

Date: Time:

Judge:

Calendar:



■ No Hearing Set

☐ Hearing is set

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

3

FILED SUPERIOR COURT THURSTON COUNTY, WA

2024 HAY 24 AM 9: 28

Linda Myhre Enlow Thurston County Clerk

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF THURSTON

SAVE THE DAVIS-MEEKER GARRY OAK.

Plaintiff,

VS.

DEBBIE SULLIVAN, in her capacity of Mayor of Tumwater

Defendant.

Case No. 24-2-01895-34

DECLARATION OF RONDA LARSON KRAMER IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

## I, RONDA LARSON KRAMER, make the following declaration:

- I am the attorney of record for Save the Davis-Meeker Garry Oak (SDMGO). I
  have knowledge of the facts stated herein and am competent to testify.
- 2. On May 21, 2024, I attended the city council meeting of the City of Tumwater. At that meeting, the city's attorney, Karen Kirkpatrick, explained to the council what legal authority the mayor was relying on to remove the tree (a registered historical landmark), without a permit. Under Tumwater Municipal Code § 2.62.060, there is a requirement to get a permit to demolish a historic structure. Ms. Kirkpatrick claimed, incorrectly, that the mayor does not need a permit to demolish a historic structure if it falls within an exception. The exception the city is relying on is in subsection (B)(3) of that same code.

DECLARATION OF RONDA LARSON KRAMER - 1

P.O. BOX 7337 OLYMPIA WA 98507-7337 360-768-0775

3. Subsection (B)(3) of TMC § 2.62.060 cross-references a definition in TMC § 2.62.030(K), which defines "emergency repair" as "work necessary to prevent destruction or dilapidation to real property or structural appurtenances thereto immediately threatened or damaged by fire, flood, earthquake or other disaster." The code plainly requires a permit to demolish a historic structure. There is no exception to the permit requirement in the case of demolishing a historic structure, even in an emergency. The emergency exception allows solely "repair" work necessary to prevent destruction to real property. Thus, no permit would be needed to prune the oak tree to prevent it from causing damage to the building. But a permit would be needed to remove the oak tree.

4. However, starting at 1:11:29 in the recording here, <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RbAQ0ctEii8&list=PLE\_nN-qDbnQqYIEbBFpMH9GFJyyM3CfSw">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RbAQ0ctEii8&list=PLE\_nN-qDbnQqYIEbBFpMH9GFJyyM3CfSw</a>, the city attorney claimed that the code did the opposite: it allowed destruction of this historic structure without a permit. In this way, she flipped on its head municipal code meant to preserve historic legacies of our community and used it to justify destroying a 400-year-old legacy without a permit. She also seemed to claim that this reading of the code was permissible because the code "was not written for trees."

- 5. At the city council meeting, the public outcry was profound. Every person who gave comments was against the mayor's plan. Arborists also testified that the city's arborist report was greatly flawed.
- 6. The city was required to notify the tribes before cutting the tree. I have been informed by people who have been in touch with the tribes that the tribes were not notified. The tribes have told my contact that they want to have time to review this before providing their response to the city.