

CITY OF VANCOUVER

PROPOSED CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 1 (Placed on the ballot by City Council Resolution #M-3240)

Ballot Title Explanation:

Current Law: City officers are elected through two elections: a primary, if more than two candidates run for a position, and a general election. The candidate with the most votes in the general election wins.

Results of Passage: City council, in advance of the candidate filing deadline for any special or regular election, could authorize single-election instant runoff voting, in which voters rank candidates in order of preference. Candidates failing to win a majority of first-choice ballots are sequentially eliminated and their votes transferred to the voters' next highest-ranked choice until the winner receives a majority of ballots.

Shall a new Section 9.03 be added to the City Charter to authorize, but not require, the city council to approve by resolution passed at least thirty days prior to the candidate filing deadline for an election, the use of instant runoff voting for the election of all city officers in any regular or special election?

YES...

NO...

Statement For Issue:

Please vote yes for Amendment 1, the Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) option.

IRV Is Fairer, Cheaper, Better Than Two-Round Elections

IRV combines primary and general elections. To vote, you simply rank as many candidates as you like, 1-2-3, instead of voting for just one. If your favorite loses, your vote transfers to your next choice, rather than being wasted.

IRV Is Fairer

IRV means every candidate faces the same hurdles over a level playing field. Not so today: 1999 Vancouver council races all needed primaries to obtain just two candidates. Positions 4 and 6 both had three candidates, so the top two could have advanced with only 34% support. And only 21% support could have been required to advance two of Position 5's five candidates!

IRV Saves Money While Shortening, Improving Campaigns

We quit paying for two elections to do the job of one. Candidates only run once, we only need to vote once.

And, while shortening campaigns, IRV increases voter interest and turnout, because IRV lets every candidate continue educating and energizing voters through Election Day.

IRV can reduce negative campaigning. With IRV, candidates must compete for second choice votes too, so voters can penalize mudslinging.

IRV is proven, abroad and in the US, where the Reform Party will use IRV for their presidential nomination. The American Political Science Association - election experts - uses IRV.

For more information, visit <http://www.fairvote.net/vancouver/> or call 737-9886.

Vote yes for a fairer, cheaper, better option for Vancouver. Vote yes for Amendment 1.

Written by: John Gear, Chair; Mark Maggiora

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

Because Amendment 1 makes IRV an option - not a requirement - it costs us nothing. Our outdated voting equipment needs upgrading, with or without Amendment 1. All modern systems handle IRV at no extra cost. We won't revert to paper ballots.

Primaries are expensive, widely-ignored and limit voter choices, wasting money and votes. Amendment 1 gives us the option of using a fairer, cheaper, and better alternative to primaries, once our voting equipment will support it.

Written by: John Gear, Chair; Mark Maggiora

Statement Against Issue:

Vancouver voters should vote *no* on Amendment 1. It is potentially risky, costly, and damaging to the democratic process.

Instant Runoff Voting (IRV), which is authorized as an option under Amendment 1, is used in only a handful of places around the U.S. It is a largely untested mechanism that would impose unnecessary and ill defined burdens on our election system without improving results.

We do not know what IRV would cost taxpayers because our state's Secretary of State is not aware of any automated system currently available to administer IRV. If such a system could be located or developed, the Secretary of State would have to certify the hardware and software, at a cost estimated at \$10,000 to \$30,000. Then, the cost to purchase, test, and administer the new system could run into the hundreds of thousands or even more. An alternative would be for the county auditor to count paper ballots, which could delay results and make our government less efficient.

IRV, with its risks, costs and burdens to efficiency, would not improve the democratic process. It is rare for four or more candidates to contest the same seat. When that happens, primaries are a fair, effective, and proven mechanism to winnow the candidates. The head-to-head final contest gives voters an additional chance to study the issues and scrutinize the candidates.

IRV proposes to replace a tested system we can afford with an experiment we cannot afford.

Written by: Ann Donnelly

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

None submitted.

CITY OF VANCOUVER
PROPOSED CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 2
(Placed on the ballot by City Council Resolution #M-3243)

Ballot Title Explanation:

Current Law: When the office of mayor becomes vacant, the mayor pro tempore assumes the office of mayor until the next regular election for council. It is unclear whether the mayor pro tempore's council seat becomes vacant when the mayor pro tempore becomes mayor and whether the mayor pro tempore must then run for his or her council seat.

Result of Passage: The amendment clarifies that a mayor pro tempore who serves as mayor in this situation is on excused absence from the council seat and may return to serve his or her unexpired council term without running for election.

Shall Sections 2.04 and 2.08 of the City Charter be amended to clarify the succession of mayor and mayor pro tempore in the event of a vacancy in the office of mayor?

YES...

NO...

Statement For Issue:

The purpose of this ballot measure is to clarify that the Mayor Pro-Tempore retains her/his City Council position after serving as Mayor Pro-Tempore when the elected mayor returns to serve as mayor or when a new mayor is elected to the unexpired term of the mayor.

To accomplish this clarification the Charter Review Committee recommends a minor change to *Section 2.04 Mayor and Mayor Pro-Tempore*; and to *Section 2.08 Vacancies in Council* of the City Charter.

These minor modifications to the City Charter solidify what was always intended and are needed to ensure that no misunderstanding exists in the future.

If these sections of the City Charter were interpreted to mean that the Mayor Pro-Tempore would lose her/his seat on the City Council when filling in for the Mayor, no member of the Council would volunteer to serve as Mayor Pro-Tempore. *A yes vote is recommended.*

Written by: Arch Miller, Chair

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

None submitted.

Statement Against Issue:

None submitted.

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

None submitted.

CITY OF VANCOUVER
PROPOSED CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 3
(Placed on the ballot by City Council Resolution #M-3242)

Ballot Title Explanation:

Current Law: City residents voted in 1981 to annex to the Fort Vancouver Regional Library District. City residents have since obtained library services directly from the district. The Charter does not reflect this change and is silent on provision of library services if the district no longer provides them.

Result of Passage: If the library district no longer provided library services in Vancouver due to disincorporation of the district, city withdrawal from the district, or other lawful means, the City council would be required to establish a library system and provide funding for ample library services.

Shall Section 8.05 of the City Charter be amended to provide that in the event that the free public library services now being provided for the city by a library district are no longer provided by the district due to disincorporation, withdrawal or by other lawful means, the city council shall forthwith establish a free public library system and appropriate adequate sums for provision of ample library services, maintenance and operation?

YES...

NO...

Statement For Issue:

The current language on libraries in the Vancouver City Charter is obsolete and needs correction. This amendment deletes the obsolete language (which refers to a city-run library) and replaces it with a short paragraph.

The amendment does two things: First, it correctly reflects the situation that exists now and for the foreseeable future, which is that the Vancouver libraries are part of the Fort Vancouver Regional Library (FVRL) System. Second, the amendment requires the City to provide library services for city residents if the FVRL system dissolves or Vancouver secedes from it.

