60.021 rather than RCW 15.60.140.

Dave Ewert – 3614 44th St. NW. Mr. Ewert commented on the amendments to include open space and wetlands in the calculation of allowable area for the number of hives. He asked Council not to adopt the ordinance with these changes. He then requested a more clear definition of what would be considered an “open space” if this language were to remain. He said that he wasn’t too concerned about bees next to his house because of the provision for a public hearing in the case of a complaint, as he knows that he could produce the life-threatening evidence for himself. He said that his concern is for others, because 5% of the people in the U.S. are allergic to insect stings. He urged Council to adopt the ordinance, but without the open space allowance that had been added.

Midi Ewert – 3614 44th St. NW. Ms. Ewert reviewed the testimony given at the meeting of April 26th for those who may not have attended. She explained her concerns for the requirement of a consistent water supply for beekeeping, explaining that in the past five years, the pond adjacent to her neighbor’s property goes dry each summer. She said that last year, her garden had a bumper crop of vegetables; so there are plenty of bees. She said that the Department of Health website claims that the greatest danger from a wild creature in the state is insect stings due to allergic reactions. Ms. Ewert concluded by stressing that bees need to be in the county or on large acreage.

Roland Morford – 1009 38th St. NW. Mr. Morford attempted to clarify some misconception about swarms. He explained that swarming is a form of reproduction and when swarming, bees do not sting. He described what happens during a swarm, explaining that no one knows what triggers a swarm.

Robert Stump – 5417 99th Ave. NW. Mr. Stump thanked Council for the improvements to the ordinance. Mr. Stump stressed that most stings are from wasps and hornets and to be stung by a honeybee, you practically have to step on the hive. He added information to the testimony on swarming. He explained that he was the person who came to collect the bee swarm at Harbor Inn and no body was stung. When bees swarm they are looking for a new home and are not interested in harming people.

Bob Thorpe – 8820 Goodman Drive NW. Mr. Thorpe told a story of how his 3-year old son was stung multiple times while visiting the home of their friends who happened to keep bees. He explained that no one knows what triggered the attack, but that his son had been stung over 21 times and became very ill. He added that he is glad to see Council addressing this issue to prevent what could become a tragedy.

Jerry Omenda – 7828 Ray Nash. Mr. Omenda explained that he has been a commercial beekeeper for over 25 years, and has approximately 150 hives distributed throughout Gig Harbor. Mr. Omenda voiced concern with the ordinance and how it may affect him as the population expands. He addressed what he termed “many misconceptions”, which he attributed to the lack of education. He asked Council to take into account the credibility of those testifying when a decision is made.

Councilmember Dick assured him that the ordinance does not seek to eliminate beekeeping, but to deal with problems that might arise. He asked Mr. Omenda what portion of the ordinance might be a problem. Mr. Omenda said that the language on page four, 6.10.050 (A), where it refers to “colonies of bees which are defensive” is scary because he doesn’t know what it means. He said that anything is defensive if it is being threatened, and recommended that this language be reworded.

Councilmember Dick asked if the word “offensive” would be an improvement. Mr. Omenda said that the only bees that would attack without being provoked would be the Africanized Honey Bees. He said that the paragraph is vague because there is no way to prove that the bees are or are not defensive or acting in an objectionable manner. He added that he doesn’t want to minimize a person’s allergic reaction to bees, and he agreed that a person could be a poor manager of anything. He said that he would like to read the ordinance more thoroughly before offering any more suggestions.

John Vodopich asked Council for direction before this returns at the second reading. Councilmember Dick recommended eliminating 6.10.040 (B) # 2, which refers to open areas, as it is not necessary for the ordinance to be successful. He said that he would even be interested in considering the suggestion to eliminate the entire section (B) with regards to parcel size limitation.

Councilmember Dick then addressed the comments by Mr. Omenda regarding the word “defensive”, adding that he thought it may be a typo and the intended word was “offensive.” He said the “objectionable behavior” reference was also vague. The final comment was in regards to the comment by Mr. Bowles about 6.10.070 (C). Councilmember Dick said that he also has a problem with the use of the word “perceived” and the ordinance would be better without the reference to a “perceived menace.”

Councilmember Picinich said that he would like to insert the word “honey” to beestings in 6.10.050, and to add “bumblebees” to Section D after the word “wasp.”

Councilmember Franich agreed with the amendments to add the word “honey” to beestings and the vagueness of the word “perceived.” He said that he would have to give further consideration to the recommendation to amend 6.10.050 (A) and whether the word “defensive” or “offensive” should be used. Under 6.10.070 (C), he agreed with the amendment from “staff” to “attorney” to draft the written decision.

