

OBSERVER REPORT FORM

This form may be completed electronically, and the space expanded as needed. If completing this form by hand, please use the back of the page to add information as needed.

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------|
| Name of Agency | Puyallup City Council | Date of Meeting | 2/13/20 |
| Observer Reporting | Nancy Dahl | Length of Meeting | 2 Hrs. |
| Members Present | All members in attendance; CM Johnson was on the phone | | |
| Others Present | Civics students from Rogers HS. | | |

Content: What issue was discussed? Was some action approved? What discussion related to League positions or priorities? If discussion related to League priorities, do you recommend League action? What documents were made available about these issues?

1. First reading of an ordinance to update animal codes relating to health and safety of animals, service animals and police dogs and updating the violation codes. It appears to update some definitions of service animals and police animals to align with state definitions and updates penalties to be in line with other cities.
2. The council passed 6-0 an ordinance allowing the city to collect from the state a portion of the sales tax generated in Puyallup under Substitute House Bill 1406 for use to fund Affordable and Supportive Housing. **CM Jacobsen** reminded constituents that this is not a new tax, but a rebate to the city of existing tax revenue to be used for this purpose. (CM Johnson’s phone connection was down).
3. The council received an update from Fred Hansen of McKenzie AIA, the consultant hired to do preliminary planning for a new Public Safety Building. Fred reviewed the numbers included in their last report and then went through adjustments to the budget that could be made to reduce the overall cost without reducing the ability for the building to support the mission of the agencies that will be housed in it. This reduced the cost from \$93 M to \$82M. Then the city Finance Director presented a discussion of the various ways bonds can be used to finance the project depending on term and interest rates. **CM Kastama** suggested that Finance Dept explore 50-year bonds in addition to 20 or 30-year bonds. **CM Johnson** suggested that the difference/month for \$93M and \$82M for the average taxpayer will be minimal so go for the \$93M and get what the agencies asked for. **CM Jacobsen** is concerned about making the cost of the project as low as possible due to the current general public discontent about taxes. **DM Palmer** reminded the council that the city hasn’t taken on any new bonds for 20 years and has paid off two large projects (library and Bradley Lake Park) so city taxes are relatively low now and the current condition of public safety facilities requires the city to make this investment. He further pointed out that councilmanic capacity is currently low due to recent hiring of new employees. The City Hall bond will be paid off in 2027 which will then, open opportunities for councilmanic expenditures. He stated that councilmanic bonds can tie the hands of future councils to raise taxes. **CM Witting** reminded the council that councilmanic bonds will affect the cities bond rating so using them could in the long run result in increasing the overall cost of the project. **CM Kastama** questioned if the downtown substation is included in the project total. **Asst. City Mngr. Kirkelie** clarified that the substation is a separate project costing an additional \$450,000, but that the bond city residents will vote on for the Public Safety Building would cover the cost of the both projects. (Councilmanic refers to anything pertaining to council persons. Councilmanic bonds, then, are loans initiated and approved only by a council. A councilmanic bond would be approved by the issuing bank based on the current financial health of the applying organization and paid back from current income sources; as opposed to typical public bonds that are approved by taxpayers through a bond ballot measure and paid back from the proceeds of the resulting new tax-based income source.)

Public Comments:

Several of the comments at this meeting were about a house on Terrace Ave that is a long-term rental to unrelated adults. The neighbors are requesting that the city change the definition of a family so that 6 unrelated adults would no longer be allowed to live in a single-family home. They contend that the neighborhood impact from each resident having a car and the resulting change in noise and confusion that they describe results from this situation is causing much distress to neighbors. Both the neighbor and the resident spoke.

An additional comment expressed gratitude to **CM Witting** and **CM Kastama** for agreeing to form a subcommittee to work together to discuss ideas to increase homeless services and shelter in the city at the recent council retreat.

Public Meetings Announced: Were there any public meetings announced that you think League members may be interested in attending and/or becoming involved with the issue?

CM Kastama reported that the **UWT school of Engineering and Technology**, which he has supported for several years, will be holding the 20th annual South Sound Technology Conference in Tacoma on March 6th in Phillip Hall from 9 AM – 4 PM.

In his report **DM Palmer** was excited to announce a plan the **South Sound Housing Affordability Committee** is working on to form a regional coalition. They have issued a Request for Proposal to hire a consultant which Puyallup will commit to supporting financially. **Mayor Door** announced that there will be a presentation to the council on this proposal at the regular council meeting on Feb. 25th.

DM Palmer also discussed changes that have been proposed by Sound Transit for the Puyallup Commuter rail station to increase capacity. They are proposing to extend the length of the platform so that additional cars can be added to the trains. The new Puyallup **Sound Transit** parking garage in Puyallup will open in 2022.

Process and Protocol:

| Characteristic | Yes | No | Comments/Explanations |
|---|--|----|-----------------------|
| Did members appear to have done their “homework”? | X | | |
| Was material for the meeting made available to the public in advance? | X | | |
| Were members courteous to each other and the public? | X | | |
| How did the group respond to your presence? | No Response | | |
| Other factors worth noting: | Mayor Door is using her power to control the agenda allowing completion of the meeting in the normal 2.5 hrs. including the executive session that followed. | | |