
KING COUNTY
2007-2008
Charter Review Commission

PUBLIC HEARING

6:30 p.m.
July 10, 2007
Black Diamond Community Center
Black Diamond, Washington

REPORTED BY: Yvonne A. Gillette, CCR No. 2129.

1 COMMISSIONERS:

TERRY LAVENDER

2

JOHN JENSEN

3

ALLAN MUNRO

4

MIKE LOWRY

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. JENSEN: There's just a couple of people to get signed in, and we'll get started.

In addition to your opportunity to have input in this process, it's also really nice for the commission to see this kind of turn out. My name is John Jensen. I'm a board member and past president of the Newcastle Chamber of Commerce. I am one of 21 commissioners.

There are several other commissioners here tonight. To my far left tonight is Governor Mike Lowry. And to my left is Mr. Allan Munro, an attorney. And to my right is Terry Lavender, who is from the unincorporated area near Woodinville. Councilman Dunn will not make it.

Also here tonight, we have our charter review coordinator, who's Mark Yango, and next to him is Corrie Watterson who is the project manager. And the person you first saw checking you in was Charlotte Ohashi, which is the administrative liaison. And to her right is Hong Ni, the executive assistant. And there are a few other-- sorry. Right here in front of me. Mary Kate and Gus and Bret. They are interns working with the county.

1 So what is the charter review commission? We
2 are a group of citizens appointed by King County
3 Executive Ron Sims. There is a mixture of
4 professions and obviously both genders. There are
5 people from the rural areas, urban areas, and we
6 think we have a good mix of diversity on the
7 Commission.

8 What have we done so far? This is the last of
9 nine public outreach meetings. We have also reached
10 out to over 360 organizations in the county. So we
11 have heard from Municipal League, Suburban Cities,
12 League of Women Voters, and the unincorporated area
13 councils.

14 I would like to give the floor now to Corrie
15 Watterson, and she's going to tell you a little bit
16 more about the process itself.

17 (Powerpoint presentation by Ms. Watterson.)

18 MR. JENSEN: Thank you very much, Corrie. We
19 don't have that many people that signed up to speak,
20 so we're going to be loose with the amount of time
21 that you have. That being said, you will also be--
22 you have the opportunity to continue your input.
23 You could send e-mails, submit written information.
24 And we'll be looking at that until we finish with
25 this task.

1 So we'll go three to five minutes. There are
2 a couple that would like to make longer
3 presentations. I want to hold that to the end. You
4 may have questions from the commissioners. That's
5 been one of the most enjoyable and I think revealing
6 parts of these hearings is when there can be a
7 little bit of a dialogue.

8 The first speaker is going to be Gregory
9 Sender. And the second speaker will be Tom
10 Carpenter.

11 MR. SENDER: There's a lot more people when
12 you look at it going there way. Mr. Governor and
13 members of council and my fellow King County
14 residents, I would like to read this excerpt from
15 the Seattle Times, and it tells exactly what I
16 wanted to voice, if that's okay. This is from
17 Richard DeBall and Mike Hewett. Making legislation
18 is like making sausage, the saying goes. It can be
19 a messy and unsightly process. But sometimes the
20 right decision is so clear and important, that
21 lawmakers can address citizens' needs in a quick and
22 tidy manner.

23 That's where we find ourselves with Initiative
24 747 the property tax protection law voters approved
25 in 2001. In a stretch of logic, a King County judge

1 declared it unconstitutional suggesting the
2 58 percent of voters who approved the initiative
3 were confused when they limited their regular
4 property tax increases to one percent a year without
5 voter approval.

6 In our opinion, the judge's ruling is yet
7 another broad swipe by the Courts at voters' rights
8 to self-government. To his credit, State Attorney
9 General, Rob McKenna, petitioned for a stay until
10 the decision was appealed to the Washington Supreme
11 Court.

