

SULTAN PLANNING BOARD MEETING

319 MAIN STREET

April 15, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Chairperson Latimore.

Planning Board members Present: Kurt Latimore, Jeff Cofer, Charles Van Pelt, and, George Schmidt.

Council members Present: Jim Flower, Steve Slawson, Kristina Blair,

Staff Present: City Administrator Deborah Knight, and Planning Board Secretary Tami Pevey.

Consultants Present: Interim Planner Brad Collins; Perteet Engineering; Land Use Attorney Andy Lane; Reid Shockey, Shockey Brent; John Wilson; Financial Consultant Pat Dugan; Storm water Consultant Dean Franz.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jerry Gibson, 1102 Dyer Road – Has mentioned a survey done by Monroe in the past and submitted it to the board. Has requested the results of the survey from Monroe and will provide them to the board when they become available. Thinks it is a good idea to hear what your neighbor is saying before making a recommendation.

ACTION ITEMS

Scott Zaffram excused absence

PB Latimore excused PB Zaffram's absence administratively as has been done in the past with other absences.

Approval of the April 1, 2008 Minutes

PB Schmidt recommending amending the minutes to show PB Van Pelt was absent and PB Schmidt was present. On a motion by PB Schmidt, seconded by PB Latimore the minutes were approved as amended; all in agreement.

Recess at 6:40 p.m. to allow council members to arrive for joint meeting scheduled at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting resumed at 6:56 p.m.

CM Blair suggested moving Discussion Item #4 to the front as it may affect Discussion #3; all in agreement.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Keith Arndt, 33311 132nd St SE – He reviewed the comp plan amendments focusing on the goals and objectives; reviewing them for clean up, reorganization, cross referencing, and simple weeding out. His recommendations are as follows:

- 6.1 Versus 6.11: compare industrial to natural environment.
- 8.11.4 – regarding storm water monitoring; suggest eliminating the word “monitor” due to the expense.
- 4.1 – affordable housing is a 30% concrete number and 70% economy fluctuations. Questioning why it is a hard number and suggest inserting language to account for fluctuation.
- 6.9 – assets valuable to community and shows no mechanism to effect policy.
- Section 7 Parks
- 7.1 – 7.3 Natural settings & 7.4 Athletic: Does it reflect the community prioritized goals? Is it efficient use of resources? Suitable to use borders, roads okay but needs to be changed to include both sides of road as well as service areas.
- 2.3.3, 2.5.1, & 2.5.7 – North end of city limits UGA line, East side of Rice Road important. Prioritize development areas. Where are lists and maps? How can I be involved in the process? It needs clearer definition.
- 2.1, 8.2, 8.3.3 – extension of service to UGA and non serviced property in limits not discussed.
- 8.2 to 8.2.7 – nothing in between, questioned why it was skipped?

Need a concentric circle development language, ambiguous, no goal stated, conflicting. Suggest clearing it up or striking it out. Leave no room for interpretation as it is clear and leaves no room for litigation. Stated his phone number is available for questions.

PB Latimore added mention of earlier comments made by Mr. Gibson during the first public comment period at 6:30 p.m.

Jerry Gibson, 1102 Dyer Road – Stated resolution is not allowing public testimony in open record hearing and is opposed to that; worried about potential litigation regarding this issue. Please reassess this policy. Passed out letter from MBA and stated consider other considerations as it is not the bible.

JOINT PLANNING BOARD/CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP DISCUSSION

Policy direction on Needs Assessment for Water, Sewer, and Storm water.

Administrator Knight stated tonight the goals are to demonstrate adequate sewer facilities; provide an adequate need assessment for water, sewer, and storm water facilities; adopt levels of service; and identify funding. She summarized the policy directions were written as staff had heard from board members. Water was the first focus of conversation.

CM Blair stated it directly conflicts with Discussion Item 3 as the framework is not to force people to connect, but goals and policies make it mandatory. CB Flower stated he is not in favor of denying residents the use of a well. Administrator Knight explained staff discussed backflow to comply with health requirements and contamination risks. PB Van Pelt suggested asking a resident with a well to disconnect. Administrator Knight clarified the water crew stated two separate systems are okay.

Reviewed water goals and all in agreement with goals 1 & 2, but wanted to ensure consistency. Goal 3 okay and 1500 for non resident needs to state it is the minimum. Water supply from Lake 16 discussed and was clarified that it was sufficient to serve 13,000 so is okay for 2025 prediction of 11,119. Some discussion held on receiving water from Everett. Goal 5 was suggested extending water and sewer with roads and more extensive roadway is more expensive infrastructure for water and sewer. CM Blair addressed Mr. Arndt's comments on boundaries. CM Flower stated we need to address infill capacity, then closeness to pipe. CM Champeaux stated broader policy review at

2011 update. Questions to answer are if you are not connected, do you hold the water slot? If they are not paying for a service, how do you justify holding a spot?

In reviewing sewer goals board in agreement that they do not want to force connections and that an assessment be paid to the city when a new sewer line is installed. CM Blair clarified there is no differentiation if the city or a developer extends a sewer line.

Consultant Wilson asked do you assess value to the property or is there a fee for the pipe? Consultant Dugan stated the property increases as value, not because of the cost of the pipe. No discussion on how to extend, latecomer as a way to recoup costs.

