

GIG HARBOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 23, 2005

PRESENT: Councilmembers Ekberg, Young, Franich, Conan, Dick, Picinich, Ruffo and Mayor Wilbert.

CALL TO ORDER: 7:01 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: Certificate of Appreciation for Service on the Design Review Board: Linda Gair and Chuck Hunter.

Mayor Wilbert presented these past members of the Design Review Board with a certificate, thanking them for their dedication and service.

CONSENT AGENDA:

These consent agenda items are considered routine and may be adopted with one motion as per Gig Harbor Ordinance No. 799.

1. Approval of the Minutes of City Council Meeting of May 9, 2005.
2. Civic Center ADA Access – Contract Authorization.
3. Pump Station 2A Project – Consultant Contract(s) Authorization.
4. Resolution No. 649 Adopting the 2005 Personnel Regulations Manual.
5. Resolution No. 650 Declaration of Surplus Property.
6. Eddon Boatyard Appraisal Review for IAC Grant Funding – Consultant Contract Authorization.
7. Eddon Boatyard Permitting Assistant – Consultant Contract Authorization.
8. Liquor License Renewals: Target Store, Puerto Vallarta, and Round Table Pizza.
9. Approval of Payment of Bills for May 23, 2005:
Checks #47108 through #47258 in the amount of \$318,270.40.

MOTION: Move to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.
Picinich / Conan – unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Second Reading of Ordinance – Acceptance of Grants and 2005 Budget Amendment. Mike Davis, Chief of Police, presented the background on the acceptance of grants in support of two main Police Department objectives; one to create a comprehensive traffic safety program, and the other to expand the ability to investigate and prosecute drug crimes.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 1001 as presented.
Picinich / Ruffo – unanimously approved.

2. Second Reading of Ordinance – Establishing Friends of the Parks Commission. John Vodopich presented the second reading of the ordinance that establishes a “Friends of the Parks Commission” chapter in the municipal code. The intent of the

commission is to advise Council on parks and recreation facilities, open space facilities, and other matters as directed.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 1002 as presented.
Young / Ekberg – unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Economic Development Board Funding Campaign. Mark Hoppen explained that for the past three years, the city has provided funding to the Pierce County Economic Development Board for the purpose of a better economic environment. He said that the EDB is entering into a 2006-2010 business and recruitment strategy and is asking Gig Harbor to commit to \$25,000 per year. He then introduced Bruce Kendall, President and CEO of the EDB, Dennis Furhop, Development Director for the EDB, and Representative Derek Kilmer, Business Retention Manager for the EDB.

Bruce Kendall, President & CEO of the Economic Development Board for Tacoma/Pierce County. Mr. Kendall gave an overview of the activities of the EDB over the past ten years. He said that the five-year work plan describes future goals. He explained that recruitment is very expensive and has a smaller return on the investment than retention, and that is why so much time is spent on business retention. He added that many businesses interested in the Gig Harbor area are looking for a regional corporate headquarters environment, or they are in the information technology field. He stressed that even though the firm may not land in Gig Harbor, many CEOs settle in Gig Harbor. He then introduced Mr. Furhop.

Dennis Furhop, National Community Development Services, Atlanta, Georgia. Mr. Furhop explained that he is helping the EDB develop a plan for the next five years. He said that the target is to collect 3.8 million dollars in the Pierce County area. He then discussed the favorable study that determined the level of support. He added that the fund-raising campaign began in January and will continue until September, 2005. A report to the community will come in June.

Councilmember Franich asked if anything could be directly related to the \$60,000 that the city has provided over the last three years. Mr. Kendall named the local businesses that had been supported by the EDB. He stressed that without sufficient participation by all, no work can be done in any of the communities. He explained that hundreds of hours had been spent on this side of the bridge.

Councilmember Picinich asked how much revenue has brought to the city per year in relation to what had been paid in support of the EDB. Mr. Kendall said that in addition to the sales tax, the money generated at the state level cycles back to the city as a result of the efforts of the EDB. He stressed that they don't want communities to invest in the EDB because they think they will receive a certain level of tax revenue, but because they understand that they are not an island. Each community is part of the regional economy.

