

1 WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL  
2 **Finance and Administrative Services Committee**

3  
4 December 11, 2001

5  
6 The meeting was called to order at 11:02 a.m. by Committee Member Sam  
7 Crawford in the Council Chambers, 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham, Washington.

8  
9 Also Present:

10 Robert Imhof

11 Marlene Dawson

Absent:

12 None

13  
14 **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

15  
16 **1. DISCUSSION WITH WHATCOM COUNTY ASSESSOR KEITH**  
17 **WILLNAUER REGARDING FEE AND TRUST LAND (AB2001-017)**

18  
19 Dawson stated she has concerns that Mr. Willnauer is aware of.

20  
21 Keith Willnauer, Assessor, stated Councilmember Dawson sent a letter to  
22 him, which is included on Council packet page two. Six weeks ago, he wrote to the  
23 United States (U.S.) Department of Interior asking for official verification of  
24 trust/fee status of particular properties in the county. He has not received a  
25 response. Over the years, there have been many communications between him,  
26 the Lummi Tribe, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). To this date, there has  
27 been no satisfactory official correspondence to settle the trust/fee status of these  
28 properties.

29  
30 Dawson stated that she faxed five legal descriptions of properties to a  
31 representative of the Department of the Interior. Those properties were supposed  
32 to have been transferred to the Tribe in trust. The representative's assistant  
33 returned a fax to her showing the deeds relating to those five properties, which said  
34 they are in a fee status. On an ongoing basis, the Department of the Interior  
35 receives a list of properties, and they need the legal descriptions of those  
36 properties. She asked Mr. Willnauer to take the legal descriptions she obtained and  
37 forward them to the BIA. There is a need to treat everyone equitably. The County  
38 needs to get its maps updated. Willnauer stated Councilmember Dawson is having  
39 better luck than he is with the BIA. He faxed the legal descriptions, maps, and  
40 diagrams already. He doesn't know why he is not getting a response, but it is not  
41 because he is not providing the correct information.

42  
43 Dawson asked how many properties or acres were inappropriately put into  
44 trust status and are still in fee status. Willnauer stated determining the amount is  
45 difficult to do. Most of the inaccuracies occurred during administrations prior to his.  
46 The records don't clearly indicate the properties that are suspect. As a guess, there  
47 are approximately 25 or 30 properties. The amount of acreage isn't that dramatic.  
48 Most of the properties are small lots. Subsequent to 1995, there has been no

1 further deterioration or issue of controversy raised in this matter. These issues are  
2 from the mid-1970's to the mid-1980's. The activity since then has been to adhere  
3 to a new and comprehensive policy regarding entrance to trust status, and require  
4 absolute official confirmation as to that activity. There hasn't been a lot of activity  
5 since 1995.

6  
7 Crawford questioned whether the scenario is that tribal members don't have  
8 to pay taxes to the county for their own land, so the County went to court over that  
9 and won the case. Then, the tribal members said they would give title to the U.S.  
10 government so they don't have to pay taxes. Now, the County doesn't know how  
11 many properties they transferred. Willnauer stated there are two definitions for  
12 property on the reservation. One definition is property held in trust by U.S.  
13 government and the BIA. The other definition is fee property that is not being held  
14 in trust. The issue in a protracted court dispute was whether or not Whatcom  
15 County had property tax jurisdiction over properties held in fee on the reservation.

16  
17 Crawford asked how the properties became held in fee. Willnauer stated  
18 there are a number of mechanisms. Property can be removed from trust for any  
19 number of reasons. Typically, the reason is because of a sale to a non-tribal  
20 member, or a removal through an agreement. Properties can reacquire trust status  
21 through an application process and with qualifying criteria.

22  
23 Crawford stated the challenging part for the County is tracking all of that.  
24 Willnauer stated it became challenging when the County challenged the tax status  
25 in court. The Ninth District Court of Appeals case held.

26  
27 Crawford questioned whether the problem is that these are properties that  
28 are not held by the U.S. government in trust, but the County is not collecting taxes  
29 on.

30  
31 Dawson stated these five properties had been transferred to the Tribe in  
32 trust. However, one can't quitclaim properties in trust. It has to be reviewed. She  
33 just verified that these properties are in fee status.

34  
35 Willnauer stated the process begins with recording official documents in the  
36 Auditors office, which are instruments of conveyance that defined the grantors and  
37 grantees as either individuals or the Tribe, in trust for the BIA. Unfortunately, that  
38 was interpreted to mean that those properties had returned to trust status. They  
39 subsequently found out that was not the case. Unless there is an official  
40 acknowledgement by the BIA about their re-entrance to trust status, those  
41 documents are meaningless. They've gone through the process of documenting the  
42 properties and putting them into an exempt status. A long series of  
43 correspondences with the BIA began to try to get official determinations on whether  
44 these properties were or were not in trust status. The County has, over the years,  
45 received much correspondence. To a layman, the correspondence might indicate  
46 that these properties are or are not in trust status. More importantly, they've been  
47 led to believe that they were in trust status. Further examinations of those  
48 correspondences find that they fall short of official determinations. In fact, the

1 question is still open. If the documents received by Councilmember Dawson  
2 indicate that the properties should be in fee status, then it is a different matter.  
3 The County has typically received correspondence that further alluded to the fact  
4 that they ought to be tax exempt and in trust status.  
5

6 Dawson stated there is a status called restricted fee. She was told that if a  
7 tribal member takes the land out of trust status and sells it to another allotted  
8 Indian, it is considered a restricted fee, which is the same as trust status. If the  
9 property is sold to a non-Indian, which she was told these parcels were, then they  
10 are in fee status. Several people have told her that restricted fee status is different  
11 from fee status, and the same as trust status.  
12

