SULTAN CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO:	Consent C 1
DATE:	March 8, 2007
SUBJECT:	February 22, 2007 Public Hearing Minutes
CONTACT PERSON:	Laura Koenig, City Clerk
SUMMARY:	Attached are the minutes of the February 22, 2007 Public Hearing on the Public Participation Process as on file in the offfice of the City Clerk.
FISCAL IMPACT:	None
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	Approve as submitted.
MOTION:	Move to accept the Consent Agenda as presented.

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

CITY OF SULTAN COUNCIL MEETING – February 22, 2007

PUBLIC HEARING – Public Participation Process
The public hearing on the Public Participation Process was opened Mayor Tolson. Councilmembers present: Champeaux, Wiediger, Slawson, Seehuus, Flower, and Blair.
There were no objections to the Council participation and no noted conflicts.

Staff:
Rick Cisar, Community Development Director. Presented the following exhibits and report:

1. Affidavit of publication
2. Staff report dated February 22, 2007

The Planning Board, on December 5, 2006 recommended revisions to the City's current Public Participation and Notice Procedures for Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Plan Elements, and Development Regulations.
Amendments to the Notice Procedures, included the posting of meetings on monthly utility bills and providing copies of information on Amendments, Projects, and related Meetings and Hearings in the Sultan Branch of the Sno-Isle Regional Library.
This information will be provided in a " Public Information Binder" in the Sno-Isle Regional Library and will include for example a draft of the proposed Amendments and Regulations, Environmental Determinations, Public Notices, and comments received from Reviewing Agencies. The Binder will be updated as the project progresses through the required Reviews, Meetings, and Hearings.
An identical binder will also be available at the front counter in City Hall. The additional binder in the Library will allow public access to the information when City Hall is closed, which was a concern of the citizens.
The revised policy and program was scheduled for City Council Action on December 14, 2006. However, the City Council referred the proposed procedures back to the Planning Board in order to complete a Public Hearing before the Planning Board and thereafter an additional Hearing before the City Council. The City Council wanted assurances that the public had sufficent opportunities to review and comment on the proposed procedures.
The amended procedures as written, encompass Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Public Participation, and Notice Procedures Plan Elements and Development Regulations. Utilizing the same procedures for the two amendment processes will afford the same opportunities for the public to participate in the review process and hopefully eliminate any confusion as to what the procedure is for the appropiate intended action.
In order to ensure consistency with the two procedures, amendments to SMC 16.134 Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedures, and SMC 16.128 Amendments to the Development Code will be required.
In comparison, the only difference between the procedures for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and a Development Regulation Amendment, is the time lines associated with their review. In general, a Comprehensive Plan Element Amendment, under both the current and proposed procedures, will involve approximately one (1) year to review. A Development Regulation Amendment which typically involves approximately 120-days, will not change under the existing or proposed procedure.
In summary, the proposed procedures are designed to provide numerous opportunities for our citizens to participate in the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Development Regulation Amendment process.

Mayor Tolson requested additional language to define "when available".

Public Input:
Josie Fallgatter: Appreciates the attentiveness given to the public participation process. A lot of the process is busy work, however, the quality of information provided to the public is just as important as how many times you tell them. They need to let the public know what the council is doing and they need to establish a program that tells the public how and when things will happen.
There are docketed items and the public does not know when they will be on an agenda. The Planning Board did not recommend two ordinances. At one time the Council requested a report from the Planning Board on their actions. The Planning Board makes recommendations and they are changed by staff before they come to the council. The main thing is what you tell the public.

PUBLIC HEARING – Public Participation Process

Loretta Storm: The City needs to communicate effectively with the citizens on major issues such as planning activities and growth on the Plateau. The quality of the notices are important. The Utility bills only tell when the meeting is, not the agenda for the meeting. For important meetings the city should send out flyers. The City has put an effort into making sure that positive issues are being publicized and they should put the same effort into notifying people of the issues.

Council
Councilmember Flower noted that the Council used to receive a descending opinion from the Planning Board and he would like to see that again.

Councilmember Wiediger asked what recommendation was changed from the Planning Board.

Councilmember Blair noted that the utility bills provide limited information and the city is looking at a newsletter. She had heard that the Planning Commission information was filtered and she appreciates the direct reports from the Planning Board. Noted that there were references to the Planning Commission that should be changed to the Planning Board in the Comprehensive Plan amendment procedures. The LOS in the Comprehensive Plan is based on a flawed premise that adding rooftops adds revenues and the general public needs to know that the calculation is wrong.

Councilmember Champeaux noted that the utility billing information as been a good source of information for the general public and is not as costly as other methods. Asked Ms. Fallgatter how she would provide information to the public on the level of service issue.
Ms. Fallgatter advised that the public needs to know the impact of lowering the level of service and that it is being lowered to allow more development.

Councilmember Seehuus noted that both sides of an issue need to be presented and that the conclusions and impacts drawn are based on who is making the determination.

Staff Response:
Deborah Knight, City Administrator, advised that the discussion at the Planning Board was to draft a resolution for the adoption of the process and that after discussing the matter with the City Attorney, it was determined that an ordinance would be more appropriate. The substance of the document has not changed, just the format of adoption.

On a motion by Councilmember Seehuus, seconded by Councilmember Flower, the Public Hearing was closed. All ayes, except Councilmember Champeaux who voted nay.

_____
Benjamin Tolson, Mayor

_____
Laura J. Koenig, Clerk City