Councilmember Dick asked what portion had been contributed by Pierce County. Mr. Kendall said that Pierce County is currently at \$50,000 per year, and are considering increasing that by a small amount. He continued to say that to the best of his recollection, Tacoma is currently at \$40,000; Puyallup is at \$10,000; Sumner is at \$10,000; Lakewood is at \$12,500; and University Place is at \$5,000. Councilmember Dick asked for further clarification on the equity of the amount being asked by Gig Harbor to contribute as compared to the other, larger jurisdictions.

Mr. Kendall described the process to contact the communities based on the current level of support and how aggressive they would like to be in the program. In the past, the City of Gig Harbor has been a very aggressive investor in the EDB.

Councilmember Young pointed out that almost all the other jurisdictions have their own economic development program, where Gig Harbor does not.

Councilmember Franich said that it comes back to what the city is getting for the amount of money spent. He said that the city offers many amenities for businesses because it's a nice area to live, and there are acres of business parks available. He asked Mr. Hoppen if we need to participate in the EDB.

Mark Hoppen responded affirmatively, explaining that development isn't something that the city has been able to focus on other than at the comprehensive plan level. Consequently, there is no vehicle to be able to define the efforts. He continued to explain that over the years he has worked with Derek Kilmer and Kevin Claig from Pierce County to learn about retention activities. He said that it may take many years to experience the results, and when it does happen, it more than makes up for the revenues expended. Either you can focus on the effort through a full-time employee or through another vehicle such as the EDB to provide the service.

Councilmember Franich said that commercial property owners are working to fill their vacant spaces. He asked if the EDB was responsible for BCTI coming to Gig Harbor. Mr. Kendall responded that no, they had done no work with BCTI.

Mayor Wilbert asked if the residents or neighbors had been involved with the survey. Mr. Furhop explained that the survey had been done with firms that may be supportive of economic develop. That is where the funding comes from. Mayor Wilbert then said that she hopes that when the EDB is out "selling" the community they realize that the city has spent a lot of money in development of the Gig Harbor North and other commercial areas, and that there are specific design codes that other cities do not have. She said that it is important that these companies know this.

Councilmember Ruffo asked for clarification of the term "non-binding" in reference to the requested support amount. Mark Hoppen explained that a request cannot be made for more than one budget year at a time.

Councilmember Young discussed the fact that Gig Harbor is not a B&O Tax city, and many businesses do not provide sales tax revenue. If the only goal is to raise tax revenue, it would be better to build wall-to-wall retail. This does not make for a good economy, and so it's important to continue to recruit for businesses that can provide jobs for the existing population. He said that it is vital to continue to participate, perhaps even more aggressively.

Mr. Hoppen said that no action is needed at this time, and further discussion can occur during the 2006 budget cycle.

2. First Reading of Ordinance – Updating References in Relation to Elections. Molly Towslee, City Clerk, explained that this ordinance updates the City of Gig Harbor Municipal Code so that references to State Law are consistent with the newly amended statutes. This will return at the next meeting for a second reading.

3. First Reading of Ordinance – Establishing Building Size Restrictions in Waterfront Zones. John Vodopich, Community Development Director, presented this ordinance that would establish a maximum building size in the Waterfront Residential district at 5,000 square feet or a total footprint of 2,500 square feet. In addition, it would establish a single-family and multi-family (up to four units) maximum building size in the Waterfront Millville district at a total size of 5,000 square feet or a total footprint of 2,500 square feet. The ordinance clarifies that the existing non-residential limit of 3,500 square feet per lot was intended to be total building size rather than gross floor area in the Waterfront Millville district. The ordinance would also establish a maximum residential building size in the Waterfront Commercial district at a total size of 5,000 square feet or a total footprint of 2,500 square feet and clarifies that the 3,000 square foot footprint limit applies to non-residential structures. Mr. Vodopich recommended that because Council had deliberated this issue at length at three previous meetings, it be adopted at this first reading.

Jan Twardowski – 3507 Harborview Drive. Mr. Twardowski voiced his concern that under this ordinance the condominium homeowners could not rebuild if their homes sustain substantial damage. He asked why the condo owners are being punished because of issues over office buildings and if this is a moral thing to do.

Councilmember Ruffo said that he fully supported what Mr. Twardowski said.