Citizen York questioned does that mean you ban all septic, such as a lot on Dyer Road. CM Blair stated policy is on the table, not to allow new septic. There is a difference between perceived and real value when sewer is available. Consultant Collins stated there is a capital cost to build a pipe as well as operating cost to the plant. A latecomer is not assessed until they connect and U-LID is paid right off the bat. Citizen Gibson is a homeowner on Dyer and his property value decreases until he hook-ups, however it is a huge bill to get the service from the house to the street and the value doesn't increase until you hookup. Administrator Knight stated there is an expense to maintain and homes not connected don't pay. Current ratepayers are required to cover the difference in the meantime. After continued discussion it was agreed that sewer policy #1 was placed on hold. Discussion continued and sewer goals 2 thru 6 were okay as is.

Consultant Pat Dugan provided a PowerPoint Presentation as provided in Agenda Item D-1, page B-1. He discussed unconnected sewer issues and provided the financial implications as well as how sewer capital might be generated. Discussion held on a standby charge for those homes not connected to sewer that could be. CM Flower challenged the standby logic. PB Cofer stated they are providing a capacity for sewer and there is a capital investment involved if they are hooked up or not. He felt it is only reasonable to assess a standby charge. CM Blair pointed out the GMA board has made it clear the city is required to show we will serve those people. As it exists we must comply. Discussion continued on LID and the percentage to pass UGA versus county requirements for septic versus sewer. Heavy debate continued on assessing a standby charge.

Consultant Dean Franz presented a Power Point Presentation on Surface Water Management as presented in Discussion Item #4, page C 1. His recommendations were as follows:

- Conveyance Design Storm Event: 10 yr (new)/25 yr (New)
- Fix Drainage Problems over multiple years; CM Slawson requested dates on photos shown of current city issues for stakeholders meeting presentation.
 - Creates a candidate CIP List
- Design Standards: WDOE 2005 manual; CM Blair suggested stating “current WDOE manual” that way you are not tied to a specific year.
- Provide water quality treatment for “older parts of city” as retrofit projects arise.
- Eliminate “monitoring” from city goals. He explained this does not mean you can’t investigate a concern because you still have runoff water quality standards in place that currently cover that.

Citizen York expressed concerns over inserting the WDOE manual and questioned if there are other options. Feels as if the board is moving fast and feels what works elsewhere may not work here. Consultant Lane stated there will be other options and they should be reviewed. Discussion held on the issue of best available science. Citizen Arndt and Citizen York held a discussion on the retrofitting process and the policy that could be utilized. CM Blair offered to sit with Garth and Mr. Franz to pursue options. CM Slawson welcomed the public to the next stakeholders meeting being held Monday April 21st.

Revised Schedule

Administrator Knight asked for direction in whether the board preferred an outline leading to the staff recommendation as has been done this evening and in the past, or providing the staff recommendation up front and moving forward from there. All members presented in agreement to have the staff recommendation provided up front with the supporting documentation to back it up. PB Latimore requested helping board members in recognizing internal and external consistency. Administrator Knight clarified by pointing out if it is or is not consistent. PB Latimore suggested “quick reference cards” or a way to put the key elements on a chart. Administrator Knight stated Consultant Shockey and Dugan work is appearing in that format. PB Schmidt suggested to include figures we have and figures yet to be defined. Suggestion on key slides

located on the wall or in a binder as a quick ready reference. CM Blair addressed concern with inconsistency as one member with a map and another missing a map.

Discussion held on the time schedule and in regards to council action a request was made to change the wording to say “not brought to council for review”

Comprehensive Plan, Goals, and Policies

Administrator Knight stated the issue before the council and planning board is an introduction of the Comp Plan Goals and Policies contained in the 2004 Plan in comparison to the 2008 Update currently underway. She stated the focus is on addressing inconsistency and recommended consuming the information in small bite size pieces. She explained that when reviewing the material “no 2004 data” means it is a new proposal.

CM Slawson asked if any consultants can be released early to save the city some money due to the late hour of the meeting. Administrator Knight released Consultants Dugan, Wilson, Collins, and Franz.

Development Regulations

Administrator Knight stated the issue before the council and planning board is an introduction and initial recommendations to make the city’s development regulations consistent with the GMA and the City’s Comprehensive Plan. She stated they will have several more opportunities to review the proposed changes to the development regulations.

Consultant Andy Lane stated there is a 7 year periodic review. In December 2004 the comp plan was done, but the development regulations were not completed. The CTED checklist was compared to the code and these are the issues being presented. CM Blair questioned the verbiage, “See a above”? Consultant Lane stated if it is to best serve the public it should be in the code, but it doesn’t need to be addressed now. CM Blair confirmed that page 13 was the start of the changes they needed to review now. CM Slawson stated his appreciation of the RCW & SMC references. Consultant Lane stated the GMA references are also listed in bold.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None given.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

CM Blair expressed her appreciation for the work that has been completed and is not making light of the work.

PB Van Pelt thanked the consultants and the public for their presence.

CM Slawson stated we need to work on releasing the consultants when we can.
Administrator Knight acknowledged that it is a sensitive issue.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion by PB Van Pelt, seconded by PB Schmidt the meeting was adjourned; All in agreement. Planning Board meeting ended at 9:54 p.m.