February 13, 2018
Official Special Election Ballot
King County, Washington

**Ballot Synopsis of Recall Charges Against Councilmember Patricia Pepper, City of Black Diamond**
Shall Councilmember Patricia Pepper be recalled from office for misfeasance, malfeasance, and violation of the oath of office, based on the following charges:

1. Pepper, as part of a council majority, violated the Washington State Open Public Meetings Act, chapter 42.30 RCW, by convening and conducting closed meetings without public notice and by entering into private agreements to prepare and approve legislation.
2. Pepper, as part of a council majority, refused to attend council meetings and failed to approve minutes.
3. Pepper, as part of a council majority, failed to enact a 2017 budget in violation of state law and instead enacted a temporary budget containing illegal provisions, impairing the city’s ability to provide essential services.

**City of Black Diamond Councilmember Patricia Pepper Response to the Recall Charges**
What does your vote mean? Yes means the Council and Mayor will choose your representative. No means I will complete my term and continue to:
- Vote for conservative budgets with strict controls on contracting while fully funding the city’s police and water departments.
- Vote for independent, professional reviews of the massive development without existing biases that risk traffic jams, environmental damage, and higher taxes.
- Vote for Council and Committee meetings held during the evening with full public notice and participation, conducted in proper order with accurate minutes.
- Require truth and accuracy from the Mayor and staff on all legislative items.

The Supreme Court does not determine whether recall accusations are truthful or accurate, despite misleading claims by recall promoters. Read the facts and legal issues here: www.PatPepper.com.

The Realtor’s Lobby, Developer Interests, and those who lost the Council election in 2015 have poured thousands of dollars into this recall petition campaign so they have a compliant Mayor and rubber stamp Council. However, we need an independent Council that defends our rural town.

The recall charges not dismissed by the State Supreme Court are technical concerns relating to timing of adoption of budgets, approval of minutes etc. The Court did NOT find material harm to City operations.

I have never violated my oath of office and have always placed your interests first. From the start, I have stood up for YOU. If you want me to continue to do that, please vote No on the recall. Thank you.

☐ Recall Yes
☐ Recall No

Continued on other side
### Tahoma School District No. 409

#### Proposition No. 1
**Replacement of Existing Educational Programs and Operations Levy**

The Board of Directors adopted Resolution No. 2017-25 concerning educational funding. This proposition authorizes the District to levy the following excess taxes, to replace an expiring levy, on all taxable property within the District, to support the District’s educational programs and operations not funded by the state:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Year</th>
<th>Estimated Levy Rate/$1,000</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$10,710,073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$11,823,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$13,051,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$14,408,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all as provided in the Resolution. Should this proposition be approved?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

#### Proposition No. 2
**Replacement ofExisting Capital Projects Levies**

The Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 2017-26 for educational facilities and technology levies. This proposition authorizes the improvement and upgrade of District facilities; including educational technology, software and training; building and site improvements; and authorizes the following excess levies for such purposes on all taxable property within the District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Year</th>
<th>Estimated Levy Rate/$1,000</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$0.29</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all as provided in Resolution No. 2017-27. Should this proposition be approved?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

#### Proposition No. 3
**School Bus Levy**

The Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 2017-27 authorizing a levy for school buses. This levy funds new and replacement school buses and authorizes the following excess levy on all taxable property within the District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Year</th>
<th>Estimated Levy Rate/$1,000</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all as provided in Resolution No. 2017-27. Should this proposition be approved?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

End of Ballot