Because we think it unlikely that the FVRL will dissolve or that Vancouver will secede, we think this amendment is unlikely to be operative. Therefore we anticipate no cost or consequence to citizens.

However, we do think it wise to have the library services requirement in place, so that continued operation of our libraries is assured, regardless of what might happen with respect to the library district.

The standard for services is taken from the preceding charter article, which requires the city to provide ample parks and recreation services. By using the same standard for libraries we set the same priority for both these important public services.

We hope citizens will pass this amendment. Although this is a small matter in itself, we feel that it is appropriate to keep the Charter current and correct, which is what this amendment does.

Written by: Ceci Ryan-Smith, Chair; John Gear

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

None submitted.

Statement Against Issue:

None submitted.

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

None submitted.

CITY OF VANCOUVER
NONBINDING ADVISORY QUESTION NO. 1
(Placed on the ballot by City Council Resolution #M-3241)

Ballot Title Explanation:

Current Law: Councilmembers are now elected at-large. Candidates residing anywhere in the city may run for any council seat. Registered voters throughout the City may vote for council candidates at both a primary and general election.

Result of Passage: City Council could, but would not be required to, consider changing the current at-large election system for councilmembers to some form of geographic ward or district system for electing and voting for city councilmembers. Any change in how councilmembers are elected would have to be done by Charter amendment approved by a vote of the people.

Should Vancouver change the present at-large method of electing council members to some form of geographic district or ward system?

YES...

NO...

Statement For Issue:

A reoccurring topic among many of Vancouver's voting citizens is the desire to have the issue of representative districts (wards) placed before the voters. Through this measure, citizens are given the voting opportunity to voice their opinion. The current system allows only at-large voting during both primary and general elections. Presently, the mayor and each council member represent all citizens in the city, not a specific geographic area. Voting for this measure will provide focus for both the citizen and council member.

A city's size does not disqualify using a district voting system. Washington State includes cities larger and smaller than Vancouver that use a districting system. The recent growth of Vancouver, through annexation, now involves more than twice as many people in this discussion. Many citizens feel that it is time to look at a district system.

In the past, several district system proposals have gone to council only to be rejected. This measure furthers the feasibility research for using such a system. Representative districts will improve the bonding between the council and those they represent and will go a long way in restoring voter's faith in local government.

A yes vote *should* begin serious discussion by citizens and city council on how best to implement representative districts.

Written by: Roberta Forbes, Sean Guard, Larry Patella

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

A yes vote on this resolution sends a mandate to the current city government to investigate the feasibility of districting.

Written by: Roberta Forbes; Sean Guard; Larry Patella

Statement Against Issue:

The issue of electing council members by wards has again surfaced, and we will express our opinion to the City Council with this vote. Please join us in sending a resounding *no* to the Council, and in rejecting the idea of returning to divided and divisive municipal government.

City council positions should be open to all citizens of Vancouver regardless of their address.

We want to encourage the best and the brightest to participate without limiting the field.

We want candidates who seek the betterment of our community as a whole, not as artificially-segmented pieces.

Partitioning the community creates artificial boundaries, resulting in a sense of "us and them" instead of we.

Artificial boundaries encourage "deal-making" instead of problem solving.

Wards, without question, would be a step backward in the evolution of good local government.

Vancouver was awarded the All America City designation for its bold and effective efforts to modernize local government. Let's not retreat to the past...*Vote no on wards* for the City of Vancouver, and keep a healthy local government that is open to all its citizens.

Written by: John Gear, Chair; Bruce Hagensen

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

Ward supporters wrote "Presently the Mayor and each council member represent all citizens in the city" - we agree, and that's the way it should be!

Rather than "improving bonding" and "providing focus," wards promote parochialism, reduce participation and citizen choice, and have contributed to some of the worst abuses in the history of local governments.

Take this opportunity to safeguard local government integrity and preserve your choices. *Vote no* on a ward system.

Written by: John Gear, Chair; Bruce Hagensen

CITY OF VANCOUVER
NONBINDING ADVISORY QUESTION NO. 2
 (Placed on the ballot by City Council Resolution #M-3244)

Should the Vancouver City Council undertake a review of the advantages and disadvantages of changing the form of government of the City of Vancouver from the present council/manager form of government to some form of mayor/council or other authorized form of municipal government?

YES... NO...

Statement For Issue:

Vancouver is one of the fastest growing cities in the state of Washington. With the current population reaching 150,000, Vancouver is the fourth largest city in the State. Vancouver has expanded significantly through annexation, and now encompasses a large and diverse area, and is projected to soon become the second largest city.

When our current form of government was adopted in 1952, Vancouver had a population of approximately 45,000.

Now is the time to reexamine Vancouver's form of government to determine if the Council/Manager form of government, as adopted for the City of Vancouver, is the appropriate form of government for the 21st century Vancouver.

Several large cities use an alternative form of government to the council/manager. Seattle uses a Mayor/Council form of government, and Portland uses a form of government (commission), which does not place the primary power in the city with a non-elected official. Currently, in Vancouver, the decisions which have the greater impact on citizens are made by an elected official, and does not answer to the voters of this community.

A yes vote for this measure *will not* change our current form of government. It is an advisory vote designed to allow citizens to examine alternatives to our current form of government without actually making the change.

A yes vote *will* start a process of investigation, discussion, and debate in this community as to the fit between our 1952 form of government and our 21st century city.

Written by: Paula Martin; Roberta Forbes; Sean Guard

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

Although the charter has periodically been reviewed, this is the first that included participation from newly annexed citizens. The committee chose to allow the entire city an opportunity to explore other options for governing a growing city.

A yes vote will allow the *entire* community to voice their desire about Vancouver's form of government with respect to how the city is run. Citizen participation is *never* a waste of resources.

Written by: Paula Martin; Roberta Forbes; Sean Guard

Statement Against Issue:

Voters approved our current Council/Management form of government in February 1952. The previous Mayor/Council form was viewed as unresponsive to the electorate. These citizen complaints and a desire for professional administration of our city's operations drove the change.

Citizen committees have regularly reviewed the City Charter at least every five years since 1973. Each review has looked closely at our form of government. None of those reviews found any good reason to recommend a change.

The solutions to problems expressed in this Charter review's hearings are best addressed by holding those in city government accountable. The responsibility for responsiveness to citizens must include understanding the distinction between "policy makers" and professional managers. City staff are the people with answers on managing city operations. Leadership should provide and demand clear and regular communications with citizens. A change in the form of government would only change the structure. It would not resolve problems expressed regarding city communications and citizen involvement.

The American Society of Public Administrators is an association that regularly assesses governance policies. They review practices throughout the country with information from around the world. After several years of study, they have concluded the Council/Manager form is the most effective form of government structure and fully endorse it for municipal governance.