12 The Court however could take months to act.
13 Perhaps a quicker and easier answer is for lawmakers
14 to assemble for one day and put this property tax
15 limit back on the books. House and Senate
16 Republicans have called on Governor Christine
17 Gregoire and Democratic legislative leaders to
18 convene a special session.

19 Why go to the time and expense if the case is
20 under appeal? There are three important reasons.
21 First, to protect property owners from needless tax
22 increases.

23 The Department of Revenue shows I-747 has
24 saved taxpayers about one billion since it passed.
25 Without voter approval, local government tax

1 increases can jump from one percent to six percent.
2 Although no jurisdiction has taken advantage of the
3 higher threshold, the window remains open, creating
4 a temptation for local governments to raise property
5 taxes. That could cost Washington property owners
6 27 to 225 million a year.

7 Second, quick action is necessary because many
8 cities and counties are developing their 2007
9 budgets. A reinstated I-747 would give them clear
10 parameters in line with citizens' wishes and avoid
11 problems for local taxing districts only to have
12 those taxes voided later by the Supreme Court.

13 Finally, this is a matter of protecting the
14 people's right to decide issues for themselves. The
15 Courts have trampled repeatedly on this right by
16 overturning initiatives on technical grounds. If
17 judges want to legislate from the bench, lawmakers
18 have a right to uphold the will of the people. The
19 judicial and legislative branches are equal branches
20 of government. And all power comes from the people
21 we serve.

22 The governor and other Democrats say a one day
23 special session is not worth the cost. For that
24 taxpayers would save at least 27 million. A great
25 return on your investment.

1 After the ruling, the governor said she wanted
2 to reach a compromise on the issue, something higher
3 than the one percent limit voters approved.

4 Translated, that means a tax increase. Homeowners
5 don't want a compromise. Voters spoke clearly in
6 2001 saying they didn't want property taxes raised
7 more than one percent a year without their approval.

8 We are confident the State Supreme Court will
9 overturn the King County ruling. But if the Court
10 doesn't act quickly, the legislature must.
11 Washington taxpayers deserve no less.

12 My current taxes are almost four hundred bucks
13 a month right now on my home. And I talk to people
14 all the time who were being taxed out of their
15 homes, that are being forced to move to other
16 locations because their taxes go up constantly.

17 Some of our founding fathers -- it was called
18 the Boston Tea Party. Taxation without
19 representation, I believe, was the reason they had
20 it. I feel like when you take away the will of the
21 people and just one judge can take it and throw it
22 out -- we the people have voted for it. It makes me
23 feel like my freedoms are eroding. And I think it's
24 dangerous. I wrote a letter to the governor, and
25 she said she was willing to make a compromise. It

1 snowed kind of over. I got a bunch of political
2 double talk.

3 I had to get up here and voice my opinion.
4 And I wish someone would address that and tell me
5 what's being done. Why should I go to the polls and
6 vote? Why should I worry about voting if nobody
7 listens? And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: His opinion is our opinion
9 too.

10 MR. SENDER: Everybody sits by and blindly
11 lets them-- I don't know what else to say.

12 MR. JENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Sender.

13 Mr. Carpenter. And after Mr. Carpenter is
14 Steve Hammond.

15 MR. CARPENTER: Good evening. And thank you
16 very much for the opportunity to talk again.

17 Again, my name is Tom Carpenter. Along with
18 being a resident in the unincorporated area outside
19 of Renton, I chair the Four Creeks Unincorporated
20 Area Growth Management Committee. I'm really glad
21 that you guys are willing to come out and have these
22 conversations.

23 Let me be brief. I wanted to restate just one
24 thing that I talked to you about when we met in May.
25 I remember the end chart in that presentation. The

1 title was shared vision. You asked a question when
2 we started this presentation, or started tonight
3 about what you believe the challenges are for the
4 next ten years, the charter review being a ten year
5 cycle, and the opportunity for learning only occurs
6 every ten years.