Councilmember Young said that this would be inconsistent with the way other nuisance complaints are handled. Carol Morris clarified that for other hearings, Council asks staff to write the findings and conclusions, with the assistance of the City Attorney.

Councilmember Franich continued to discuss 6.10.070 (B), adding that he would also like to think about the recommendation by Mr. Bowles to amend the language to “certain or near-certain systemic reaction.”

Steve Osguthorpe described how the draft ordinances have evolved. He explained that the one-acre requirement came from the Planning Commission meetings as an alternative to banning beekeeping; the nuisance ordinance was drafted to address the complaint process and the ability to prohibit beekeeping; and lot size requirements came from the Pierce County model. He said that staff could find no science to substantiate the lot size limitations in the Pierce County ordinance. He voiced concern for where the ordinance was headed if the lot size limitations were removed. He suggested an attempt to incorporate the public comments and bring back another ordinance that would be agreeable to all parties. This may require an additional meeting.

2. First Reading of Ordinance - Redefining Allowable Siding Materials. John Vodopich, Community Development Director, said that the ordinance has been amended to reflect changes recommended at the April 12th meeting to incorporate the recommendations from the Planning Commission. These amendments were to delete language pertaining to prohibited siding materials and to incorporate the list of prohibited materials into the list of allowable accent siding materials.

Chuck Hunter – 8829 Franklin Street. Mr. Hunter, a member of the Design Review Board, asked Council to table this ordinance until the updates to the Design Review Manual update is completed. He explained that the Board is working on a section for

the manual to address logical places that would allow some materials, such as concrete tilt-up or all metal buildings to be used.

Councilmember Ekberg asked when the updates to the manual could be expected. Mr. Hunter responded that he did not know, and would be happy to discuss the issues with completion of the updates at a later time.

Lita Dawn Stanton – 111 Raft Island. Ms. Stanton echoed Mr. Hunter's comments and also asked Council to postpone a decision until the Design Manual update could be completed. She said if Council decides to move ahead, she would like clarification on the current language and whether the DRB would be allowed to comment on metal siding or concrete tilt-up if it did not resemble wood. Mr. Osguthorpe responded to her question. She then urged Council to not accept the ordinance as written, as there are applications in which these types of materials may be appropriate.

Wade Perrow – 9119 North Harborview Drive. Mr. Perrow referenced the minutes of the March 18th Planning Commission meeting which reflect the concern voiced by two members of the Design Review Board. The ordinance would not allow a developer to bring in a proposal to use metal siding or concrete if it does not look like wood or masonry, and the DRB would be powerless to make a determination. Mr. Perrow asked that this be tabled until the entire Design Manual is updated. He added that the design guidelines need to be clear, and should address the requirement of the Comprehensive Plan to have an employment based district. Mr. Perrow asked for clarification of the minutes in which Mr. Osguthorpe stated that this material restriction would only apply to prominent facades visible from a public way.

Mr. Osguthorpe responded that Mr. Perrow is correct; the minutes do say public way. He explained that a prominent façade is one that is visible to any public right of way or from the road providing primary access. It would not pertain to every façade visible from the road, but the one facing the private road providing primary access or the façade visible from any public road. He said that there is an error in the minutes.

Councilmember Young said that he is pleased that they are considering an employment district. He agreed that action should be postponed on this ordinance until completion of the updates to the manual.

MOTION: Move to postpone action on this ordinance until that portion of the Design Manual update is completed.
Young / Ekberg – unanimously approved.

3. Second Reading of Ordinance – Building Size Analysis. Mr. Vodopich explained that this ordinance only addresses the increase of the building size limitations in the B-2 zones, the Olympic Village activity center, and the Westside B-2 area from 35,000 s.f. to 65,000 s.f. It also deletes the PUD bonus provision only in the Westside and Olympic Village areas. He recommended a series of five worksessions for Council to work through the various other building size issues to begin on June 1st.

Walt Smith – 11302 Burnham Drive. Mr. Smith supported the recommended increase from 35,000 s.f. to 65,000 s.f. for all the B-2 zones within the urban growth area, excluding downtown Gig Harbor. He said that due to increased costs and regulations, the only avenue left is an increase in building size limits, adding that for a retail center to be successful, it must have a major tenant. Mr. Smith stressed that the Design Manual will give adequate control and protection. He said that the success of the city has been due to the planning for financial opportunity, and urged working in cooperation for planning for the future. He said that he saluted the courage of the city manager for bringing forward a conceptual plan for a town center as a vision for the future, and encouraged further dialog.