We urge a no vote on this issue. The City should rather focus resources and energies on efforts to better inform and involve citizens in the business of city governance.

Written by: John Caton; Mark Maggiora; John McDonagh

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

None submitted.

Ballot Title Explanation:

A current population vote is less than the current City Charter in 1952, which was adopted for the council/manager form of government. An Mayor/Council form of government, in the city with a non-elected official and city operations. Vancouver could lawfully operate under a variety of alternatives to municipal government. Result of Passage: City Council could, if it were to require, examine the advantages and disadvantages of changing the present form of government of the City to some other form. Any change would have to be done by Charter amendment approved by a vote of the people.

CITY OF CAMAS
PROPOSITION NO. 1
LIBRARY GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS - \$7,960,000

Ballot Title Explanation:

The City of Camas seeks voter approval to incur debt in the form of general obligation bonds maturing within a maximum term of twenty-one years to be paid by a tax levy in addition to the regular property tax levy in the district. The amount of the debt incurred will not exceed \$7,960,000 nor exceed the amount permitted by the Constitution and laws of the State of Washington, and will be used to pay for expanding and improving the City Library.

For improving, expanding and equipping the City Library, including parking, additional land and technology equipment, shall the City of Camas issue general obligation bonds in the principal amount of \$7,960,000, maturing within a maximum of twenty-one years from date of issue, and shall annual tax levies in excess of regular property tax levies be authorized to repay said bonds, all as provided in City Ordinance No. 2216?

BONDS, YES... BONDS, NO...

Statement For Issue:

Why: Camas is growing and with that growth the need for an enlarged and expanded library has become obvious. During the past twenty years the population of Camas has increased by 180% while the number of items checked out from the library has increased by 250%. The collection size has not grown because of lack of space. Providing desired services out of the 1940 building has become increasingly difficult.

Vision: A revitalized Camas Public Library will be a place where the best of the old merges with the brightest of the new, and where the printed page and electronic data inform and inspire. It will be a welcoming, comfortable, efficient, well-stocked and active place to serve Camas children and adults well into the 21st Century.

Goals: The Camas Public Library Board of Trustees and the Camas City Council agree that the library requires a facility approximately doubled in size. The preferred solution is to remodel the existing structure and unite it with a modern yet complementary addition that reflects the explosive growth and high-tech future of Camas.

Results: Much needed study areas, quiet reading space, and public meeting spaces will be important parts of the complex. The original building will be carefully renovated, preserving an important civic treasure while bringing it into compliance with current structural, life safety, and accessibility codes. The new facility is designed to support the latest technologies in both print and digital materials and provide flexibility to meet current and future demands. It's long overdue.

Written by: Barbara Baldus, Co-Chair; Co. June Rainey; Helen Gerde

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

The 1939 library building is in serious trouble: floor load, wiring and lighting are inadequate. Meeting room space is not accessible to all. There is not enough room for today's users, let alone the 25,000 Camas residents of tomorrow.

The costs of a main city library cannot be compared to a satellite branch. A good public library is one of the best investments a community can make. Vote yes for quality of life.

Written by: Barbara Baldus, Co-Chair; Co. June Rainey; Helen Gerde

Statement Against Issue:

1) The proposed expansion is too big and expensive:

Includes a new community room for 100 people. The library already has two community rooms for 49 people each. After hours, 4 other community facilities within approximately 2 miles of the library are available.

Includes an unnecessary parking facility. Vertical head in parking on all four sides of the block will accommodate parking. Shared space with existing nearby parking lots is also possible.

Doesn't utilize space well. Requires the costly relocation of existing city offices. The library addition could be designed as a smaller two-story structure. Current plans designate more than 7000 square feet out of 20,000 to work space for a staff of 12 employees.

2) The tax burden is not shouldered equitably by those who would use the facility:

The planned library in Three Creeks, the second largest FVRL branch in Clark County will be 13,000 sq. ft. It will cost \$4.5 million which includes \$1.5 million for materials. Three Creeks taxpayers will pay an additional \$.18 per thousand for 10 years for the bond. Both FVRL residents and Camas citizens already pay \$.50 per thousand for library services. In Camas, the \$7.96 million dollar bond is estimated to cost taxpayers an additional \$.35 cents per thousand for the next 20 years and does not include books. In 1998, 51% of the items checked out were to people who live outside of Camas. Non resident users are not asked to pay their fair share.

Written by: Margaret Tweet

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

No. The owner of a \$200,000 home would pay about \$70 more per year for 20 years above the \$100 per year they already pay annually for library services. A new plan is needed, with more citizen input from all areas served. Partnerships with school libraries could be explored for weekend and summer access. The board needs to clarify whether the digital expansion will include access to hardcore pornography, gratuitous violence, or other destructive materials.

Written by: Margaret Tweet

CITY OF RIDGEFIELD

PROPOSITION NO. 1

ADOPTION OF THE COUNCIL-MANAGER FORM OF GOVERNMENT WITHIN THE CITY OF RIDGEFIELD, WASHINGTON

Ballot Title Explanation:

The City of Ridgefield is currently a non-chartered code city doing business under the Mayor-Council form of government as provided in RCW 35A.12. An elected mayor is the chief administrative officer of the city. The proposal is to change to a Council-Manager form of government as provided by RCW 35A.13. An elected council will select a professional administrator to be the chief administrative officer. A mayor will be selected from among the council to be the "chairman" of the council and be the head of the city for ceremonial purposes.

Shall the City of Ridgefield adopt the COUNCIL-MANAGER form of government and abandon the MAYOR-COUNCIL form of government? (This will not affect the City's operation as a non-charter code city.)

YES, adopt the COUNCIL-MANAGER form of government.....

NO, retain the current MAYOR-COUNCIL form of government....

Statement For Issue:

Why we should vote for a City Manager/Council type government.

Ridgefield needs professional management because it is now a multi-million dollar business. We have a major sewer project that needs help and a rapidly growing community that needs direction daily.

The primary strength of the Council/Manager Plan is the unification of powers in an elected body and a professional administration of public business.

A Manager will apply modern business practices resulting in efficient and responsive city services also a cost effective Government and wise use of tax dollars.

The laws on Growth Management and Wetlands are increasingly complex. These and other issues require professional management. It is not realistic to expect a part time Mayor to provide enough time to perform these duties.

The City Council has complete control and can hire an experienced capable manager. They can establish the guidelines for training education and expected performance. They also have the power to fire a manager who does not perform to their expectations.

The Council/Manager Plan has been used in the United States since 1908. In Washington State, all of the newly incorporated cities since 1983 have selected the Council/Manager Plan. Over 71 million Americans live in Council/Manager Communities today.

Written by: Gary Adkins

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

None submitted.

Statement Against Issue:

The City of Ridgefield has operated with the Council-Mayor form of government for over 50 years. Why do we need to change it this year?