13 Crawford questioned the amount of back taxes owned on those speculative  
14 30 or 40 properties. He doesn't want the County to spend \$100,000 trying to  
15 pursue a \$10,000 problem. Willnauer stated the expenditure in the initial suit was  
16 dramatic. Most of his activity since then has been sensitive to those kinds of  
17 expenditures. The potential expenditure for litigation far exceeds the tax return in  
18 all cases. It's not a good cost-benefit analysis. On the flip side, as the Assessor he  
19 cannot tolerate paying the dollar that someone else should be paying. That is how  
20 the taxpayers feel. A professional definitive response to his communication with  
21 BIA would settle most of these issues.  
22

## 23 **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

### 24 **1. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2001 BUDGET, REQUEST NO. 12** 25 **(AB2001-397)** 26

27  
28  
29 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated there are a few key issues.  
30 Based on settlement requirements from the arbitrator's agreement, the  
31 administration proposes an additional \$140,000 to cover settlement costs back to  
32 January 1, 2000. A memo in the Council packet outlines the need to provide  
33 funding for the cost of Labor and Industry expenses in the settlement, based on the  
34 unfortunate death of a sheriff deputy. Another item is the need to fund the cost of  
35 Labor and Industries expenses based on the unfortunate death of a Sheriff's Deputy  
36 in September. Another part of that appropriation is unanticipated legal costs for  
37 Guild negotiations over the last year.  
38

39 Another item relates to transfer of funding to cover accounting duties.  
40

41 Another item is to cover dental reimbursement costs in 2001.  
42

43 Crawford asked if the Labor and Industries pension payment is typical in the  
44 case of any deputy death. Desler stated he is not too knowledgeable about Labor  
45 and Industries costs because they don't usually have deaths in their workforce. In  
46 this case, they tried to do an accounting of all the different costs associated with  
47 this from a variety of governmental entities. One of the key issues they could not  
48 deal with in the existing budget is the costs that Labor and Industries say the

1 County has to cover for a pension payment for the widow. There is an insurance  
2 policy to cover it, but it has a \$250,000 deductible.

3  
4 Crawford asked if the County could lower the deductible. Desler stated the  
5 County could.

6  
7 Crawford asked the annual cost of the insurances. Desler stated the amount  
8 is about \$20,000 for that premium. They could lower the deductible. The  
9 administration is seeking to implement this action now because this is the least  
10 costly way, in light of future Labor and Industries insurance payments. The  
11 administration will explore the additional costs of lowering the deductible. This is  
12 an outstanding event. Whatcom County has not had a death in its workforce in  
13 decades.

14  
15 Crawford asked about the deputies' guild arbitration. He questioned whether  
16 State law provides reimbursement for the costs of the binding arbitration, since the  
17 State requires binding arbitration for the deputies. Desler stated it is an unfunded  
18 mandate.

19  
20 Crawford asked the cost if the County had negotiated this agreement through  
21 its own means. Desler stated it is difficult to speculate. There are many  
22 complicated details. The County does not have a signed contract yet.

23  
24 Dawson moved to recommend approval of the ordinance.

25  
26 Motion carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.

27  
28 **2. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE ANNUAL FERRY RATES (AB2001-395)**

29  
30 Dawson moved to recommend approval.

31  
32 Jeff Monsen, Public Works Director, stated there are three items regarding  
33 this topic. He questioned whether the Council received a memo from him dated  
34 December 7, 2001 regarding a substitute Unified Fee Schedule.

35  
36 Crawford stated there is a concern that what the County is doing by raising  
37 the car rates, but not the walk-on rates, is creating a system by which the car users  
38 subsidize a parking lot. The concern comes from people who feel that they have to  
39 have their car go onto the ferry. They feel they are subsidizing a population of  
40 people who don't have to bring their cars on the island. Therefore, they can park  
41 and receive all the benefits of parking and walking on the ferry. Yet, they do not  
42 have to pay for that. The issue became more complicated than they thought it  
43 would be. They've studied this extensively, and he is happy with it. However, he  
44 will vote against the motion because he prefers to wait until after the hearing  
45 before making a recommendation.

46  
47 Hoag stated someone suggested that the quarterly vehicle pass not be  
48 eliminated, but increased to \$220. She asked the reason for elimination and what

1 Mr. Monsen thought of an increase instead of elimination. Monsen stated the tone  
2 of this proposal encourages walk-on traffic, because the greatest capacity problem  
3 is the number of cars using the ferry. Also, the current quarterly pass rate is \$160.  
4 It is an unlimited use pass, which pays for four roundtrips per week, and the rest  
5 are free. If they are going to consider reinstating the quarterly pass, put some  
6 effort into improving that program. They need to improve how they administer that  
7 program. Rather than charge \$220, pick how many trips the quarterly pass should  
8 pay for. Five trips per week would cost \$260. Four trips per week would cost  
9 \$208.

10  
11 Hoag asked if the quarterly pass makes it quicker loading the boat. Monsen  
12 stated all transactions occur on the boat, so there would be no time saving. Also,  
13 they consume administrative time when someone needs to transfer a sticker from  
14 one car onto a new car. He can't deal tonight with how to change the operation of  
15 the program.

16  
17 Hoag suggested dealing with the rate structure tonight, and then Mr. Monsen  
18 could come forward with a program. Monsen stated there are three rate structures,  
19 cash fare, a punch card, and the quarterly pass. One issue that has not been dealt  
20 with is whether or not they want to reconsider discounts for certain categories of  
21 passengers, such as fulltime residents. One way to deal with that is a quarterly  
22 pass for a certain class of individuals. Now, anyone can pay for unlimited use.  
23 Paying for four uses per week, and the rest being free, is a large discount. They  
24 are talking about fewer than 25 users per quarter.