Dave Morris – 6018 106th Ave NW. Mr. Morris spoke in support of the increase in the B-2 zones, asking Council not to forget the other B-2 zones outside city limits governed by those zoning designations.

Jim Pasin – 3208 50th St. Ct. Mr. Pasin recommended inclusion of the PUD allowance in the Westside and Olympic Village areas. He said that it would be fair not to exceed 75,000 s.f. This would allow flexibility with use of the property and reward amenities. He continued to say that he would also like a provision for existing buildings that might be over the 65,000 s.f. limit. If destroyed, they should be allowed to rebuild at their existing size.

Carmella Micheli – 10429 Sunrise Beach Drive. Ms. Micheli spoke in favor of keeping the 35,000 s.f. limit. She said the limits have been effective to ensure that no “big-box” retailer would attempt to build. She stressed that bigger is not better, and one way to stop this is to limit the size. She said that more important than size is the purpose, use, and look of the buildings allowed and perhaps a 65,000 s.f. building would better serve the city if architecturally acceptable, and the use did not create a traffic impact. She talked about traffic congestion during the hours of 6 a.m. and 11 a.m. on Point Fosdick, and on Soundview near Olympic Village.

Carl Halsan – PO Box 1447. Mr. Halsan echoed the comments made by Mr. Morris and Mr. Smith in regards to the Urban Growth Area. He said that construction would have to meet city standards even though outside city limits, and urged Council to amend the language to include the building size increase in all B-2 zones except downtown.

Randy Boss – 3206 50th St. Ct. Mr. Boss supported the increase in building size from 35,000 s.f. to 65,000 s.f. He said that it is his job to place retail, and the 35,000 s.f. limit has made it difficult to place them in this market. With the new bridge, he said that Council should provide shopping opportunities in this community, naming several national chains that desire to be in this market area. He then urged Council to amend the ordinance to exclude the exception to the PUD process in the Olympic Village and Westside areas.

Marty Ball – 8304 86th Ave. / business: 5790 Soundview Drive. Mr. Ball explained that he is the owner of the BDR Building and a 4th generation Finholm. Mr. Ball spoke in support of the energy being spent on the downtown area and the vision proposed by Mark Hoppen, stressing that the downtown is the most attractive, sensitive part of the community. Using Whistler as an example, he said that he hopes Gig Harbor can grow and still deal with the necessary amenities such as parking. He stressed that he is very interested in the past history as well as the future of Gig Harbor. He echoed the comments by architect David Bowe that if you rely solely on size you will get structures that are not appealing. The focus should be on restrictions based on amenities and diversity of use. He concluded with a story of driving his grandfather around just to “see how Gig Harbor has changed.”

Councilmember Franich responded that the size of buildings does matter and influences what happens around a community in general. He said that there was a whole room full of people last week that like the character of the Gig Harbor downtown.

Mr. Ball said that a way to address this is the segregation of the zones. The area with the most opportunity is the area from Pioneer to Soundview and across the street at the Uddenberg property, which could have underground parking to free up the area down below to become a city park. He stressed that he is not in support of 100,000 s.f. buildings there, but he didn't want to see it too restricted. He agreed that further on toward Stinson, the old town character can be retained.

Lois Hartwig – 3423 47th St. Ct. Ms. Hartwig urged Council to consider what an increase in building size will do to the traffic on the Westside and what can be done to mitigate the impact that the increase in size will bring. She spoke in favor of protecting the downtown Gig Harbor, adding that the Westside is worthy of the same protection.

Jack Bujacich – 3607 Ross Avenue. Mr. Bujacich agreed with the building size increase to 65,000 s.f., adding he hopes that with the exclusion of the PUD process in the Olympic Village and Westside areas, that it didn't eliminate the possibility of building a hospital. He then addressed the comments by Mr. Ball about Whistler, saying that this area was built brand new, not from an existing, quaint, residential community. He said that he would like to see a moratorium on construction in the basin area until the meetings are concluded. He added that he hopes that the people attend those meetings and let their intentions be known.

Steve Derepy – 9221 Peacock Hill Ave. Mr. Derepy moved here nine months ago from a community overrun with corporate giants without any planning. These store sucked everything from the community and put nothing back. He urged Council to keep the 35,000 s.f. building size to keep the character.