7 The question is, which one is most important.
8 For me, in 1990, across the country, there was an
9 unprecedented amount of environmental legislation
10 that was passed in the state of Washington that
11 turned out to be the Growth Management Act. Those
12 kinds of acts have a long learning cycle time.

13 We're 17 years into that activity. And
14 although I tend to agree that in the beginning,
15 strong legislation to be able to put things into
16 play was the right answer, it unfortunately today
17 has let the pendulum swing a little too far. I'm
18 not an environmentalist or any kind of radical. I
19 believe in the area I have lived in. What I want is
20 to be able to drive down this road and continue to
21 see lots of trees and some buffering from the
22 housing that's going on.

23 Unfortunately right now, what's happening both
24 in terms of the way we have structured the county
25 counsel and the way the dialogue is going on, there

1 is a very divisive kind of environment going on
2 between what I would consider to be urban thinkers
3 and rural thinkers. Or you could get them between
4 property rights people and socialists to use another
5 term. That divisiveness when we need to do some
6 soul searching is counterproductive.

7 The challenge we're going to give to the
8 county council -- they will be out for another UAC
9 meeting shortly. One of the challenges is going to
10 be is how to stop that divisiveness. I made some
11 recommendations about restructuring the county
12 council. I also recognized-- and the recommendation
13 was that we needed to take a look at things like,
14 perhaps splitting up the council into two houses.
15 Whether that can be done legally or not, I don't
16 know.

17 What I challenge the charter review commission
18 to do is to look for more and more ways in which we
19 can deal with this situation over the ten years to
20 remove this polarity that appears to be going on
21 between different types of groups. Environmental
22 groups on one side and industrialization on the
23 other side. Neither are right, and neither are
24 wrong.

25 What we have to do is find a way to walk a

1 line together. And the charter of this county is an
2 important backbone to that activity. So please,
3 along with all the other things, keep in mind that
4 we got to get rid of the divisiveness. And also
5 recognize this is an 80-20 split. Somehow or other,
6 we have got to get the voice of the people who are
7 in the unincorporated areas. They are the stewards
8 and custodians of the land. They are the ones that
9 have done this stuff out here. But the development
10 is really causing the trauma among the people that
11 live here. Somehow or others we have got to do this
12 development in a lot more sensitive manner. And the
13 only way to do it is get this divisiveness dialogue
14 out of the process.

15 MR. JENSEN: Mr. Steve Hammond.

16 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much for this
17 opportunity. And I would like to say that much of
18 what I feel was included in the previous testimony.
19 So there's no sense in going back over that again.
20 The nature of the charter -- and by the way, one of
21 the previous reviews is where we got the
22 unincorporated area councils. They have no teeth.
23 The council still has the final say. But they were
24 attempting to try to address that.

25 A major part of what is happening in the

1 charter -- and I appreciate the conciliatory nature.
2 But a previous speaker was making reference to the
3 Boston Tea Party. It was the same feeling of being
4 governed by someone who does not live among you that
5 caused those feelings. And that's what has been so
6 contentious since the Growth Management Act.

7 And now if you're not aware with the recent
8 Supreme Court decision, McFarland versus King
9 County, the whole right of referendum and initiative
10 was eviscerated. Growth Management Act has become
11 the 2000 pound elephant in the room. If someone
12 claims something is Growth Management now, it is no
13 longer subject to the voice of the people. That
14 ruling has basically escalated the contentiousness
15 and frustration.

16 The King County government essentially has the
17 same ability to rule in the urban area and the rural
18 area in criminal justice. There's not a lot of
19 difference in deciding if someone is breaking the
20 law, how they should be dealt with, whether they;
21 should be punished, etc. That sort of thing is not
22 an urban versus rural. Unfortunately most of what
23 county government was originally intended for was to
24 govern those who were not inside any other kind of
25 jurisdiction. It was meant to be the most local

1 government for unincorporated areas.