25  
26 Crawford stated this committee already had this discussion and  
27 recommended that the quarterly pass be eliminated. It has been the source of  
28 some of the concerns they've heard. It is best to move this forward to the full  
29 Council so the community can have a hearing.

30  
31 Hoag stated the ferry rate for a walk-on passenger with a bicycle was \$.50  
32 for the bicycle. She questioned whether the new rate is for clarification or a  
33 change. Monsen stated item ten on the substitute Exhibit A reflects one change  
34 that the rate for all vehicles, including bicycles, includes the driver. Previously, a  
35 number of the items did not include the driver. The old fare for a bicycle and a rider  
36 totaled \$1.50. There was a \$1 fare for the bike rider. A number of the items are a  
37 dollar more because it includes the driver fee.

38  
39 Dawson spoke regarding the first item on the agenda, the **discussion with**  
40 **Whatcom County Assessor Keith Willnauer regarding fee and trust land**  
41 **(AB2001-017)**. Documents say that the language relative to the Lummi Indian  
42 Tribe members has been adjusted to be consistent with the lease agreement  
43 between the County and the Tribe. That is a lease agreement that was never  
44 approved by the Department of the Interior. It is null and void.

45  
46 Motion to recommend approval of the substitute ferry rates failed 1-1 with  
47 Crawford opposed.

1 Crawford stated the item moves forward to the full Council with no  
2 recommendation.

3  
4 Hoag asked why they increased the bike fee. Monsen stated it is the only  
5 rate they have that deals with coins. They want to deal exclusively with whole  
6 dollars.

7  
8 **3. RESOLUTION SETTING HEARING DATE AND NOTICE OF HEARING ON**  
9 **SALE OF COUNTY TAX TITLE PROPERTY, REQUEST NO. 05-01**  
10 **(AB2001-380)**

11  
12 Dawson moved to recommend approval.

13  
14 Hoag stated she talked to Parks Director Roger DeSpain. This required the  
15 County to do a lot line adjustment and a survey. She asked if the buyer paid for  
16 the lot line adjustment and the survey, but the buyer didn't. She suggested that  
17 the lot line adjustment and survey be added to the cost. The Council needs to  
18 approve an amendment. She also asked if the County could require a covenant  
19 restriction that the land only be used as a drain field. Mr. DeSpain agreed that was  
20 appropriate.

21  
22 Dawson moved to add the lot line adjustment and survey costs and create  
23 the covenant restriction.

24  
25 Motion to amend carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.

26  
27 Motion to recommend approval as amended carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.

28  
29 **COUNCIL "CONSENT AGENDA" ITEM**

30  
31 **1. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #01-**  
32 **120 TO THE ONLY BIDDER, EBENAL GENERAL INC., TO INSTALL**  
33 **PROXIMITY LOCKS AT CENTRAL SHOP IN THE AMOUNT OF \$69,896**  
34 **(AB2001-403)**

35  
36 Dawson moved to recommend approval.

37  
38 Crawford asked why they only received one bid.

39  
40 Hoag stated the bid is very high.

41  
42 Mike Russell, Facilities Supervisor, stated the County advertised last year and  
43 received no bids. The County advertised this year, and asked several companies to  
44 bid. Only one did. The cost includes a mechanized gate, the box lock system, and  
45 a staffed gate.

1 Crawford stated he is fine with the winning bid, except the contractor usually  
2 gets involved in general construction projects. It seems strange that the contractor  
3 is bidding on this electrical job. Russell stated he has subcontractors.  
4

5 Crawford asked if the bidding process verifies that he does this type of work.  
6 Russell stated he's worked with this contractor before and knows that this  
7 contractor has done this type of work with the State and Bellingham Technical  
8 College on remodeling and heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC).  
9

10 Hoag asked where the County advertises its bids. Russell stated the Finance  
11 Division does the advertising.  
12

13 Brad Bennett, Finance Division Manager, stated the County advertised two  
14 consecutive weeks in the official County newspapers, the Bellingham Herald. They  
15 will also send the bid to a list of contractors.  
16

17 Crawford asked if the administration could include advertisements in the  
18 Weekly Construction Reporter, and the Dodge Report. There would not be any  
19 cost, other than making sure that the bid is correct. Those are the two publications  
20 that the commercial and industrial contractors around town read and subscribe to.  
21 They are regional publications.  
22

23 *(Clerk's Note: End of tape one, side A.)*  
24

25 Russell stated the administration calls as many contractors as it can.  
26

27 Motion carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.  
28

29 **2. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #01-**  
30 **131 TO THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, BLYTHE PLUMBING AND**  
31 **HEATING, FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF THE GAS BOILER AT**  
32 **NORTHWEST ANNEX, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$113,578.78 (AB2001-404)**  
33

34 Dawson moved to recommend approval.  
35

36 Crawford asked if this is included in the budget.  
37

38 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated it is in the budget for 2001.  
39

40 Hoag asked if the County already did this a year or two ago at the Northwest  
41 Annex. Desler stated the administration tore down the old jail out there and put in  
42 a generator. This is a 100-year old facility that the administration is trying to bring  
43 into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This project will cost a bit more than originally anticipated.  
44 The administration will use money from other one-time projects that were over-  
45 funded. They estimated the costs over a year ago, in the summer of 2000. The  
46 final bids are a bit more than the estimates.  
47

48 Motion carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.

1  
2 **3. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #01-**  
3 **132 TO THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, EBENAL GENERAL INC.,**  
4 **FOR REPAIRS TO THE SUPERIOR COURTROOM HVAC SYSTEM, IN THE**  
5 **AMOUNT OF \$72,293 (AB2001-405)**  
6

7 Dawson moved to recommend approval.  
8

9 Crawford asked if this is a generator for the heating/ventilation/air  
10 conditioning (HVAC) system.  
11

12 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated it is for the entire system for  
13 that courtroom.  
14