The Council-Mayor form of government gives the citizens a person that they can go to if they do not like how city government is being run. That person, the Mayor, was elected by the citizens, and is responsible to them for city government. In the Council-Manager form of government the manager operates the city, but he is *not* accountable to the citizens. You can not vote out the manager.

Professionals also bring in bureaucracy. They tend to need more professionals around them to make the city function, hence more expense to the city. Ridgefield has a limited budget and may go broke with professional help.

If we need additional help in the mayor's office, make it an administrator, not a manager. Then we can affect change in a positive manner.

Written by: Tevis Laspa

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

None submitted.

LA CENTER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 101
PROPOSITION NO. 1
LA CENTER SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS - \$16,500,000

Ballot Title Explanation:

LaCenter School District No. 101 seeks voter approval to incur debt in the form of general obligation bonds maturing within a maximum term of twenty years to be paid by a tax levy in addition to the regular property tax levy in the district. The amount of the debt incurred will not exceed \$16,500,000 nor exceed the amount permitted by the Constitution and laws of the State of Washington, and will be used to pay for the construction, equipping and for making improvements to district schools.

For constructing and equipping an elementary school, making improvements to La Center High, La Center Intermediate and La Center Elementary Schools and for other capital improvements, shall La Center School District #101 issue \$16,500,000 of general obligation bonds, maturing within a maximum term of 20 years, and shall annual property tax levies in excess of regular tax levies be authorized to repay such bonds, all as provided in District Resolution #98/99-5?

YES...

NO...

Statement For Issue:

After nearly a year of community meetings, building tours, and recommendations to the board, the La Center School District Board of Directors voted in August to submit a 16.5 Million Dollar bond measure for voter consideration in the November 2 General Election. Enrollment has increased approximately 575 students since the last successful bond passage in September of 1990, bringing district enrollment to approximately 1,325 full time equivalent students. If voters approve the November measure, all grade levels in the district benefit. A new K-2 elementary school site will be acquired and a core building constructed and equipped. The elementary school built in 1938 and the intermediate building built in 1961 will undergo major modernization. The elementary will increase by six classrooms, see the addition of a gymnasium and upgrade of current multi-purpose and primary facilities. Modernization of the intermediate includes addition of a media center and multi-purpose room as well as general site improvements. Twelve classrooms will be added and equipped at the high school along with enlarged locker rooms, media center, parking and gymnasium improvements. A modular building will house district office facilities. The La Center School District Board of Directors urges the La Center community to support this project which culminates hundreds of hours of community involvement and provides funds to construct, equip and make improvements to district facilities.

Written by: Brian West, Chair

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

None submitted.

Statement Against Issue:

None submitted.

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

None submitted.

WOODLAND SWIMMING POOL AND RECREATION DISTRICT

ADVISORY BALLOT PROPOSITION

Ballot Title Explanation:

This is an advisory vote (non-binding), sanctioned by the Woodland Swimming Pool and Recreation District. The purpose of this advisory vote is to gauge the opinion of the citizens of the District (the same as the Woodland School District) regarding creation and construction of a swimming and recreational facility in and adjacent to the Horseshoe Lake Park in Woodland, as proposed by the Woodland Community Swimming Pool Committee. There is no current law or order mandating the creation and construction of such a facility. This vote is merely advisory in nature and does not affect current law.

Should a swimming pool and recreation center to be operated by the Woodland Swimming Pool and Recreation District be constructed on property situated in and adjacent to Horseshoe Lake Park?

YES...

NO...

Statement For Issue:

This advisory vote is the final step in what has been a long and difficult journey to conceive and construct a community pool and recreation center in and adjacent to Horseshoe Lake Park. Previously raised issues regarding Shoreline Permits, Moratoriums, open space and the DNR have been addressed and resolved. Concerns over proper use and preservation of the park have been clarified and accommodated.

The only real issue that remains is: Do the citizens in the entire Woodland School District support the pool and recreation center at the new location as proposed? The previous vote (September 1998) focused on where the pool should be (or not be) and was limited to the opinions of only the people within the Woodland City limits. This advisory vote seeks the opinions of all of the citizens in the Woodland school district.

The conclusions derived from the time, expense and research charitably conducted by the Woodland Community Swimming Pool Committee, demonstrate that the area in and adjacent to the park is the safest and most viable option for a pool and recreation center. This is the voters chance to finally end speculation and vote yes to build a facility that everyone will be proud of and use for years to come.

Written by: Benno Dobbe, Chair; Bruce Hulett; Ron Orr

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

Just like in the 1950's, volunteers would like to improve Horseshoe Lake Park with private funding and bring it up to today's standards. It has an inadequate boat ramp, unsafe swimming environment, bad roads, undesignated parking, no handicap accommodations, insufficient restrooms and a deserted, brown, open space. The new proposed swimming and recreational facility will address all those problems, and still increase the open space in the park, with the possible donation of private land.

Written by: Benno Dobbe, Chair; Bruce Hulett; Ron Orr

Statement Against Issue:

Woodland's Horseshoe Lake Park was developed by volunteers in the 1950's and dedicated to the community to be utilized and preserved by those who love the lake. It has been the ambition of the city to preserve this natural resource for generations to come.

This space has been used for Planters Days, US Bicentennial and State Centennial celebrations, Veterans Day recognition, carnivals, Easter, fishing, swimming, boating, picnicking, logging shows, circus, family/youth sports and recreation. The city has no other developed open space for large community events.

Horseshoe Lake is a precious non-renewable resource that must be retained for present and future generations to enjoy. The population of the community has tripled since the park was constructed.

To date the WCSPC has not submitted an approvable site plan including required costly infrastructure (water, sewer, street, lighting, landscaping, setback, off-street parking). The swimming/recreation facility could be built in many other available locations, including a site already purchased by the WCSPC.

The facility will take the park road, boat launch road and part of the open field in the park.

Voters of the city of Woodland will be asked again to vote on allowing a large indoor swimming pool and recreation facility in the park. Last year the majority said no. The majority of the city council ignored the wishes of the people and favored the facility in the park.

This election will include all the Recreation District voters.

Vote *no* to preserve the integrity of Horseshoe Lake Park.

Written by: Walter E Hansen, Sr.

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

This advisory vote is not the final issue. Shoreline permits, moratoriums, openspace have not been resolved. Land ownership is still in question. When the entire recreation district gets to vote they should also understand this may take taxes to support. I am in favor of the entire district getting to vote, as they are the ones that will have to help support this facility. Vote *no* on this pool site.

Written by: Walter E Hansen, Sr.

GREATER BATTLE GROUND LIBRARY CAPITAL FACILITY AREA PROPOSITION NO. 1

Ballot Title Explanation:

State law allows voters to create a Capital Facility Area in a portion of an existing library district. The citizens residing within the boundaries of the proposed Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area are served by the Fort Vancouver Regional Library District. Passage of this measure will create the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area. Creating the Capital Facility Area will allow residents within the area to vote on whether or not to fund construction of a library facility within the area.