2 In King County, we obviously have a situation
3 where thanks to Reagan Dunn moving outside into the
4 rural areas just recently, we now at least have one
5 person who lives in the unincorporated area. Be
6 that as it may, before that point, what I did two
7 years ago in the campaign was to draw a line from
8 Woodinville to Federal Way lives and realize all
9 nine council members lived west of that line, none
10 of them in unincorporated areas.

11 So we are being governed by those who do not
12 live among us, don't represent us. And I have often
13 said we are being treated as if we are the county's
14 free zoo so that people in the urban areas can feel
15 good about saving the environment and can drive out
16 here and look at our animals for free.

17 And that's sort of the feeling we get as the
18 rules and regulations come down. I will also tell
19 you that I spent an awful lot of time with clients
20 who are in trouble with DDES. And DDES is not
21 always following their own rules. DDES, Department
22 of Developmental Environmental Services. And it's a
23 mouthful to say, DDES.

24 So but let me give you two examples. One of
25 the most egregious, I have three clients right now

1 who had a building damaged either by wind, fire or
2 water. When I was on the council, it was the last
3 major comp plan review and the critical areas
4 ordinance all coming down in the same year. Very
5 contentious year.

6 We were promised on camera under testimony
7 that DDES would allow buildings to be rebuilt.
8 Today, however, I want to promise you that no one is
9 being allowed to have a building rebuilt after it's
10 damaged by wind, fire, or water, unless they can
11 meet all the new and current codes. That's contrary
12 to what we were promised. Very rarely does any
13 building that's damaged in that way still meet the
14 current codes. The person is being told, of course
15 you can rebuild. You can't rebuild what you had in
16 the location you had it.

17 I could give another example. And that
18 example would be code enforcement, which a number of
19 code enforcement officers have alleged things to
20 clients, citizens, which when I showed up on the
21 scene and said, excuse me, I don't think that's the
22 law, can you show me that, turned out to be it
23 wasn't the law. These kinds of things make for a
24 feeling of bad police. Now, DDES is not police, but
25 many people say code enforcement in a law

1 enforcement kind of role. It comes across very
2 egregiously when you find out the person you have
3 been trying to cooperate with isn't giving you the
4 straight skinny.

5 Several other examples could be given. As
6 long as a situation exists where the legislation is
7 being made by those who neither are impacted
8 personally by the laws they pass nor have to stand
9 for election by voters who themselves are impacted
10 by the laws they pass, where is the incentive for
11 them to hear us? I don't vote for Larry Phillips.
12 I don't vote for Dow Constantine. You know, go down
13 the list. I have one council representative I vote
14 for. The rest of them pass the laws with impunity.
15 And many of them govern entirely -- are you hearing
16 me? -- entirely urban districts with no
17 unincorporated area.

18 Dow Constantine has some on Vashon. Kathy
19 Lambert has the largest portion of unincorporated
20 area. That leaves six of them that regulate only
21 incorporated area. County government is meant to be
22 a local thing. If you live in a city, and your
23 plumbing breaks down, you don't say, I need to call
24 my councilman.

25 Legally, I understand we have been told one

1 person, one vote. And we have had a very difficult
2 time dealing with how do you get one person, one
3 vote and still give the unincorporated areas their
4 say. But I want to tell you, our problem is not
5 sewage. Our problem is somewhat waste water,
6 because the regulations are coming down on us by
7 folks who essentially aren't-- I mean, I wish I
8 could just go story after story. Look at the
9 farmers who were told they had to put in concrete
10 bunkers because they needed to protect the ground
11 water. Concrete is porous. Whose's expense?
12 Yours, cost of doing business. They put them in.
13 Two years later, the soil was tested. Seepage is
14 still there. It's coming through concrete. They
15 said you you're going to have to tear them out. At
16 whose expense? Yours, cost of doing business.
17 People who didn't know what they were doing are
18 passing regulations. These things escalate.

19 When I was a councilmember in district nine, I
20 had two people living side by side, one of whom who
21 voluntarily got in the Ag Commission program for
22 development rights, giving those away. Right next
23 door, the person decided not to do so. And the next
24 year the council down zoned them, and they lost
25 their rights anyway. One got paid and one didn't.