15 Crawford asked if it is a budgeted item. Desler stated it is.  
16

17 Motion carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.  
18

19 **4. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #01-**  
20 **133 TO THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, DALE'S ELECTRIC, FOR**  
21 **THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EMERGENCY OPERATIONS GENERATOR IN**  
22 **THE AMOUNT OF \$75,596.90 (AB2001-406)**  
23

24 Dawson asked how often an emergency generator is used, and how old the  
25 current generator is.  
26

27 Crawford stated it is a U.S. Navy World War II surplus generator. The  
28 County has to insure that this facility operates 24 hours per day, seven days per  
29 week. It is for emergency services.  
30

31 Motion carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.  
32

33 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated it is a generator for the  
34 emergency operating center in the basement and certain parts of the courthouse.  
35

36 **5. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #01-**  
37 **134 TO THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, AQUATIGHT**  
38 **ENVIRONMENTS, FOR THE RESURFACING OF THE SALLYPORT**  
39 **DRIVEWAY AT THE PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING, IN THE AMOUNT OF**  
40 **\$52,637.94 (AB2001-407)**  
41

42 Dawson moved to recommend approval.  
43

44 Motion carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.  
45

46 **6. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #01-**  
47 **136 TO THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER, PICTURE PERFECT**

1           **PAINTING, FOR THE STEAM CLEANING OF THE COURTHOUSE**  
2           **EXTERIOR IN THE AMOUNT OF \$62,488.19 (AB2001-408)**  
3

4           Dawson asked how steam cleaning is different from pressure washing.  
5

6           Mike Russell, Facilities Supervisor, stated the courthouse needs to be cleaned  
7 about every three years to prevent mold. Steam cleaning is pressure washing with  
8 heat to kill the bacteria on the building. They don't need to repaint for a couple of  
9 years, but do need to seal the bricks with an acrylic. It has to be done every seven  
10 to fifteen years, depending on the warranty. The contractor will also seal the  
11 bricks.  
12

13           Dawson moved to recommend approval.  
14

15           Hoag asked how important it is to do this during this year, since the County  
16 is financially tight. Russell stated the more they defer the more the growth gets  
17 under the stucco and creates damage. It is more expensive and time consuming to  
18 remove. The mold algae will get into the pores, under the stucco, and push its way  
19 out.  
20

21           Crawford stated there is a problem in moist areas with the waterproof stucco.  
22 It does a great job of keeping water out. However, if there is any water behind the  
23 stucco, the application also holds the water in. Water inside a wall is a bad thing.  
24 He asked if this building has that problem. That problem exists with the Civic  
25 Center building. Russell stated it does not.  
26

27           Crawford stated that as waterproof stucco systems have been used widely in  
28 the last 15 years in moist areas, there have been many lawsuits because they  
29 ended up trapping water in the walls and causing even more problems.  
30

31           Motion carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.  
32

33   **7.    REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO AWARD BID #01-**  
34   **141 TO THE ONLY BIDDER, SOTO & SONS CONSTRUCTION, FOR THE**  
35   **REPLACEMENT OF THE SIDEWALK ON THE NORTH SIDE OF LOTTIE**  
36   **STREET, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$47,746.83 (AB2001-409)**  
37

38           Dawson asked if the City of Bellingham should do this.  
39

40           Dewey Desler, Deputy Administer, stated this part of the property is County  
41 right-of-way property. The administration is concerned about deferred  
42 maintenance and repair that has existed in the past many years. That is why there  
43 is so many projects coming forward now. The County has to do some catch-up  
44 work on its assets.  
45

46           Dawson moved to recommend approval.  
47

1 Crawford asked why they are replacing the sidewalk. They have deferred  
2 making decisions on capital improvements in some regard pending the capital  
3 facilities plan. A sidewalk is a borderline issue.  
4

5 Mike Russell, Facilities Supervisor, stated the sidewalk is uneven and broken.  
6 There is also a drainage issue on that side of the street.  
7

8 Desler stated the administration has considered holding issue until the capital  
9 facilities plan is done. There are other underlying issues with the water that is  
10 intruding into the existing building. This solution stops further damage to this other  
11 building.  
12

13 Motion carried 2-0 with Imhof absent.  
14

15 *(Clerk's Note: Councilmember Imhof arrived at 12:02 p.m.)*  
16

17 **8. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO APPROVE SOLE**  
18 **SOURCE PURCHASE OF CARPET FROM DUPONT FLOORING SYSTEMS,**  
19 **FOR REPLACEMENT CARPET AND INSTALLATION FOR VARIOUS**  
20 **AREAS WITHIN THE COURTHOUSE, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$140,350**  
21 **(AB2001-410)**  
22

23 Crawford asked where the carpet is.  
24

25 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated the carpet to be replaced is in  
26 the Auditor's Office and in Superior Court.  
27

28 Mike Russell, Facilities Supervisor, stated it is also in the corridors and the  
29 Sheriff's records storage area.  
30

31 Crawford asked why this is a sole source item. Russell stated it is sole  
32 source because of the type of carpet. They are using the DuPont carpet squares  
33 that don't allow mold and moisture to penetrate. It also does not require glue for  
34 installation. The contractor will also install the carpet. The County will receive an  
35 18-year warranty. The current carpet is lasting about nine years. There are  
36 several other departments that are scheduled for carpet replacement in 2002.  
37

38 Hoag asked whether they could defer this replacement.  
39

40 Russell stated it is a real liability issue. Anytime there is a variance in height  
41 of ½-inch or more, the liability becomes the County's. People stumble all the time.  
42 If the public comes into any of these offices or corridors, there is a real issue of  
43 liability.  
44

45 Dawson stated it is important to maintain the facilities to maintain good first  
46 impressions.  
47

1 Crawford stated he attended a tour of County facilities. He suggested that  
2 the newly elected councilmembers attend a similar tour.