Shall the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area be established?

YES...

NO...

Statement For Issue:

We need a quality, full-service library with enough space for a good collection of books, on a site with adequate parking that is close to schools and accessible to as many North County residents as possible.

The Battle Ground Community Library has been bursting at the seams for years. With up to 700 children, teens, moms and dads, and elders a day in the 3800 square foot library, there isn't enough room. Just think - that's a spot two feet by two feet for each person, if we took out all the books, the work areas, the tables and chairs, and the bathrooms! It's getting worse. The population in North County is growing fast.

The new law allows us to create a Library Capital Facility Area so that people who are served by a particular library facility will pay for the bonds it takes to build that facility. After a lot of citizen input, the area for the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area was chosen to coincide with the current service area of the Battle Ground Community Library.

A yes vote on this measure will authorize this bond district, and allow voters to approve the accompanying bond measure. Please vote yes and do your part to create the community library facility we so desperately need.

Written by: Karen Williams

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

A larger library facility will provide more space, more books, and more parking that our growing community needs now. Our library checks out close to as many items as the Vancouver Mall Library with less staff, in almost half the space and without enough parking. Overcrowding is precisely why a larger facility is necessary. We are open 10 hours Monday through Wednesday, 8, Thursday through Saturday. This is our opportunity to build for the future!

Written by: Karen Williams

Statement Against Issue:

The current facility should be put to full use prior to expansion. Better financial accountability to the public should be made so that residents know how library dollars are now spent before investing more. The library system has ample finances to improve services due to the influx of new residents from whom taxes are collected.

Library income has jumped from \$5,883,299 in 1993 to \$9,912,950 in 1998 (59% increase). Library hours and services have not risen accordingly. A performance audit by an independent group should be the *first step* to improve library services.

The Washington Public Library Statistics most current information is for 1997. These statistics show that the Battle Ground library had the third highest circulation in the district (333,074), comparable to the Vancouver Mall, (350,430). However, the Mall branch operated 73 hours a week and Battle Ground 54, a 19 hour difference.

Better hours would be less expensive means of expansion. Service could be improved by opening on Sundays for eight hours and expanding other days. Sunday afternoons are high usage hours in other libraries. Extended daily hours could also improve access.

The FVRL library board has voted to override Referendum 47 limits for the last two years for "emergency" expenditures. In 1998, the library director was given a 4% raise and is now paid approximately \$109,500. This was about \$20,000 more than directors of comparable sized systems in the state in 1998. Funds should be directed to serve the public, not a bloated administration.

Written by: Tom Armstrong

Rebuttal of Statement For Issue:

No taxation without representation. Citizens should vote against the new taxing district because it offers *no local control*. Other taxing districts like schools, fire, or cemetery districts are governed by an elected board from the district. The FVRL library board, who would oversee the library, is made up of 7 trustees appointed by commissioners in three counties. Residents have no means of appeal to a library board decision, or elect a better board.

Written by: Tom Armstrong

GREATER BATTLE GROUND LIBRARY CAPITAL FACILITY AREA PROPOSITION NO. 2

Ballot Title Explanation:

If a Capital Facility Area is established by the voters in the Greater Battle Ground Area, pursuant to Proposition No. 1, voters within this area may vote to finance the construction and equipping of a new library facility to be located in Battle Ground. Presently no funding is available to finance a new library facility. If approved by voters, general obligation bonds of not more than \$4.3 million will be authorized to fund a new library facility. Such bonds shall be repaid by property taxes on property within the Capital Facility Area created in Proposition No. 1.

Shall the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area, Clark County, Washington, incur indebtedness and issue not more than \$4.3 million of general obligation bonds maturing within 15 years and levy annual excess property taxes necessary to pay and retire such bonds to remodel and expand the building at 606 NE 1st Street, Battle Ground, Washington, a new library facility, and equip and stock with books and other library materials this facility?

YES...

NO...

Statement For Issue:

Finally, our change is here to solve a significant problem, and to improve our community for ourselves, our children, and our neighbors. We have needed a new library for years. The Fort Vancouver Regional Library District responded to a great opportunity and acquired the United Methodist Church in Battle Ground, to remodel into a new library.

The community told the Library we want and need a bigger facility with more parking and space for books, programs, study, research, and community activities. They've listened, and they've done their part to help us.

A good library benefits the entire community. A yes vote on this bond will cost about the same as two paperback books per year, over 15 years. And it will bring us so much more! The money will buy a new facility with the space we need, and a much-improved collection. It will allow us to use this wonderful community resource without tripping over each other, and give our children a better place to study and learn.

We've been asking, planning, and hoping for years. It's here-now is the time, this is our chance.

Please vote yes.

Written by: Karen Williams

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

This vote is about facilities, not the Internet. Public input on the Internet access policy was sought for over a year, and hundreds of statements painstakingly considered. The library has installed a state-of-the-art filtering system that allows parental control over Internet access. What cannot be disputed is that our community needs a larger library. The current building, built in 1959, is inadequate to serve a population that has increased 125% since 1990.

Written by: Karen Williams

Statement Against Issue:

The FVRL system has selected unrestricted Internet access without adequate public input. This includes highly objectionable material like hardcore porn, illegal drug manufacture and violent "entertainment." Residents now have a chance to vote *no* to tax dollars spent on destructive, addictive materials.

The library has acted to permit a parent to select filtered Internet access for his or her own child only. However, minors can obtain a library card with Net access without parental permission. The public, including offenders and youth, can still obtain porn while other patrons wait for access.

A one time mailing to inform parents of the filtering option is not going to help parents with language barriers, lack of computer literacy, or those who move to this fast growing area after the mailing. A parent option does little to prevent reported problems like porn surfers who have left porn on the screen, or posted and handed out printouts of hardcore materials to youngsters. Almost every branch in the FVRL system has repeated complaints about porn exposure.

More than 878 libraries nationwide do filter out highly objectionable materials. Two systems in Washington State voted to filter net access for all users this summer.

The Tacoma twelve branch library system has filtered out extreme materials for almost two years. If a site is blocked incorrectly, it can be accessed with staff assistance. This happens only about twice a month.

Clean sweep of Internet porn should be provided before any tax dollars are used for expansion - it's excellence.

Written by: Tom Armstrong

Rebuttal of Statement Against Issue:

Residents should not vote millions of Bond funds to the library until elected representatives from the area oversee operations. Many states have library boards who are elected and are directly accountable to the citizens - this board is not. States, counties, or cities in which elected representatives oversee library funding are beginning to withhold funds from libraries that do not take action to block obscene or highly objectionable Internet materials. *No to taxation without representation.*

Written by: Tom Armstrong

Complete text of local measures

CITY OF VANCOUVER RESOLUTION NO. M-3240

A RESOLUTION and proposal to add a new Section 9.03 to the City Charter to give city council the option to authorize the use of instant run-off voting (IRV) in elections of city officers at any regular or special election.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF VANCOUVER:

Section 1. That as recommended by the Charter Review Committee in its report of June 23, 1999, it is hereby proposed that a new Section 9.03 be added to the City Charter to read as follows:

Section 9.03 - Instant Runoff Voting Authorized

(1) Method authorized but not required: Nothing in this charter shall preclude the City Council from authorizing, by resolution, the use of instant runoff voting for the election of city officers in any regular or special election that may be held.