1 These kinds of things have-- there has to be
2 more voice from here. And it can't just be
3 testimony that is largely ignored. It has to be
4 that we sense we're being heard, listened to. And
5 it's land use that rises to the top. I attended an
6 Ag Commission meeting recently where they are
7 considering restricting the size of the house.
8 Where in the world did you get there?

9 So all of these things pressuring on us really
10 boil down to land use, fees, zoning regulations,
11 land use regulations, ag rules, all of those kinds
12 of things. But they are being passed by those who
13 don't live among us, aren't affected by the rules,
14 and aren't elected by the people who live by the
15 rules.

16 MR. JENSEN: Next is Kathy Myers, and after
17 Kathy will be David Field.

18 MS. MYERS: I live in the rural
19 unincorporated section of Maple Valley. Kind of
20 amusing, how can county government serve you better?
21 How can King County government simultaneously meet
22 the needs of urban and rural residents? It can't.
23 When you have a government where the vast majority
24 of people are totally unaccountable to the rural
25 residents on issues that affect only rural

1 residents, it can't be effective. It will never be
2 fair.

3 I guess in a theoretical sense, it could be.
4 If the politicians were all motivated solely by
5 doing the best and being ethical. I don't think
6 anybody that lives in the rural land finds that to
7 be the case with the King County Council.

8 The rural residents have to be governed by
9 people who are accountable to them when it comes
10 time to vote. If we're not, we are never going to
11 be given fair treatment. I have lived in Maple
12 Valley for 18 years. And King County has worked
13 very hard to urbanize the rural lands. The rural
14 people have protested consistently the urbanization
15 of our lands to no effect whatsoever, because,
16 again, those politicians are not accountable to us.
17 They don't care what we think.

18 When the Growth Management Act was passed, the
19 county was required to put labels on the areas. The
20 label that they put on the half of Maple Valley that
21 had sewers was ludicrous. I think it stated that we
22 were a regional draw. If you drove 20 minutes away,
23 you found people that had never heard of Maple
24 Valley. We had politicians that would literally get
25 lost when they came to Maple Valley. And these were

1 our representatives.

2 So they put this label on us, that said we
3 were this wonderful essentially urban area. We
4 weren't. I called down to Olympia. Are they
5 required to label us urban because we have sewers?
6 Absolutely not. They are allowed by law to do that,
7 but the label should be accurate. It's not. What
8 can we do? Nothing. Apparently it's a bottoms up
9 piece of legislation, which means citizens are
10 supposed to force the legislators to abide by the
11 law by voting.

12 So they put this label on half of Maple
13 Valley. So they whip out that magic eraser, erase
14 rural and put in urban. And now when you drive
15 through that portion of Maple Valley, it's
16 appalling. We are a rural community with urban
17 levels of traffic.

18 I drive through and look at all of the land
19 that used to be beautiful forests and is now boxes
20 sitting ten feet from each other. It's disgusting.
21 This from a King County council that pays lip
22 service to how deeply it cares about protecting the
23 rural land. They don't care at all about protecting
24 the rural land. In my opinion, they chose to do
25 this to Maple Valley, because they had two choices.

1 There is a growing demand for more houses here. The
2 development has to go somewhere. They could put it
3 in the backyards of those urban constituents that
4 get to vote for them, or they could put in the
5 backyards of the rural people who don't vote for
6 them. Of course they chose to urbanize the rural
7 part of Maple Valley.

8 That was totally inaccurate and unfair. We
9 had no say in what happened. So here's this King
10 County council that professes to care about keeping
11 rural areas rural. And they slaughter Maple Valley,
12 sell it out to developers. After that, they came up
13 with a 401 program. Again, we protested with
14 absolutely no effect whatsoever.

