SULTAN CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: Consent C 1B

DATE: September 9, 2010

SUBJECT: Council Meeting Minutes

CONTACT PERSON: Laura Koenig, Clerk/Deputy Finance Director

SUMMARY:
Attached are the minutes of the August 24, 2010 Special Council Meeting as on file in the office of the City Clerk.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve as submitted

CITY OF SULTAN SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – August 24, 2010

The special meeting of the Sultan City Council was called to order in the Sultan Community Center by Mayor Eslick. Councilmembers present: Pinson, Slawson, Davenport-Smith, Neigel, Blair and Beeler. Absent: Wiediger

CONSENT AGENDA:
The following items are incorporated into the consent and approved by a single motion of the Council. On a motion by Councilmember Slawson, seconded by Councilmember Davenport-Smith, the consent agenda was approved as presented. Pinson – aye; Slawson – aye; Wiediger – aye; Davenport-Smith – aye; Blair – aye; Beeler - aye.

1. Approval of the City Council recommended changes to the goals and policies in the environmental element of the 2008 revisions to the 2004 comprehensive plan.

ACTION ITEMS:
Recommended changes to the goals and polices in the Economic Development Element.
Under Vision 2040, the staff recommended Economic Development Element goals and policies are divided into three topic headings consistent with Vision 2040:

1. Business
2. Places
3. People

During the public input process in 2009 and 2010 to update the comprehensive plan, residents and business owners were clear that Sultan should promote economic development by partnering with the business community to remove barriers to free market forces and invest in maintaining the city's infrastructure. Through land use planning, construction permitting, and building infrastructure, Sultan can create the framework for private investment and continued economic growth. Among other things, the Economic Development goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan establish an economic vision for the community and express support for the core goal of the local and State planning principles.
In Sultan those goals are to:

- Increase employment to reduce commutes.
- Provide a sound tax base.
- Encourage small business.
- Revitalize existing properties.
- Capture existing sales tax.
- Reduce commute to retail centers.
- Market retail & industrial land opportunities.

Sultan's goal is to promote job growth somewhat in proportion to the demographic of local workers to reduce the home-to-work commute.

Discussion: Small business development and the role of the city in promoting business; real estate system involvement – appropriatness of city promotion; education and training participation – lack of capacity, expertice or resources; issues of equity and the role of the city. The consensus of the Council was additional clarification was required on the numbering and the "people" section. Councilmember Pinson moved to approve the City Council's recommended changes to the goals and policies of the economic development element of the Comp Plan; seconded by Councilmember Davenport-Smith. All nays – motion failed.

CITY OF SULTAN SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – August 24, 2010

DISCUSSION

Shoreline Element.

The issue before the city council is to review the planning board's recommendation to replace the goals and policies from the 2008 comprehensive plan with the goals and policies from the 2008 SMP. The comprehensive plan would reference the shoreline policies to ensure consistency between the two documents.

The City of Sultan Shoreline Master Program consists of goals, policies, recommendations, and implementation plans to guide the development of the city's shorelines in support of the city's land use element and vision for the future.

The Shoreline Master Program is a separate program from the comprehensive plan but the SMP must be consistent with the comprehensive plan. The city's shoreline management policies are included in Chapter 2.6 of the 2008 revisions to the 2004 comprehensive plan.

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) did not include any multi-county planning policies that specifically address shorelines. The city should ensure its shoreline goals and policies are consistent with the PSRC multi-county planning policies (MPP). The small group reviewed the shoreline policy questions on February 3, 2010. The general consensus was to meet the minimum requirements of the state shoreline management act. There was discussion about using the city's extensive shoreline resources as a way to attract tourism and improvement economic development.

The City Council consensus was to accept the Planning Board recommendation.

Utilities Element.

The issue before the city council is to review the planning board's proposed changes to the utilities element and provide direction to staff.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) differentiates between urban and rural public services and facilities (36.70A.110). Certain public services and facilities, such as sanitary sewers, are allowed only in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), with very few exceptions. The GMA requires local jurisdictions to determine which facilities and services are necessary to serve the desired growth pattern and how they will be financed (36.70A.070). The state's intent is to ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate and provided in a timely manner without decreasing the current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

Between 2005 and 2007 the City of Sultan was petitioned 9 times in front of the Growth Management Hearings Board. The board found the city was out of compliance with the Growth Management Act 8 of the 9 times. The end result was excessive amounts of time and money were spent in 2008 working to address the issues identified by the Growth Management Hearings Board and bringing the city into compliance.

The majority of the petitions filed with the GMHB were focused on the transportation element and capital facilities element. Specifically the GMHB found the city did not due its due diligence in planning to provide water and sewer services to current and future residents and businesses.

On September 6, 2008 the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board issued its final decision and order in Fallgatter IX on the Capital Facilities Plan. In regards to sewer, the Board found:

- The 2004 Capital Facilities Plan did not demonstrate adequate sewer facilities will be available within the planning period to serve the unsewered population.
- The 2004 Capital Facilities Plan failed to provide an adequate needs assessment (i.e. current needs, future needs, and expected levels of service) for water, sewer and stormwater facilities.

- The 2004 Capital Facilities Plan did not incorporate local adopted levels of service.
- Identified funding was lacking in the 2004 Plan to serve the adopted level of service. The City cannot rely on future development to provide for major infrastructure such as sewer.

The city council and planning board spent considerable time in 2008 revising the 2004 Comprehensive Plan and Capital Facilities Plan to ensure compliance with the Growth Management Hearings Board's final decision and order in Fallgatter IX.
In order to address the GMHB concerns the council adopted the following policies in the 2008 Comprehensive Plan Update:
Water

- Water service provided within the Urban Growth Area (UGA), plus the current water residents already connected that are outside the UGA.
- Management of private wells inside the city once water service is available to the resident, but not to force connection or decertification.
- Fire flow standard set at minimum requirement of 1,000GPM for residential and 1,500 GPM for non-residential properties.
- Water supply from Everett as supplemental to Lake 16.

Sewer

- To require connection to sewer when new lines are laid and related financing when lines are extended.
- Do not require connection on existing lines unless septic tanks fail or the property is redeveloped.
- Alternative sewer collections systems were allowed, but do not prefer grinder pumps.

Stormwater

- Create an effective stormwater management plan that will control runoff quality, volumes, and directions.
- Collection: utilize natural drainage corridors and open channel wherever practical…maintain the channels in a "natural state to blend with the natural surroundings…."
- Retention: Require land developments to hold or retain storm runoff.
- Runoff Quality: Monitor and establish performance standards governing the use of fertilizers, chemicals, loss of soil, erosion during construction, and wastes.
- Costs: Equitably distribute costs to the private properties that contribute runoff.

Discussion: Septic system in developments; sewer system standards; fire protection; backflow devices; conservation and public education; sensitivity of stromwater policies.
The detailed changes to the goals and policies will be provided in the next staff report.

Adjournment: On a motion by Councilmember Slawson, seconded by Councilmember Davenport-Smith, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 PM. All ayes.

_____
Carolyn Eslick, Mayor

_____
Laura J. Koenig, City Clerk