(2) Advance notification required: A resolution authorizing the use of instant runoff voting for an election must be passed at least thirty days before the candidate filing deadline for that election.

(3) Instant runoff voting defined: Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) allows the majority will of the voters to be determined in a single election. Instead of a voter indicating a single choice, each voter indicates his or her first choice, second choice, and so on, for up to as many choices as there are candidates. If a candidate receives a majority of first choice ballots, that candidate is elected. However, if no candidate receives a majority of first choice ballots, the candidate with the fewest first choice ballots is eliminated from contention, and the second choices of those voters whose first choice was eliminated are then counted as first choices. If a candidate now has a majority of the ballots, that candidate is elected. If not this process is repeated until one candidate receives a majority of the ballots. Instant runoff voting makes a second round or runoff election unnecessary.

(4) Uniformity required: If instant runoff voting is to be used to elect to any city officer then it must be used for all city offices appearing on the ballot during that election.

ADOPTED at regular session of the Council of the City of Vancouver, the 9th day of August, 1999.

CITY OF VANCOUVER RESOLUTION NO. M-3243

A RESOLUTION and proposal to amend City Charter Sections 2.04 and 2.08 to clarify succession in office for the mayor and mayor pro tempore.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF VANCOUVER:

Section 1. That as recommended by the Charter Review Committee in its report of June 23, 1999, it is hereby proposed that Section 2.04 of the City Charter be amended to read as follows:

Section 2.04 Mayor and Mayor Pro Tempore: Biennially, after the newly elected councilmembers have assumed office, at its first meeting, the city council shall choose from among its members a member who shall have the title of mayor pro tempore and shall act as mayor during the absence or disability

of the mayor and shall succeed to the office of mayor in case of a vacancy. The mayor pro tempore shall upon succession to the office of mayor serve as mayor only until the next regularly elected councilmembers assume office regular general election, at which time a person shall be elected to serve for the unexpired term of the mayor. The mayor, or the mayor pro tempore when serving as mayor, shall preside at meetings of the city council and shall be recognized as head of the city government for all ceremonial purposes and by the governor for purposes of military law, have the rights, privileges, and immunities of a member of the council, but shall have no regular administrative duties. The mayor shall receive a salary of \$480 per annum as a councilmember, plus \$720 per annum for services as mayor, making a total annual salary of \$1,200 payable in equal monthly installments; provided, that such compensation may be changed by ordinance.

Section 2. That as further recommended by the Charter Review Committee in its report of June 23, 1999, it is hereby proposed that Section 2.08 of the City Charter be amended to read as follows:

Section 2.08 Vacancies in Council: Vacancies in the city council shall be filled by a majority vote of the remaining members of the city council, but such appointee shall hold office only until the next regular general election, at which time a person shall be elected to serve for the remainder of the unexpired term. In the event of the extended excused absence or disability of a councilmember, which shall include, without limitation, the period the mayor pro tempore serves as mayor in case of a vacancy in the office of mayor, the remaining members of the city council shall have the power to appoint a councilmember pro tempore to serve during the absence or disability.

ADOPTED at regular session of the Council of the City of Vancouver, the 9th day of August, 1999.

CITY OF VANCOUVER RESOLUTION NO. M-3242

A RESOLUTION and proposal to amend City Charter Section 8.05 to provide for the provision of ample library services by the city in the event that the existing library district no longer provides such services.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF VANCOUVER:

Section 1. That as recommended by the Charter Review Committee in its report of June 23, 1999, it is hereby proposed that Section 8.05 of the City Charter be amended to read as follows:

Section 8.05 Library: A- (E) free public library under a board of five trustees has been established services are provided for this city by a library district in accordance with state law. The board of trustees shall submit their proposed budget annually to the director of finance who shall have it included in the general city budget. In the event that the district no longer provides such services to the city due to disincorporation, withdrawal or by other lawful means, F(t)he city council shall forthwith establish a free public library system and shall appropriate annually an adequate sums for provision of ample library establishment services, maintenance, and operation.

ADOPTED at regular session of the Council of the City of Vancouver, the 9th day of August, 1999.

CITY OF VANCOUVER RESOLUTION NO. M-3241

A RESOLUTION and proposal to refer to the voters of the City of Vancouver a nonbinding advisory ballot on the desirability of a ward or district system for electing councilmembers.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF VANCOUVER:

Section 1. That as recommended by the Charter Review Committee in its report of June 23, 1999, it is hereby proposed that a nonbinding advisory ballot be put to the voters of the City of Vancouver to read as follows:

NONBINDING ADVISORY QUESTION:

Should Vancouver change the present at-large method of electing councilmembers to some form of geographic district or ward system?

Yes _____ No _____

ADOPTED at regular session of the Council of the City of Vancouver, the 9th day of August, 1999.

CITY OF VANCOUVER RESOLUTION NO. M-3244

A RESOLUTION and proposal to refer to the voters of the City of Vancouver a nonbinding advisory ballot on whether City Council should undertake a review of the advantages and disadvantages of changing the form of government of the City of Vancouver from the present council/manager form of government to some form of mayor/council or other authorized form of municipal government.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF VANCOUVER:

Section 1. City Council having considered the Charter Review Committee report of June 23, 1999, and public testimony received August 2, 1999, there is hereby proposed that a nonbinding advisory ballot be placed before the voters of the City of Vancouver to read as follows:

NONBINDING ADVISORY QUESTION:

Should the Vancouver City Council undertake a review of the advantages and disadvantages of changing the form of government of the City of Vancouver from the present council/manager form of government to some form of mayor/council or other authorized form of municipal government?

Yes _____ No _____

ADOPTED at regular session of the Council of the City of Vancouver, the 9th day of August, 1999.

CITY OF CAMAS ORDINANCE NO. 2216

AN ordinance providing for the submission to the qualified electors of the City of Camas at an election to be held on November 2, 1999, of a proposition authorizing the City to issue its general obligation bonds in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$7,960,000 for the purpose of providing funds to expand and improve the City Library.

WHEREAS, the best interests of the inhabitants of the City of Camas (the "City") require the City to improve,

expand and remodel the building housing the City Library; and

WHEREAS, to provide financing for the acquisition, construction and equipping of such library improvements it is deemed necessary and advisable that the City issue and sell its unlimited tax levy general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not to exceed \$7,960,000 (the "Bonds"); and

WHEREAS, the constitution and laws of the State of Washington provide that the question of whether or not the City may issue the Bonds be submitted to the qualified electors of the City for their ratification or rejection;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CAMAS, DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Findings: Construction and Equipping of Library Building Improvements.

