

**SULTAN CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

ITEM NO: Consent C 1 C

DATE: July 8, 2010

SUBJECT: Council Meeting Minutes

CONTACT PERSON: Laura Koenig, Clerk/Deputy Finance Director

SUMMARY:

Attached are the minutes of the June 29, 2010 Special Council Meeting as on file in the office of the City Clerk.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve as submitted

CITY OF JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING BOARD MEETING – June 29, 2010

The regular meeting of the Sultan City Council was called to order in the Sultan Community Center by Mayor Pro-tem Slawson. Councilmembers present: Pinson, Slawson, Davenport-Smith, Blair and Beeler. Mayor Eslick arrived late. Absent: Wiediger.
 Planning Board Present: Linth; Knox, Harris and Knuckey.

COMMENTS

Blair: Blaine has the highest transportation impact fees in the state.

Davenport-Smith: Water rights issue was discussed at the AWC conference and Department of Ecology's non action in some case is a concern.

Linth: The open house on the park element this afternoon was well attended.

DISCUSSION

Population and Growth Projection Analysis

The issue before the city council and planning board is to discuss the population forecast alternatives for 2030 and 2040 and select a preferred alternative for developing the water system plan and general sewer plan.

In 2005 as a part of the comprehensive plan 10-year update, the city adopted a population project of 11,119 for the year 2025. Because the 7-year update to the comprehensive plan is to ensure compliance with the growth management act and regional goals and policies, it would be difficult to change the population projection of 11,119 for the year 2025.

The city will have the opportunity, consistent with the Puget Sound Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) to amend its population projection during the 10-year update. The 10-year update will begin in 2012 and be completed in 2015. During the 10-year update the city will work with Snohomish County and other small cities in the region to allocate the 37,000 people the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) estimates will move to small cities in Snohomish County between 2000 and 2040.

The issue for the city council and planning board is to review the range of population forecasts prepared by ECONorthwest in the *City of Sultan Population Forecast* report and select a population projection for 2030 so work can proceed on developing the water system plan and general sewer plan.

This section presents the population forecast for Sultan's UGA. ECONorthwest developed high, medium, and low growth rates for Sultan to show a range of population growth scenarios. Each of the three forecast alternatives would meet the allocations of population to small cities described in Tables 6 and 7.

The **Low** population forecast projects that Sultan's UGA will grow to 12,398 people by 2030, an increase of 1,279 people between 2025 and 2030. The growth rate used in the low forecast (2.2% average annual growth) is based on the County's historical growth rate over the 1990 to 2009 period.

The **Medium** population forecast projects that Sultan's UGA will grow to 13,409 people by 2030, an increase of 2,290 people between 2025 and 2030. The growth rate used in the medium forecast (3.8% average annual growth) is based on the Sultan's historical growth rate over the 1990 to 2009.

The **High** population forecast projects that Sultan's UGA will grow to 13,881 people by 2030, an increase of 2,762 people between 2025 and 2030. The growth rate used in the

CITY OF JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING BOARD MEETING – June 29, 2010

high forecast (4.5% average annual growth) is based on Snohomish County's forecast growth rate for Sultan over the 2006 to 2025 period.

Discussion: Impacts of other outside factors on the proposed growth rates – gas rates, housing. The population allocation is based on providing enough density to accommodate the growth. Cost of infrastructure will be based on where the population is located – the further the expansion is from the plant, the more costly it will become. The population figures will be applied to the water and sewer plans for consistency between the plans and to provide guidelines for the capital project needs. The city will need to expand the infrastructure to accommodate growth and the costs will be incurred by the current residents if growth does not occur.

The County will assign the population numbers to the city and the city will have to prepare adequate documentation to protest the allocated number that is unrealistic for the city.

The city must decide what level of population they want to plan for in the 2030 time period. The city must plan infrastructure improvements and impact fees to accommodate the population. The historic growth rate for Sultan is 3.8%. The city has a seven year historically growth pattern – based on the history, there will be two building peaks over the next fifteen years.

Need to be realistic in the assumption; the current allocation of 11,119 is not realistic. Changing zoning to allow mixed use could provide for the allocated population.