15 And now King County's at it again. There's
16 150 some acres in Maple Valley. It's surrounded by
17 incorporated land, but it is rural King County,
18 unincorporated land. King County is going to
19 designate it urban and sell it to a developer.

20 I am an environmentalist, by the way. It is
21 incredibly important, critically important to
22 protect habitat in the urban area. King County has
23 an opportunity to do this on this land. And if they
24 cared about protecting urban land, that's what they
25 would be doing. It's a done deal.

1 As a speaker said, we don't have any
2 representation truly. They don't care about us.
3 They never will, until they have to, and that's not
4 going to happen. I believe a previous charter
5 review commission did recommend to them that they
6 find a way for the-- for people like me to have a
7 voice. Of course, it was their option as to whether
8 to pay attention to that or totally blow it off.
9 And we know what they did. I don't know if there's
10 anything more that you can do or that you can tell
11 us that we can do. We're helpless. As I said, they
12 are not accountable, and they don't want to be.

13 Efficient? Anyone who is working with DDES--
14 no. It now takes about a year and a half to get a
15 building permit for a regular person. I tried to do
16 a development. Sorry. Good heavens. I tried to
17 build a house for my parents. And I went in -- over
18 the course of three months, I went in several times.
19 Every time, oh, gee, you need this too. It is a
20 model of inefficiency. I suspect there are so many
21 regulations, they can't keep them straight. Is
22 there anything we can do? Is there anything you can
23 do?

24 MR. JENSEN: I think it's a good question.
25 And it's definitely a theme that we have heard here.

1 I do appreciate it. What I would like to do before
2 we start to engage in a dialogue is to make sure we
3 get to the speakers, but I appreciate what you're
4 saying.

5 This is David Field. And the next speaker
6 will be Warren Iverson.

7 MR. FIELD: I'm glad to see you tonight. We
8 had a solution for this. But you wouldn't help me,
9 sir. My name is Dave Fields. I live in Hobart.
10 You previously heard Four Creeks' presentation on
11 their ideas. And for the most part, I agree with
12 it. And but I have got a couple of things that I
13 would like to see changed in it.

14 Number one, I would like to see the King
15 County budget office as an autonomous unit, not part
16 of the executive's dwell. All too often, if they
17 want a particular social program in the urban
18 area -- the first time it was Guardian One was going
19 to disappear. Well, we suddenly found some more
20 money somehow for Guardian One. But all too often,
21 the budget is used as a toy to coerce what the
22 county executive wants out of the county council.

23 The second thing I would like to see with that
24 agency is that all budgets be zero based. That
25 means you have to justify your expenditures. You

1 have to actually go through and say, well, I have
2 got this many people, and I need this much money.
3 Well, you gave me 35,000 last year. How about
4 60,000 this year? That's not cost effective. And
5 very often, if you have tried to read King County
6 budgets as I have. Without a lawyer on one side and
7 an accountant on the other, you don't know what they
8 say anyhow.

9 That's my second suggestion. My third is
10 about DDES, but I have got an idea. King County
11 could do this if they would. But I think that as a
12 charter item, it might get a little further credence
13 than we have been able to get it so far. I would
14 like to see the revenues that pay for DDES positions
15 taken out of the general fund, not as fees that they
16 charge to the clientele. Because what incentive do
17 you have to complete a project in a timely manner if
18 when you do so, you're cutting your own throat,
19 because you're not going to get enough in your
20 budget?

21 The other thing I would like to see happen is
22 a spin off of environmental services from
23 development, I would like to see development have a
24 flat fee schedule. And sensible fees, darn it. Not
25 \$35,000 to put a house in. Environmental services

1 rightly belongs with surface water management.

2 Now, third, and this is a little bit --
3 because I'm getting that age too. For 16 years, I
4 have had the honor of representing the Hobart area
5 to the greater Maple Valley area council. And over
6 that time, I have seen family after family after
7 family move out because they can no longer afford to
8 live in King County.