3  
4 Imhof moved to recommend approval.

5  
6 Motion carried unanimously.

7  
8 **9. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
9 **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND BEK ENGINEERING**  
10 **AND ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. FOR EXCAVATION OF CONTAMINATED**  
11 **SOIL AND GROUND WATER MONITORING AT THE NORTHWEST**  
12 **ANNEX AND SAR FACILITIES, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$33,500 (AB2001-**  
13 **411)**

14  
15 Imhof moved to recommend approval. He asked if this is the diesel tanks  
16 that were in the ground for the generator over there.

17  
18 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated it is also for the gasoline tanks.  
19 Part of the expense is reimbursed by the insurance plan for the coverage that the  
20 County had for that effort. The reimbursed amount is a substantial majority of the  
21 cost.

22  
23 Imhof asked the estimate on number of yards that would be excavated.  
24 Russell stated there is not an estimate yet. They had hoped to show that the  
25 gasoline is diminishing, but it is not.

26  
27 Imhof asked if they are going to do any air purging to get it out. Russell  
28 stated they would do that with this project. They are going to do peroxide  
29 injections to help break down the gasoline. So far, the gasoline has not gotten out  
30 to the other areas and area wells.

31  
32 Motion carried unanimously.

33  
34 **10. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
35 **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND BOSMAN FUELS, INC.**  
36 **OF LYNDEN TO CONTINUE SERVICE FOR THE CARD LOCK FUELING**  
37 **SYSTEM LOCATED AT CENTRAL SHOP AND VARIOUS LOCATIONS**  
38 **(AB2001-412)**

39  
40 Imhof moved to recommend approval.

41  
42 Motion carried unanimously.

43  
44 **11. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
45 **CONTRACT AMENDMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND**  
46 **RESOLUTION SERVICES, LLC FOR A MONETARY INCREASE AND TERM**  
47 **EXTENSION OF FACILITATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES TO THE**  
48 **WRIA WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROJECT PLANNING UNIT, IN THE**

1           **AMENDED AMOUNT OF \$85,560, WITH A TOTAL AMENDED CONTRACT**  
2           **AMOUNT OF \$134,980 (AB2001-413)**  
3

4           Bruce Roll, Water Resources Division Manager, stated professional services  
5 provided staff for the Planning Unit and other meetings where consensus is needed.  
6 This is a continuation of a project began last year. It will continue through 2003.  
7 The same amount of money will pay for more meetings. This issue was brought  
8 before the Planning Unit at the last meeting. The Planning Unit agreed that the  
9 service is important.

10  
11           Imhof moved to recommend approval.

12  
13           Motion carried unanimously.

14  
15   **12. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
16   **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND NORTHWEST**  
17   **HYDRAULIC CONSULTANTS, INC. FOR PHASE ONE OF A BANK**  
18   **STABILIZATION PROJECT ON THE NOOKSACK RIVER NEAR RITTER**  
19   **ROAD, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$40,517.95 (AB2001-414)**  
20

21           Dawson moved to recommend approval.

22  
23           Imhof asked if the County would be able to do something at Ritter Road by  
24 doing this.

25  
26           Paula Cooper, Engineering Manager - River/Flood, stated this will hopefully  
27 get the County to the point where it can do something at Ritter Road. They've  
28 learned a lot over the past two years. This includes an alternatives analysis. One  
29 issue that was raised by the permitting agency is about the alternatives that the  
30 County has looked at. This project will look at those alternatives and address that  
31 concern of the permitting agencies.

32  
33           Motion carried unanimously.

34  
35   **13. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO AN**  
36   **INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND THE**  
37   **CITY OF EVERSON FOR THE LEASE OF SPACE FOR STORAGE OF SNOW**  
38   **REMOVAL EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES, IN THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT**  
39   **OF \$15,750 (AB2001-415)**  
40

41           Dawson moved to recommend approval. She asked if County can buy a  
42 piece of property to put up a storage building.

43  
44           Bruce Mills, Assistant Director of Engineering, stated this was a County  
45 building, but the County sold it to the City of Everson, which agreed to lease it back  
46 to the County for ten years. The real estate contract is just about up.  
47 Coincidentally, they have a road construction project in front of this facility. The

1 County agrees to pay five percent of the road construction project in exchange for a  
2 20-year lease.

3  
4 Dawson asked why the County would lease. Mills stated the facility is used  
5 to get equipment without running back to the Central Shop.

6  
7 Crawford asked if this request money is for the lease or the road project.  
8 Mills stated it is for both. The County is paying half of the local match. The State is  
9 paying for 90 percent of the project. The County is paying for five percent, and the  
10 City of Everson is paying five percent. The five percent is this estimated amount of  
11 the project. The amount is all the County will have to pay for 20 years.

12  
13 Motion carried unanimously.

14  
15 **14. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
16 **GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND THE WA**  
17 **DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY TO PROVIDE REIMBURSEMENT OF 75%**  
18 **OF THE COUNTY'S COSTS OF A LOW COST RIPARIAN RESTORATION**  
19 **PROGRAM, IN THE COUNTY'S SHARE AMOUNT OF \$83,333 (AB2001-**  
20 **416)**

21  
22 Paula Cooper, Engineering Manager - River/Flood, stated the State  
23 Department of Ecology was not able to complete its final review of the actual grant  
24 agreement by today. She doesn't anticipate that they will have any meaningful  
25 changes, other than assigning the agreement a number and a financial name. The  
26 nature of the revisions has been minor changes to the scope of work. The general  
27 terms and conditions of this agreement are the same for all State Department of  
28 Ecology agreements. She doesn't anticipate any changes. She asked the  
29 committee and Council to approve this conditioned on allowing the Executive to  
30 execute the grant agreement, with the authority to make any minor scope-of-work  
31 changes to address the Department of Ecology (DOE) concerns.