Consensus of the Council and Planning Board was to use the 3.8% as the most realistic number.

Park Classification and Levels of Service

The city is in the process of updating its park and recreation open space plan (PROS Plan). During the April 27, 2010 joint meeting, the city council and planning board directed staff to evaluate the following policies questions:

1. Changing the classification for Reese Park and River Park from neighborhood parks to community parks.
2. Amending the current park level of service from one community park to three neighborhood parks.
3. Evaluating the park impact fee to ensure adequate revenues to fund the adopted level of service

During discussions about the city's park system with the small work group on March 9, 2010, several members of the group questioned the classification of city parks especially the decision to include Reese Park, Cemetery Park, River Park and the Water Treatment Plant as "neighborhood" parks.

The city has three alternatives:

- 1) Keep the current classifications and do not change the level of service standards;
- 2) Amend the classifications to be consistent with the National Park and Recreation Association standards and change the level of service standard to maintain the current impact fee;
- 3) Change the classification and maintain the level of service to increase the current impact fee.

This discussion prompted city staff to review the definitions of park classifications provided by the National Recreation and Parks Association. Following the joint meeting on April 27, 2010, the city council and planning board directed staff to work with the consulting firm (PMC) to

CITY OF JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING BOARD MEETING – June 29, 2010

evaluate the following changes to the parks classification and impacts to levels of service and park impact fees.

According to the analysis by PMC, the city can choose to change the park classifications to fit the standard definitions provided by the National Park and Recreation Association and keep the current LOS (neighborhood park 1.5 acres/1,000 and community park at 2 acres/1000). This means the city would exceed the community park LOS in 2025 by 24.97 acres but have a 16.68 deficit in neighborhood parks. There is no required level of service for parks, it is choice by the city.

Under this scenario, the city could build 16.68 acres of neighborhood parks for approximately \$7,506,000. The city could keep the impact fee at today's rate of \$3,175 per single-family dwelling unit since the focus would shift from one community park to three neighborhood parks. To be consistent with other agencies, staff would recommend changing the classifications to be consistent with the National Park and Recreation definitions of parks.

Discussion: Amount of the Impact fee for parks and the need to plan for future park land. Need for consistency in definitions for dealing with other agencies.

The consensus of the Council and Planning Board was to amend the classifications to be consistent with the National Park and Recreation Association standards and change the level of service standard to maintain the current impact fee.

Comprehensive Plan Goals, Policies and Programs

The issue before the city council and planning board is how to reorganize the goals, policies and programs in the comprehensive plan elements.

The city council and planning board have been reviewing and recommending revisions to the goals and policies in the 2008 revision to the 2004 comprehensive plan (2008 Revision) since February. The 2008 revised comprehensive plan is more "reader-friendly" than the 2004 plan. The city council would like the 2011 comprehensive plan update (2011 Update) to move one step further and help readers understand how goals, policies and programs work together.

Alternative formats for the 2011 Update for the city council and planning board have been presented for consideration. City staff and the consultants from Studio Cascade are seeking feedback from the city council and planning board.

Once the city council selects a preferred format, City staff and the consultant team will begin to reformat the goals and policies for the elements as they are finalized by the city council and planning board. The consensus was to use a combination of the samples presented.

Planning Board Community Outreach Program

The issue is to provide direction to the planning board on its outreach efforts to the Sultan community on the comprehensive plan elements. The program was very successful in gathering community input on the park and recreation open space plan. The Planning Board is interested in continuing to provide public outreach and education to the community.

Discussion: Council needs to set the agenda for the Planning Board; what are the other issues that need to be addressed; need to take the information back to the groups again to show them the action taken; post information on the web site; the selection process for which groups the information is presented to; expanding outside the city limits provides input from other users of the park and recreation facilities.

The consensus was to continue to with the outreach program under the direction of the Council.

CITY OF JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING BOARD MEETING – June 29, 2010

Adjournment: On a motion by Councilmember Slawson, seconded by Councilmember Blair, the meeting adjourned at 9:05 PM. All ayes.

Carolyn Eslick, Mayor

Laura J. Koenig, City Clerk