The City Council hereby finds that the best interests of the inhabitants of the City require the City to improve, expand, equip and remodel the City Library Building, including parking, acquisition of equipment and additional lands and interests in lands, all in the order and in the manner deemed most necessary and advisable by the City Council (the "Library Building Improvements"). The estimated cost of the Library Building Improvements, including incidental costs and costs related to issuing and selling the Bonds as provided in this ordinance, is estimated to be \$7,960,000. Without limitation, the costs of all necessary consulting services, design, inspection and testing, administrative expenses and other costs incurred in connection with the acquisition, construction, equipping and financing of the Library Building Improvements shall be deemed a part of its cost.

The City Council shall determine the exact specifications for the Library Building Improvements. If the City Council, by ordinance, shall determine that it has become impractical to acquire, construct or equip any portion of the Library Building Improvements by reason of changed conditions, or costs substantially in excess of the amount of bond proceeds or tax levies estimated to be available, the City shall not be required to acquire, construct or equip such portions. If all of the Library Building Improvements have been constructed or acquired or duly provided for, or found to be impractical, the City may apply the bond proceeds or any portion thereof to the payment, redemption or defeasance of the Bonds in such manner as the City Council, by ordinance and in its discretion, shall determine.

Section 2. Authorization of Bonds. For the purpose of providing the funds necessary to pay the costs of the Library Building Improvements, together with incidental costs and costs related to the sale and issuance of the Bonds, the City shall issue and sell its general obligation bonds in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$7,960,000. The Bonds shall be issued in an amount not exceeding the amount approved by the electors of the City and not exceeding the amount permitted by the constitution and laws of the State of Washington. The balance, if any, of the cost of the Library Building Improvements shall be paid out of any other legally available funds. The Bond proceeds shall not be used for the replacement of equipment or for other than a capital purpose.

The Bonds shall be issued in such amounts and at such time or times as found necessary and advisable by the City Council and as permitted by law. The

Bonds may be issued in one or more series and shall bear interest payable at a rate or rates authorized by the City Council. The Bonds shall mature in such amounts and at such times within a maximum term of twenty-one years from date of issue, all as authorized by the City Council and as provided by law. The Bonds shall be general obligations of the City and, unless paid from other sources, both principal of and interest on the Bonds shall be payable out of annual tax levies to be made upon all the taxable property within the City without limitation as to rate or amount and in excess of any constitutional or statutory tax limitation. The exact date, form, terms, options of redemption, maturities, covenants and manner of sale of the Bonds shall be as hereafter fixed by ordinance or ordinances of the City Council. After voter approval of the Bond proposition and in anticipation of the issuance of such Bonds, the City may issue short-term obligations as authorized by Chapter 39.50 RCW.

PASSED by City Council of the City of Camas, Washington at a regular meeting held on the 13th day of September, 1999.

**CITY OF RIDGEFIELD
RESOLUTION NO. 223**

A RESOLUTION PROPOSING ABANDONMENT OF THE MAYOR-COUNCIL FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN THE CITY OF RIDGEFIELD AND REQUESTING THE COUNTY AUDITOR TO SCHEDULE A SPECIAL ELECTION

WHEREAS, the City of Ridgefield, a noncharter code city, has operated under the mayor-council form of government authorized by RCW Chapter 35A.12 for longer than six consecutive years; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Ridgefield has determined that it is in the best interests of the citizens of the City of Ridgefield to cause an election to take place to determine whether the City should abandon the mayor-council form of government, and,

WHEREAS, the next general municipal election will be held November 2, 1999; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIDGEFIELD, WASHINGTON, AS FOLLOWS:

1. The City Council of the City of Ridgefield proposes abandoning the current plan of government known as the mayor-council form of government under RCW 35A.12 and adopting the plan of government known as the council-manager form of government found under RCW 35A.13. The City shall remain as a noncharter code city.
5. This resolution shall be enforced immediately upon its adoption by the City Council.

DONE AT THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIDGEFIELD, WASHINGTON, ON JUNE 10, 1999.

**LACENTER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 101
RESOLUTION NO. 98/99-5**

A RESOLUTION of the Board of Directors of La Center School District No. 101, Clark County, Washington, providing for the form of the ballot proposition and specifying certain other details concerning submission to the qualified electors of the district at a special election to be held therein on November 2, 1999, of a proposition for the issuance of its general obligation

bonds in the aggregate principal amount of \$16,500,000 or so much thereof as may be issued under the laws governing the indebtedness of school districts for the purpose of providing funds to construct, equip and make improvements to district facilities.

WHEREAS, improvements to school facilities are needed in La Center School District No. 101, Clark County, Washington (the "District"), in order to provide the students of the District with adequate, proper and safe educational facilities; and

WHEREAS, in order to provide part of the funds to enable the District to construct, equip and make such necessary capital improvements to its existing facilities, it is deemed necessary and advisable that the District issue and sell its unlimited tax levy general obligation bonds in the principal amount of \$16,500,000; and

WHEREAS, the Constitution and laws of the State of Washington (including RCW 28A.530.010 and RCW 84.52.056) provide that the question of whether or not such bonds may be issued and sold for such purposes and taxes levied to pay such bonds must be submitted to the qualified electors of the District for their ratification or rejection;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of La Center School District No. 101, Clark County, Washington, as follows:

Section 1. Findings. This Board of Directors (the "Board") hereby finds and declares that the best interest of the students and other inhabitants of the District require the District to carry out the plans hereinafter provided at the time or times and in the order deemed most necessary and advisable by the Board.

Section 2. Capital Improvements. The District shall:

Construct and equip a new K-2 elementary school and acquire a site therefor.

Construct and equip a new bus maintenance facility together with driver's lunchrooms.

Construct and equip a modular building for District office facilities.

Construct and equip additions and improvements to La Center High School including, but not limited to, 12 classrooms, locker rooms, media center, parking and gymnasium improvements, and remodel and equip main entry, offices and computer facilities.

Improve and upgrade La Center Elementary School including, but not limited to, remodeling of the Gabrielsen Building, addition of six classrooms and a gymnasium, upgrade the multi-purpose and primary buildings, make site improvements and provide for temporary housing of students during construction.

Complete construction of La Center High School track and stadium.

Remodel and improve La Center Intermediate School including, but not limited to, addition of a Media Center and multi-purpose room and general site improvements.

The cost of all necessary architectural, engineering, and other consulting services, inspection and testing, administrative and relocation expenses, on and off-site utilities, related improvements, lands and interests in lands and other costs incurred in connection with the making of the foregoing capital improvements shall be deemed a part of the costs of such improvements. Such improvements shall be complete with all necessary furniture, equipment and appurtenances.