32  
33 Imhof moved to recommend approval with the condition to allow the County  
34 Executive to make minor modifications based upon the DOE concerns.

35  
36 Motion carried unanimously.

37  
38 **15. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO AN**  
39 **FCAAP GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND THE**  
40 **DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY FOR LOWER NOOKSACK RIVER**  
41 **HYDRAULIC MODELING, IN THE COUNTY'S SHARE AMOUNT OF**  
42 **\$64,650 (AB2001-417)**

43  
44 Dawson moved to recommend approval.

45  
46 Paula Cooper, Engineering Manager - River/Flood, stated this is just a grant  
47 she discussed with the Council in September. This is the funding for the consultant

1 to develop the hydraulic modeling for the Nooksack River. It is part of the  
2 comprehensive flood hazard management planning.

3  
4 Motion carried unanimously.

5  
6 **16. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
7 **LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND SUN**  
8 **COMMUNITY SERVICES TO PROVIDE A COMMUNITY HOME FOR**  
9 **ADULTS RECOVERING FROM MENTAL ILLNESS (AB2001-418)**

10  
11 Dawson moved to recommend approval.

12  
13 Crawford stated there are no funds committed or received in this lease.

14  
15 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated 20 years ago, the County  
16 acquired this home on Chestnut Street. It was to be, and has been, used for adult  
17 mental health services. About a year ago, the County could not find a lease  
18 agreement to cover that arrangement. They also found that the property had not  
19 been maintained over twenty years, which the County took care of last year. Now,  
20 the administration is bringing forward a lease that covers a set period of time. The  
21 County provides the ongoing support for the activities associated with that  
22 organization. State and federal funds support it.

23  
24 Crawford asked the value of the property. Desler stated they haven't had an  
25 assessment, but he estimated the value to be approximately \$250,000.

26  
27 Dawson questioned whether the County is now keeping all its leases in one  
28 location. Desler stated they are trying to.

29  
30 Motion carried unanimously.

31  
32 **17. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER IN A**  
33 **CONTRACT AMENDMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND**  
34 **WHATCOM COUNTY AGRICULTURE PRESERVATION COMMITTEE, TO**  
35 **PROVIDE CAUCUS SUPPORT IN THE WRIA 1 WATERSHED**  
36 **MANAGEMENT PROJECT FOR 2002 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$17,500**  
37 **(AB2001-419)**

38  
39 Bruce Roll, Water Resource Division Manager, stated this is a continuation of  
40 services approved for caucus support earlier this year. This is a continuation for  
41 next year, and is included in the 2002 budget. He submitted information on the  
42 requests for support that have been received so far. The second series of requests  
43 is for anticipated requests.

44  
45 Dawson moved to recommend approval.

46  
47 Motion carried unanimously.

1 **18. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO AN**  
2 **AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND BENEFITPORT**  
3 **ADMINISTRATORS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE DIRECT**  
4 **REIMBURSEMENT DENTAL PLAN, IN AN ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF**  
5 **\$18,306 (AB2001-420)**  
6

7 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated this is a contract the  
8 administration proposes. It covers the administration of the direct reimbursement  
9 dental plan. The company will process the payments, track costs, and report  
10 progress.

11  
12 Imhof asked if this is a new company who is doing the administration.

13  
14 Karen Goens, Human Resources Division Manager, stated Reppond  
15 Administrators was bought out by Benefit Port. It is the same arrangement as in  
16 the past.

17  
18 Crawford asked if the \$71 is an increase. Goens stated it is.

19  
20 Desler stated that is the total cost per employee for all dental services.

21  
22 Goens stated the previous amount was approximately \$65 to \$68.

23  
24 Hoag stated a problem is that, when there are two insurances, this company  
25 was saying that the amount it will reimburse is a percentage of the remaining cost  
26 after what the other insurance paid. Goens stated it is not an insurance plan. It is  
27 a cost reimbursement plan. The administration specifically designed it this way.  
28 This approval is just for the administration of the plan, not what is in the plan itself.  
29 The costs of this plan are going up, and they are tracking that. To sustain this over  
30 time, they are going to have to manage the costs over time.

31  
32 Hoag stated employee benefits are being reduced based on the fact that they  
33 are getting money from another insurance. Goens stated that is how the plan is set  
34 up.

35  
36 Hoag stated the Council should ask that it be changed. It is not appropriate  
37 that the benefit the County provides reduces what the employee gets from the  
38 administrator. It reduces the reimbursement of the employee's out-of-pocket  
39 expense, based on what the other insurance paid.

40  
41 Crawford agreed. Insurance companies ought to provide an incentive for  
42 employees to use other insurance resources whenever possible. There are going to  
43 be times when employees who have access to other insurance plans will choose to  
44 not use other insurance companies. If the reimbursement administrator meets the  
45 insurance companies to save all the members that 30 percent difference, it would  
46 make a difference. County government needs to encourage cost sharing through  
47 using multiple coverage as soon as possible.  
48

1 Hoag stated it is a matter of justice for the other employees. If the  
2 employees are spending money on another plan, then their benefits should not be  
3 reduced. They would need a clause that the reimbursement not exceed total cost  
4 spent by employee.

5  
6 Imhof moved to recommend approval.

7  
8 Motion carried unanimously.