9 These are retirement age people, people that
10 no longer have a salary. They then find themselves
11 faced with the medical problems that we all have.
12 With the price of oil heat, which is horrendous this
13 last year -- the new electrical rates went up. They
14 have got all kinds of problems. And then comes the
15 tax bill. And, oh, my lord, how am I going to pay
16 that and feed us and get my medicine and everything
17 else? And they can't do it, a lot of them. So they
18 pack up, they sell, they leave the homes they love,
19 the children they have raised, and the house they
20 thought they were going to retire in.

21 Well, without the state changing everything
22 we're probably not going to limit property taxes,
23 even though we would all like to, and we voted for
24 it. But another suggestion, that persons 62 years
25 and older who have lived in their houses for ten

1 years or more be granted immunity from all King
2 County generated taxes as far as property taxes go.
3 And that they must continue to live in the house
4 that they received the exemption on. In other
5 words, they can't go to a more expensive house, but
6 the home that they have occupied for the last ten
7 years. That seems fair to me. They paid their
8 share. They have gotten their kids through school.
9 But this isn't really affecting any of those taxes
10 either, because the school taxes aren't affected by
11 this. Just the county generated taxes, not the fire
12 districts, not the schools, not the EMS, not the
13 library tax. I would like to say the port tax, but
14 you can't do that either. But just the generated
15 taxes from King County would make a big difference
16 whether these people stay in their homes or leave.

17 And that's all I have, thank you.

18 MR. JENSEN: The next speaker is Mr. Iverson.
19 And the speaker after that is Richard Bonewitz.

20 MR. IVERSON: My name is Warren Iverson. And
21 I'm from Hobart area. I'm also a founding member of
22 the greater Maple Valley area council and still on
23 the council.

24 We had a wonderful presentation last week. I
25 think it was from Mr. Carpenter, the Four Creeks

1 council. And basically, I would support anything,
2 any proposal he comes up with. You folks have an
3 awesome responsibility, a challenge beyond what I
4 can foresee. Whether you can do it or not, do you
5 have the political wherewithal, the guts to do this
6 thing, the ability to do this thing beyond politics.
7 As I see the main focus-- well, Dave alluded earlier
8 to Cedar County. The three things that came up out
9 of that was lack of representation. Have we heard
10 that tonight? High taxes. Have you heard that
11 tonight? And help me out-- oh, the over protection
12 of services whether it's a \$35,000 house permit. In
13 Black Diamond here, I believe in the next five
14 years, they want to build ten thousand houses in the
15 city of black diamond. The city of Maple Valley
16 wants to build another two thousand, plus another
17 two thousand in the doughnut hole.

18 In the rural area, Mr. Bonewitz may allude to
19 this, less than one percent growth, one percent, not
20 fifteen thousand homes, three hundred homes, one
21 home. There's been a mention about a 1900 square
22 foot code size for a building in the rural area.
23 Why? There's been mention by Mr. Sims, executive
24 Sims of having a building permit for a home in the
25 rural area in September have to address the global

1 warming issue, and you're driving from your house to
2 your work place, how that's going to affect global
3 warming in the rural area. One percenters, not in
4 the city of Maple Valley, not in the city of Black
5 Diamond, not Renton, not Seattle, the one
6 percenters. Why?

7 I believe the easiest change but the most
8 difficult change is to reapportion the county with
9 nine council districts. Take six of them divided by
10 land, and take the other three at large districts.
11 Divide the county north to south in three different
12 districts, and one across the center from east to
13 west. Six districts, three at large would make a
14 county council of nine, but the representation we're
15 lacking now would be there for the rural area, I
16 believe.

17 Thanks again for your time. I hope you're up
18 to the challenge.

19 MR. JENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Iverson.

20 The next speaker is Pat Trob and after Pat
21 will be Cory Olson.

22 MS. TRAUB: Thank you for letting me speak.
23 I'm from Enumclaw. I work on a farm. I just got--
24 the vet was there. My neighbors are out haying.
25 They are milking cows. And they are taking care of