Hal Limoler – 10409 Sunrise Beach NE. Mr. Limoler said he has owned his cabin property since 1984. He said that he liked the old Whistler, which was grand. The new Whistler has become overcrowded. He continued to explain that he has disagreed with some of the decisions made by this Council in regards to Gig Harbor, but he hasn't

known the basics. He said he planned on becoming an advocate to keep Gig Harbor the way it was when he bought his property. He described West Seattle, a thriving community with no big box stores. He then talked Federal Way and how it has changed to a jungle over the years due to uncontrolled growth, warning that this is what could happen here. He said that he would like his children to remember Gig Harbor in its present form, adding that he is against having the larger box stores.

Linda Gair – 9301 No. Harborview Dr. / business – 7811 Pioneer Way. Ms. Gair agreed with a moratorium on the downtown until the issue can be resolved. She said that several people just attended a conference on downtown revitalization. One of the things that came from that is that Gig Harbor needs to be a “cool” community. This will be the focus of the discussion in the weeks to come, but the opportunity is here now to develop a vision with the downtown property owners, the business owners and the residents. She stressed that Gig Harbor has to have the quality of life required to bring people here. She then suggested that the Westside owners get together to come up with a vision for that area.

Wade Perrow – 9119 No. Harborview Drive. Mr. Perrow asked for clarification of the definition of maximum gross floor area.

Councilmember Young responded that it is not the footprint, but the total square footage.

Mr. Perrow said that 65,000 s.f. limit wouldn't allow a school, or a medical center and many buildings far exceed this limit with multiple floors that wouldn't create a footprint challenge. All buildings have go through the SEPA checklist to address traffic, stormwater runoff and other issues. He said that he agreed with the comment from Councilmember Ruffo that he didn't know how we arrived at this point, and asked that Council look at the limitation from the perspective of multiple stories.

John Kvinsland – 14022 Powell Road. Dr. Kvinsland said that as a member of the Westside community, he is in favor of the increase to 65,000 s.f. and the vision brought forward by Mark Hoppen, which he described as “way past due.” He said that several years ago, he wondered why an annexation effort was rejected, as he thought the city would welcome the tax revenue. He described his visit to Newport, Rhode Island, and recommended modeling this place when developing a vision for Gig Harbor.

John Vodopich presented the proposed schedule for the building size worksessions:

- Session 1 - All zones that currently do not have building size limits.
- Session 2 - Downtown Business District.
- Session 3 - Waterfront Zones.
- Session 4 - All zones within the basin.
- Session 5 - All zones that currently have limits, included the B-2 in the UGA.

Councilmember Young said that the B-2 zones outside the city limits have never been discussed, which may be an oversight. He said that the B-2 zone in the Purdy area is

more in character with the Westside, but agreed that it may be more appropriate to separate these zones. He addressed comments from Carmella Kelly, explaining that each project has to submit traffic concurrency information, and improvements made to ensure traffic flows. He continued to explain that on the Westside, the commercial areas did not create the traffic problems. The congestion has occurred because of the population increase outside city limits that travel through town.

Councilmember Young said that the existing buildings on the Westside are more in line with the proposed increase to 65,000 s.f. He said that the city does not want to discourage redevelopment of property, but does want to retain the scale. He explained that the 35,000 s.f. limit was put in place as the only recourse available to limit what buildings look like. This was implemented with the idea that after the Design Review Guidelines were adopted, the size limits would revert back. This was never done, and we are now working toward a solution.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 959 as written.
Ekberg / Young -

Councilmember Franich said that no one could know what might have been built in Olympic Village if the 35,000 s.f. was in place at the time it was redeveloped. He said that the comment that the increase in population has caused the congestion on the Westside is a one-sided view. He stressed that the people coming in and out of the commercial developments do contribute to the gridlock.

Councilmember Franich continued to say that he agreed that the existing businesses should be allowed to rebuild to the existing size. He said that Safeway and QFC have both gone through a major remodel, which is a positive thing. He said that the size of the building does affect the character of the community, but that he is in support of the 65,000 s.f. limit.

Councilmember Picinich asked for clarification on whether this would prevent a hospital from being built on the Westside. Mark Hoppen explained that this only applies to commercial, and Franciscan Health Services is a non-profit organization and therefore, would not be affected.

MOTION: Call for the question.
Picinich - Five voted in favor. Councilmember Young voted no. The question came forward for vote.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 959 as written.
Ekberg / Young – unanimously approved.

The Mayor called for a brief recess at 9:35 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:42 p.m. Councilmembers Picinich and Franich left the meeting during this break.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Contract for Chief of Police. Mark Hoppen, City Administrator, presented the employment contract for the hiring of Michael Davis, who will join the City on June 1st. Mr. Hoppen explained that one change had been made to the agreement in the packet at the recommendation of the city's personnel attorney, Scott Snyder. He explained that Mike Davis has passed all his pre-employment background and psychological checks and recommended approval of the contract.