Councilmember Ekberg asked the square footage of his building. Mr. Twardowski described each condo as approximately 3,000 square feet, not including garages, with two floors and a basement. There are two buildings of two units each for a total of four. He stressed that this ordinance affects all the other condominiums too.

John Vodopich clarified that if a structure becomes non-conforming and is damaged by more than 50%, it needs to comply with the underlying regulations. If the ordinance is passed, the building size in the Waterfront Millville district will be either 5,000 s.f. or a

2,500 s.f. footprint. He added that in the Shoreline Master Program, it is 75% for single-family.

Bruce Steel – 6610 Sunnybay Road NW. Mr. Steel said he is a partner in a piece of property along Harborview Drive and is adamantly opposed to the ordinance. He said that he has been involved with this process for 20 months and it seems that there are three important issues: maximum public access to the waterfront; view corridors from Harborview Drive; and building size. This ordinance addresses the issue of building size, but to the detriment of the other two. He said that his architect was present with drawings to illustrate the effect of this ordinance. Mr. Steel described his property, then stressed that everyone is in agreement that they would like to preserve the historic netshed on the property, which they are willing to do. They would like to construct a small marina with associated parking. He asked Council to keep in mind that there are only a couple of remaining vacant properties, so this ordinance is site specific. The third thing that they are working on is what to do with the uplands. They are trying to design something that meets all three important criteria. If this ordinance is passed, it may force them to building three five-thousand square foot houses, as they have three lots of record. The owners would then chop this whole waterfront section from public access. He said that he doesn't want to build three big houses here, believing that this is the wrong thing to do. He said that he wants the public to be able to walk out to the bulkhead and enjoy the water. He continued to say that he wants staircases going down to the bulkhead level. He said that if the ordinance is passed, and due to the topography of his site, he could not connect the buildings with a public plaza area as illustrated in one of the drawings; it would be considered one structure. He introduced Steve Bull, his architect, to describe what could happen on this site with the new ordinance.

Councilmember Picinich asked Mr. Steel if he was planning to build a 10,000 s.f. underground parking lot. Mr. Steel responded that it is a parking lot covered by a public amenity. The two buildings would be allowed by themselves, but it is the connection between the two that creates the difficulty.

Mayor Wilbert asked if he had talked about the project with the neighbors. Mr. Steel said that he had talked to Mr. Jerkovich and ended up buying his property.

Steven Bull, 1502 25th Avenue South, Seattle. Mr. Bull gave a detailed explanation of the information and drawings in the packet given to Council. Mr. Bull said that the first drawing illustrates the height limits. The third sheet shows possible development that could occur with the proposed amendment, and the last sheet is an alternative that would not be allowed with the proposed amendment. He explained that the primary goals are to retain the view from Harborview Drive, retain the small scale and structure of the neighborhood, and provide shoreline access. Issues that are based in the Comprehensive Plan are preserving visual interest, developing and preserving an appropriate architecture, developing outdoor activity areas and minimizing asphalt coverage.

Mr. Bull continued to explain that one of the key changes in the draft ordinance is the change from gross floor area to building size. He said that Option A of the draft ordinance limits development to 5000 s.f. and defines building area, plus habitable area, plus garages and other support spaces. This includes garages within the developable area of the site, and if topography allows, there is the ability for a two-story structure with a walk-out lower level. The first drawing illustrates this option in which you could get a condition not necessarily anticipated. The second possibility under Option A is a 2500 s.f. footprint with a basement. He said that it is unclear what building footprint actually means.

Mr. Ball voiced concern with language in Option B, explaining that it is unclear how the basement area is calculated or whether a basement larger than the 2500 s.f. footprint would be allowed. He then spoke to minimizing asphalt coverage and other aspects of view corridors and open space in this zone. The inclusion of garages into the gross building area forces property owners into surface parking. He said that the next drawing illustrates what would be allowed in Option B; three separate structures separated by a 20 foot space, surface parking at the lower level, and structures on piers. This option has no public access or public amenities. The last drawing illustrates an option that would not be allowed under the proposed ordinance. This drawing shows a plaza connecting two, 2500 s.f. footprint, 2-story structures over a basement. The plaza would provide an overlook of the water for the public.