9  
10 **19. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
11 **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY AND CATHOLIC**  
12 **COMMUNITY SERVICES TO PROVIDE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR**  
13 **YOUTH DETAINED IN THE JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER AND ON**  
14 **SUPERVISION IN THE COMMUNITY, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$69,500**  
15 **(AB2001-421)**

16  
17 This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

18  
19 **20. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
20 **CONTRACT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY HEALTH AND HUMAN**  
21 **SERVICES AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH – NUTRITION**  
22 **EDUCATION, TO PROVIDE GRANT FUNDING FOR NUTRITION**  
23 **EDUCATION TO FOOD STAMP ELIGIBLE FAMILIES AT THE**  
24 **BELLINGHAM FOOD BANK, IN THE CONTRACT AMOUNT OF \$21,196**  
25 **(AB2001-422)**

26  
27 Imhof moved to recommend approval.

28  
29 Motion carried unanimously.

30  
31 **21. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
32 **CONTRACT AMENDMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY HEALTH AND**  
33 **HUMAN SERVICES AND THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH**  
34 **SERVICES – CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES, TO PROVIDE FUNDING**  
35 **FOR PUBLIC HEALTH NURSING HOME VISIT SERVICES TO FAMILIES**  
36 **WITH BABIES AND YOUNG CHILDREN AT RISK FOR CHILD ABUSE**  
37 **AND NEGLECT, IN THE AMENDED AMOUNT OF \$37,405 FOR A TOTAL**  
38 **AMENDED CONTRACT AMOUNT OF \$145,613 (AB2001-423)**

39  
40 Dawson moved to recommend approval.

41  
42 Motion carried unanimously.

43  
44 **22. REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO ENTER INTO A**  
45 **GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM COUNTY HEALTH AND**  
46 **HUMAN SERVICES AND WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF**  
47 **ECOLOGY, TO PROVIDE 100% REIMBURSEMENT FOR COSTS**  
48 **ASSOCIATED WITH INVESTIGATING SITES BELIEVED TO BE**

1           **RELEASING HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES, IN THE GRANT AMOUNT OF**  
2           **\$128,000 (AB2001-424)**

3  
4           Imhof moved to recommend approval.

5  
6           Motion carried unanimously.

7  
8           **23.    REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE TO PROVIDE**  
9           **MATCHING FUNDS FOR PHASE I OF THE IMPROVED "WAYFINDING"**  
10           **SYSTEM FOR CITY CENTER AND THE WATERFRONT AREA, IN THE**  
11           **AMOUNT OF \$30,000 (AB2001-425)**

12  
13           Dawson asked if the County is paying for signage to its own facilities and  
14 other facilities.

15  
16           Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated City of Bellingham asked the  
17 County to partner with the City and the Port of Bellingham to organize a new  
18 signage system for the City of Bellingham. This was included in the budget, but it  
19 has not been implemented until now.

20  
21           *(Clerk's Note: End of tape one, side B.)*

22  
23           Desler stated the money does not pay for specific directions to the  
24 courthouse, but the program is built around better ways to coordinate traffic to the  
25 civic center area. The County appropriated the money in the 2001 budget. Now,  
26 this is the contract and agreement that allows the County to spend the money.

27  
28           Crawford moved to recommend approval.

29  
30           Dawson stated she would be more comfortable directly paying for signage to  
31 County facilities. The City has more money than the County.

32  
33           Crawford stated he would vote to approve because the County indicated its  
34 agreement in the past to work with the City on this project.

35  
36           Motion failed 1-2 with Crawford in favor.

37  
38           Desler stated the City proposed a project to redesign the entire signage  
39 system for downtown Bellingham. They sought out the Port and the County to  
40 partner with them. There wasn't any negotiation. The City just made a proposal to  
41 the Executive. It went to the Council in the non-departmental budget. Discussion  
42 occurred in October 2000. There have been some delays in the project until now.

43  
44           Crawford stated this item would move forward with no recommendation from  
45 the committee.

46  
47           **24.    RESOLUTION APPROVING, AS PLANNING JURISDICTION SOLELY FOR**  
48           **THE PURPOSES OF RCW 39.84.060, THE ISSUANCE OF NONRECOURSE**

1           **REVENUE BONDS OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**  
2           **OF THE PORT OF BELLINGHAM, THE PROCEEDS OF WHICH WILL BE**  
3           **USED FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES WITHIN THE**  
4           **COUNTY BY ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY (AB2001-426)**  
5

6           Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated the management of the Port of  
7 Bellingham, which established this development corporation, approached the  
8 County to ask for help in facilitating a positive development in the industrial area in  
9 the western part of the county. They are proposing that the County Council provide  
10 planning approval for the issuance of these non-recourse revenue bonds. There are  
11 funds that are only available this month. There will be no County money involved.  
12 There is no obligation on the part of the County to repay any bonds. This is a  
13 signal to the State to allow the State to continue processing the bonds for the  
14 benefit of projects at the refinery.  
15

16           Crawford asked what they are going to do with the money.  
17

18           Mike Abendhoff, BP - Cherry Point Refinery Government and Public Affairs  
19 Manager, stated they are using the grant for pollution control at the refinery.  
20

21           John Marvin, BP - Cherry Point Refinery Comptroller, stated these bonds allow  
22 the company to take advantage of the federal law that allows them to issue bonds  
23 that are exempt from federal taxes. There are no state monies or local monies  
24 being used. The refinery is wholly responsible for the bond payment of the  
25 principal and interest. They get a lower interest rate on those. It allows them to  
26 make improvements in their plant to keep the plant modern, upgraded for pollution  
27 control facilities, and de-bottlenecking. They hope to comply with federal  
28 environmental laws and also keep highly competitive.  
29

30           Imhof asked the total amount. Marvin stated the original amount was up to  
31 \$130 million.  
32

33           John Carter, Port of Bellingham Finance Director, stated the issuance next  
34 week would be for \$23 million out of the \$130 million that is in the resolution. The  
35 State of Washington allocates the bond cap through their State bond cap allocation  
36 process. That is all that is available this year. He hopes the County Council will  
37 approve this total amount of funding, and that the Port will continue future  
38 resolutions direct from the Port Commission. The County is giving blanket approval  
39 for \$130 million, of which \$23 million will be issued next week.  
40

41           Hoag asked how much of the \$130 million is allocated to the dock  
42 improvements that the refinery proposes. Marvin stated none of it. The language  
43 in the resolution is what the federal law allows for tax exempt financing for all of  
44 these types of facilities.  
45

46           Hoag asked for a breakdown of where the monies will go. Marvin stated he  
47 doesn't have the details available today. Most of the tax exempt financing will be  
48 used for solid handling facilities and waste treatment facilities.