MOTION: Move to authorize the Mayor to sign the employment agreement for Chief of Police with the amendment to Section 7-A.
Dick / Conan - unanimously approved.

2. Agreement with IAC for Funding Assistance – Skansie Brothers Park Property Acquisition. Councilmember Dick asked for clarification in regards to using the grant funds retroactivity for the purchase of the Skansie Park Property. Mark Hoppen discovered that the necessary language that addressed this concern was located in paragraph (I) on the second page of the agreement.

MOTION: Move to authorize the Mayor to sign the Agreement with IAC for Funding Assistance for the Skansie Brothers Park Property Acquisition.
Dick / Young – unanimously approved.

3. Resolution No. 624 – Authorizing Application to the IAC for Funding Assistance – Skansie Park Property Acquisition Phase II.

MOTION: Move to adopt Resolution No. 624 as presented.
Young / Ekberg – unanimously approved.

STAFF REPORTS: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Jim Pasin 2710 39th St. Ct. – Mr. Pasin said that the city has spent a great deal of money on the center divider on Point Fosdick, which now has weeds growing in it. He asked that the Public Works Department tend to these center flower beds on a regular basis. He said that his concern is that the city has beautification projects, but if you don't keep them maintained, the end result is worse than without the improvements.

Councilmember Ekberg explained that this is traditionally done by the summer hires. Mark Hoppen added that by the weekend of the Maritime Gig, the whole city will be in "ship-shape" condition. He continued to explain that the amount of weeding at the Civic Center has become a monumental task, and that a new Community Service program is being developed to help deal with this. He agreed that this is a city-wide problem that

needs to be evaluated in order to deal with weeds effectively and to prevent this from occurring in the future.

Councilmembers agreed that with the increase in median improvements, park property and the added grounds at the Civic Center, it has become a problem of lack of staff to perform the duties. Mr. Hoppen said that the routines would be evaluated before a request at budget time for increased staffing. Councilmember Ekberg suggested contracting for services until the staff could be added.

Mr. Pasin continued to discuss his concern with the increase in traffic that is taking a shortcut through Fairway Estates since 36th Street has opened to the freeway. He stressed that the city cannot wait another 2-3 years for a roundabout at the Pt. Fosdick and 36th intersection. He said that there needs to be a signal and a left turn lane at that intersection now to address the safety issues.

Mark Hoppen explained that the problem is not the altered traffic pattern on Pt. Fosdick, but the backup all along Highway 16. DOT is evaluating the extension of the merging lane off 36th, and have already adjusted the frequency of the traffic light on 22nd. The city is planning turning pockets this summer as a temporary measure until the roundabout can be constructed. He said that Lighthouse Christian School is going to change their entrance to further down Pt. Fosdick.

Councilmember Dick stressed that a traffic light would not ease the congestion in the morning because it's backed up clear to the freeway. Unless DOT does something on the highway, any improvements that the city makes won't help.

Mr. Hoppen said that DOT is reevaluating an option to open an access on Stone Road past the toll lanes for transponder units. He said that the preliminary improvements to the intersection at Pt. Fosdick and 36th will be done this summer. Councilmembers added that the roundabout is to be constructed in the next construction season and that there is a long lead time to order and install traffic lights.

Jim Pasin voiced another concern that contractors are asked to follow the Design Review manual, but when the city constructs a project, they don't follow the same requirements. He asked Council to take this into consideration during the updates to the manual.

COUNCIL COMMENTS / MAYOR'S REPORT:

Tacoma City Council Meeting. Mayor Wilbert reported that she had a water-taxi survey on the city website and sent the information to all the newspapers in the South Puget Sound and took the message to the Tacoma City Council meeting last Tuesday to put landings on the Thea Foss Waterway. She continues to work with the Discovery Institute to develop a public-private partnership for a water-taxi on Puget Sound.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OTHER MEETINGS:

John Vodopich said that he would revise the proposed schedule for worksessions to discuss building size issues to allow for proper public notice. The meetings would be held every other week at 6:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Community Rooms. The first meeting is scheduled for June 1st.

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 10:07 p.m.
Ekberg / Conan - unanimously approved.

CD recorder utilized:
Disc #1 Tracks 1 – 14.
Disc #2 Tracks 1 – 21.
Disc #3 Tracks 1 – 3.



Gretchen Wilbert, Mayor



Molly Towslee, City Clerk