Councilmember Franich asked for clarification on the height of the buildings in the illustrations. Mr. Ball responded 18', which comply with the zoning criteria for height and bulk. He said that he believes that either building could be constructed under the existing code.

Councilmember Ekberg said that Illustration B shows one of his concerns that if you adopt a building size limitation, you then build to the allowed size and can end up with three or four buildings that maximizes the site. Mr. Ball responded that he didn't think there should be an issue with the building size limitation due to the requirements for roof pitch, view corridors and setbacks. These limits would prevent an enormous building. The 2500 s.f. footprint or the 5000 s.f. gross total building area is probably sufficient for most development within the waterfront district. He said that the issue is the redefinition of gross floor area to building area, which forces the inclusion of garages that otherwise, could be placed out of site and public space.

Councilmember Young pointed out that from the waterview the lower level parking appears to add another story to the structure. He said that he would be inclined to not include garages if they were truly underground. Mr. Ball said that the attached photographs show enormous retaining walls on the adjacent properties. He continued to explain that the city's Design Review process address those types of design issues, and to preserve the village character, you must provide creative solutions that take advantage of the topography to make sure that all aspect of the design meet the goals of the community.

John Vance – 3503 Harborview Drive. Mr. Vance spoke against the ordinance. He praised the openness of the process, adding that this is his third or fourth time to ask Council to preserve his home and that of his neighbors. He explained again that each of the four units is approximately 2900 s.f. plus an additional 500 s.f. garage for each unit. This is much smaller than the 20,000 s.f. individual residence that could be built there. He spoke about the public viewing area in front of their home, which complies with the intent to have waterfront access. He said that Council says that they want to preserve what exists, and has directed staff to come back with an ordinance that does this. But yet, each time it comes back with little, if any change and the condominiums become out of compliance. He asked “What is the intent of the Council. Is it to force people out of their homes, or to protect citizens of this community?”

Charles Carlson – 3505 Harborview Drive. Mr. Carlson said that at the first reading of this ordinance, it was noted that multi-family was not addressed. Now staff has included multi-family, but the restrictions will not allow any multi-family unit on the entire waterfront to be rebuilt if destroyed. He said that this process began because of large commercial buildings, so an ordinance was passed to limit the size of those structures. This ordinance states that numerous complaints were received from the public regarding large buildings, but during the three readings of this proposed ordinance, not one proponent has stepped forward in support of these amendments. He wondered where are all of “these people” that want these changes along the waterfront. Everyone has the same goal...to preserve what we have in Gig Harbor.

Councilmember Young apologized by saying that multi-family structures were supposed to have been exempted in all waterfront zones and then sent back to the Planning Commission to develop standards in which to regulate them.

Carol Morris, City Attorney, recommended that if Council wants to preserve the small-town character of this area, they need to identify what it is, and then establish that as a baseline in the ordinance rather than changing the non-conforming structure provision in the code. If you want to include the condominiums, then you determine how large they are and then use that as a base-line for development.

Councilmember Franich said that the intent is to allow what existing structures as a part of the community, but to prevent another Water’s Edge Condominium project in the future. Councilmember Young pointed out that there is case law that says you cannot do that. He said that the Planning Commission never intended for single-family zoning rules to apply to multi-family structures, and there must be a better way to regulate them.

Ms. Morris said that you cannot just address the non-conformity issue because that establishes a separate class of structures in this area. This creates perpetual zoning and establishes these structures as a protected, non-conforming use. This condition does not exist anywhere else and goes against legislative intent for an ordinance that regulates structures to be smaller.

Councilmember Ruffo said that there is a present situation that he is trying to preserve and a future situation that is different. He said we have to figure out how to do that. Ms. Morris asked Council to reevaluate why they are passing the ordinance and to identify what the problem is they are trying to address.

Councilmember Ruffo replied that it is a “present” verses “future” issue and for any newly-developed property. Councilmember Young asked if this means treating vacant property different than existing property. This sets up two different zoning classes within the same zone. Councilmember Ruffo said that would be fine.

Councilmember Picinich asked if there was any way to exempt these multi-family structures from this ordinance that allows them to rebuild to what they currently have.