If available funds are sufficient from the proceeds of bonds authorized for the above purposes, and state or

local circumstances require, the District shall use such funds to pay the principal of or interest on the bonds or acquire, construct, equip and make other capital improvements to the facilities of the District, all as the Board of Directors may determine, after holding a public hearing thereon pursuant to RCW 28A.530.020.

The District shall determine the application of available moneys as between the various projects set forth above so as to accomplish, as nearly as may be, all improvements described or provided for in this section. The District shall determine the exact extent and specifications for construction of structures or other improvements.

If the Board shall determine that it has become impractical to accomplish any of such improvements or portions thereof by reason of state or local circumstances, including changed conditions, incompatible development or costs substantially in excess of those estimated, the District shall not be required to accomplish such improvements and may apply the bond proceeds or any portion thereof to other portions of the improvements, to other capital improvements, or to payment of principal of or interest on the bonds, as the Board may determine after holding a public hearing thereon pursuant to RCW 28A.530.020.

In the event that the proceeds of sale of the bonds, plus any other moneys of the District legally available, are insufficient to accomplish all of the capital improvements provided by this section, the District shall use the available funds for paying the cost of those improvements for which the bonds were approved deemed by the Board most necessary and in the best interest of the District.

It is anticipated that the District will receive funds from the State of Washington pursuant to RCW 28A.530.020 in the estimated amount of \$6,000,000. The District intends to apply such funds to the purposes described in this section. Such funds may also be applied to pay the principal of or interest on the bonds provided for herein or to make other capital improvements to the facilities of the District as the Board may determine after holding a public hearing thereon pursuant to RCW 28A.530.020.

Section 3. Authorization of Bonds. For the purpose of providing part of the funds necessary to pay the cost of the improvements described in Section 2 hereof, together with incidental costs and costs related to the sale and issuance of the bonds, the District shall issue and sell its unlimited tax levy general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not to exceed \$16,500,000. The balance of the cost of such improvements shall be paid out of any moneys which the District now has or may later have on hand which are legally available for such purposes and out of possible state or federal grants of money. None of said bond proceeds shall be used for the replacement of equipment or for any other than a capital purpose. Such bonds shall be issued in an amount not exceeding the amount approved by the qualified electors of the District as required by the Constitution and laws of the State of Washington or exceeding the amount permitted by the Constitution and laws of the State of Washington.

Section 4. Details of Bonds. The bonds provided for in Section 3 hereof shall be sold in such amounts and at such time or times as deemed necessary and advisable by this Board and as permitted by law, shall

bear interest at a rate or rates not to exceed the maximum rate permitted by law at the time the bonds are sold, and shall mature in such amounts and at such times within a maximum term of twenty (20) years from date of issue, but may mature at an earlier date or dates, as authorized by this Board and as provided by law. Said bonds shall be general obligations of the District and, unless paid from other sources, both principal thereof and interest thereon shall be payable out of annual tax levies to be made upon all the taxable property within the District without limitation as to rate or amount and in excess of any constitutional or statutory tax limitations. The exact date, form, terms and maturities of said bonds shall be as hereafter fixed by resolution of the Board of Directors. After voter approval of the bond proposition and in anticipation of the issuance of such bonds, the District may issue short term obligations as authorized and provided by Chapter 39.50 RCW.

ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of La Center School District No. 101, Clark County, Washington, at a regular meeting held August 24, 1999.

**GREATER BATTLE GROUND LIBRARY
CAPITAL FACILITY AREA
JOINT REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF
GREATER BATTLE GROUND LIBRARY
CAPITAL FACILITY AREA**

**Joint Request of the City of Battle Ground, the
Town of Yacolt and Fort Vancouver Regional
Library District**

WHEREAS, library service to the residents of the City of Battle Ground (the "City") the Town of Yacolt (the "Town") and the residents of the areas of unincorporated Clark County surrounding the City and the Town is provided through a facility (the "Battle Ground Community Library") owned and operated by the Fort Vancouver Regional Library District (the "Library District"); and

WHEREAS, the City, the Town, and the other areas served by the existing Battle Ground Community Library have experienced significant growth in the number of residents; and

WHEREAS, the growing population has resulted in increased usage of the Battle Ground Community Library; and

WHEREAS, the Battle Ground Community Library cannot accommodate the larger collection needs of the growing population and cannot accommodate the highly-automated information services required by technological advancements; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City, the Town Council of the Town and the Board of Trustees of the Library District have determined that a new library facility is essential to the public welfare and the residents of the City, the Town and Clark County residents in the areas surrounding the City and the Town; and

WHEREAS, chapter 27.15 RCW permits, upon the request of the City, the Town and the Library District and the approval of the voters, the creation of a library capital facility area to construct and finance library capital facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Library District expects to enter into an appropriate interlocal agreement with the governing board of the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area that would assign responsibility to the Library District for designing and administering the

remodel and expansion of the building at 606 NE 1st Street, Battle Ground, Washington, for use as a new library and would also assign the Library District responsibility for equipping and stocking the facility with books and other library materials; and

WHEREAS, the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area would be responsible for financing for the remodeling and expanding the building at 606 NE 1st Street, Battle Ground, Washington for use as a new library and for equipping and stocking the facility with books and other library materials; and

WHEREAS, the Library District will be responsible for operating and maintaining the library capital facility financed by the approved ballot proposition; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City of Battle Ground, the Town of Yacolt and the Fort Vancouver Regional Library District request as follows:

1. Joint Request. The City, the Town and the Library District jointly request that the Clark County Board of Commissioners, pursuant to chapter 27.15 RCW, provide for establishing a library capital facility area to be known as the "Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area" and submit to the voters of the said area two ballot propositions at the next general election, which shall read substantially as follows:

Proposition 1: Shall the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area be established?

Proposition 2: Shall the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area, Clark County, Washington, incur indebtedness and issue not more than \$4.3 million of general obligation bonds maturing within 15 years and levy annual excess property taxes necessary to pay and retire such bonds to remodel and expand the building at 606 NE 1st Street, Battle Ground, Washington, a new library facility, and equip and stock with books and other library materials this facility?

2. Boundaries of the Greater Battle Ground Library Capital Facility Area. The following described, as the district boundaries exist as of the date of this document: Being the Battle Ground School District (#119) and the Hockinson School District (#98), excluding those portions lying within Fire Districts 5 and 6: Also, that portion of the Ridgefield School District (#122) lying within Fire District 11. APPROVED this 2nd day of August, 1999.

**WOODLAND SWIMMING POOL AND
RECREATION DISTRICT**

We, the Woodland Swimming and Recreational District, hereby resolve and authorize that an advisory vote be commenced and conducted for the purpose of determining whether a pool and recreation center should be constructed in and adjacent to Horseshoe Lake Park pursuant to the proposal made by the Woodland Community Swimming Pool Committee. Dated: September 3, 1999
WOODLAND SWIMMING AND RECREATIONAL DISTRICT