1  
2 Hoag asked if any of the \$130 million will be used in the near-shore  
3 environment, or if it will all be used in the upland. Marvin stated now they are  
4 upland projects. He couldn't speak about future projects.  
5

6 Imhof moved to recommend approval.  
7

8 Carter stated BP asked for up to \$130 million in tax exempt financing  
9 underneath the industrial development tax laws, that are available for projects in  
10 the future and in the past. This project now is for expenditures already made. In  
11 planning documents, they have a number of projects that qualify under the broad  
12 categories of pollution control and dock and wharf. Those are the two categories  
13 that the BP facilities qualify for. BP provided to the Port a preliminary list of all the  
14 solid waste and pollution control facilities within their plant. It is strictly preliminary  
15 at this point, and does not total \$130 million. There are a number of projects that  
16 could be added in the future. BP is going through an improvement planning  
17 process, and want to have a resolution from the Port of Bellingham for up to that  
18 amount. Given that, every time BP comes back for actual bonding, all the projects  
19 will have to meet the normal planning and zoning issues that the county Council  
20 has in place. This is not something that has come before the County before.  
21

22 Hoag stated the resolution says Atlantic Ridgefield plans to spend money on  
23 additional projects. She asked how much of that is for the near-shore environment  
24 and how much is for uplands. Marvin stated he doesn't have that breakdown with  
25 him. He is not able to speak on the future because there are proposed projects  
26 that have not yet taken place within the \$130 million. Many of those projects are  
27 placeholders. Of the money that has been spent, most has been spent on the coker  
28 facility in the plant and on waste treatment.  
29

30 Dawson asked why the County is even involved in this.  
31

32 Dewey Desler, Deputy Administrator, stated the County has a responsibility  
33 under State law to provide planning unit approval.  
34

35 David Thompson, attorney with Preston, Gates, and Ellis, stated he is the Port  
36 of Bellingham bond counsel. This is a peculiar provision of the State's industrial  
37 development bond financing statute. Bonds issued for projects like these have to  
38 be approved by the issuer, which is the Industrial Development Corporation of the  
39 Port of Bellingham. In addition, the legislature of the jurisdiction has to give  
40 approval, but that approval does not replace any other land use approvals. The  
41 language of the resolution is designed to make that clear. The approval is simply to  
42 bless the issuance of the bonds. The approval is to make sure that each jurisdiction  
43 is aware of what is going on.  
44

45 Crawford asked the tax revenue that BP provides to the County. Marvin  
46 stated BP provides state and local taxes in the amount of \$39.3 million. The  
47 property tax bill is \$5.1 million per year.  
48

1 Dawson moved to recommend approval.  
2

3 Hoag asked for information before the evening meeting on the funds that will  
4 be expended or proposed to be expended on projects in the near-shore  
5 environment.  
6

7 Motion carried unanimously.  
8

9 **25. RESOLUTION SETTING NOTICE OF HEARING ON SALE OF COUNTY  
10 TAX TITLE PROPERTY, REQUEST 07-01 (AB2001-428)**  
11

12 Dawson moved to recommend approval by acclimation of items 25 through  
13 27.  
14

15 Motion carried unanimously.  
16

17 **26. RESOLUTION SETTING NOTICE OF HEARING ON SALE OF COUNTY  
18 TAX TITLE PROPERTY, REQUEST 08-01 (AB2001-429)**  
19

20 See Consent Agenda item 25.  
21

22 **27. RESOLUTION SETTING NOTICE OF HEARING ON SALE OF COUNTY  
23 TAX TITLE PROPERTY, REQUEST 09-01 (AB2001-430)**  
24

25 See Consent Agenda item 25.  
26

27 **28. APPROVAL OF AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHATCOM  
28 COUNTY AND THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM FOR THE PURPOSE OF  
29 ANNEXATION AND DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM  
30 UGA FOR APPROXIMATELY 53 ACRES IN THE VICINITY OF MERIDIAN  
31 STREET, VAN WYCK ROAD, AND HORTON ROAD (AB2001-438)**  
32

33 Crawford asked if this is different than the one they did last week near the  
34 fire station.  
35

36 Bruce Mills, Assistant Director of Engineering, stated the one done last week  
37 was for Deemer Road. On this, the County will get some money back from the City  
38 due to recent improvements done to Van Wyk Road.  
39

40 Dawson moved to recommend approval.  
41

42 Motion carried unanimously.  
43  
44

45 **OTHER BUSINESS**  
46

47 Desler stated that the total amount for the lot line adjustment and survey, as  
48 discussed regarding the **resolution setting hearing date and notice of hearing**

1 **on sale of County tax title property, request no. 05-01 (AB2001-380),** is  
2 about \$400, for a total price of \$9,400. The County will create language to put a  
3 restrictive covenant on the property so it will only be used for a drain field.  
4

5  
6 **ADJOURN**

7  
8 The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.  
9

10  
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Jill Nixon, Minutes Transcription  
13

14  
15 ATTEST:

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL  
WHATCOM COUNTY, WASHINGTON

16  
17  
18  
19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Dana Brown-Davis, Council Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sam Crawford, Committee Member