Councilmember Young read his recommendation at the last meeting to direct staff to bring back a revised ordinance removing multi-family structures from consideration and to take suggested changes to the Planning Commission to regulate them. He then apologized that he was unclear in specifying that this should be done in all waterfront zones. He suggested doing that at this time.

John Vodopich suggested that in Section 2, (l) of the proposed ordinance, merely delete the stricken “N/A” under attached four units and leave this not applicable so that the building size limits would not apply to attached dwellings up to four units and delete the reference in footnote “4” to multi-family attached residential structure (up to 4 units). With that revision, single-family residences would be limited to 5000 s.f. total or a 2500 s.f. footprint. If you went with a change to building size, non-residential structures would be limited to 3500 s.f. per lot total building size. This would address the current situation for the condos, but it would leave the Waterfront Millville wide open to multi-family structures of any size.

Councilmember Picinich said that he didn’t want to leave it wide open, but wanted to protect the current condo owners.

David Bowe – 705 Pacific Avenue. Mr. Bowe said that he is in complete agreement with Carol Morris on the issue of non-conforming uses and the zoning code. He said that he also serves as a Tacoma Planning Commission member, and understands comprehensive plans and the non-conforming aspects. You agreed that you cannot set up different codes based upon existing structures. He then said he is representing Jim Sullivan of Tanglewood Development, who has a property similar to Mr. Steele’s, and John Barline of Haub Brothers Investments who has property similar to both. He said that he also has been challenged by these regulations. He explained that Mr. Steele’s property, located between the Morris Marina and the Tides Tavern, would be a parking lot if this code were adopted. He said that the goal is to put the parking underneath the building, out of public view. It would be difficult to meet the commercial parking requirements if they are not allowed to do so. He said that if this ordinance is passed, it would create a moratorium on commercial development in the waterfront zones. He said that the design manual has the requirements to shield parking, and environmentally, it is

the right thing to do. He said that this ordinance would not be a good economic development tool. Mr. Bowe addressed Councilmember Young's question about height and size, explaining that if you use the existing topography of the site, you would have a two-story element no matter if one story is parking or if it becomes a residential site.

Councilmember Dick asked Mr. Bowe for language that may achieve his intent. Mr. Bowe responded that removing parking structures from the gross or footprint area. You cannot put the commercial parking under the building or enclose it and meet the proposed size limitations. You would have to exempt parking structures or limit their size.

Councilmember Young mentioned that the language recommended by David Freeman at the last meeting would meet the intent.

Jack Bujacich – 3607 Ross Avenue. Mr. Bujacich said he has nothing against underground parking depending on topography, but is opposed to having them excluded from the ordinance. He used the Ancich property as an example, saying that if a garage is allowed to be built up to the property lines, then a structure built on top, you could end up with something above the road. He then addressed the illustration of three 5000 s.f. houses, adding that the setbacks would limit them to 2250 s.f. structures. He voiced concern that the project is coming forward in a piecemeal fashion. He then said that any ordinance that creates a non-conforming situation, it is a bad ordinance and agreed with Carol Morris's comments. He said that there has to be a way to keep the condos without making them non-conforming.

Jill Guernsey – 3224 Shyleen. Ms. Guernsey addressed the issue of non-conformity. She said that the two types of non-conformity are uses and structures. The issue before Council is non-conforming structures. The condo owners have stated many times that the proposed ordinance would not allow them to rebuild if their homes were more than 50% destroyed by fire. She said that this is no different that if her home on the hill burned over 50%. She asked if she would be able to rebuild if the setback had changed and the code had changed to no longer allow you to build as close to the property lines. If not, then her home would be non-conforming and she would not be allowed to rebuild. She said that she thinks that what is being requested is for Council to work on the non-conforming ordinance and suggested that it is a simple fix. Rather than dealing with a percentage issue, allow someone to build in an existing footprint within a certain time period by which this has to be done. Even though their structure is non-conforming, they have an opportunity to rebuild.

Councilmember Young asked her if she would distinguish between a structure destroyed by a disaster or a major remodel. Ms. Guernsey responded that yes, she would distinguish between the two. She said that major maintenance or repair could occur if the structure was not being expanded.

Councilmember Ekberg asked for clarification on the recommendation for a time limitation. Ms. Guernsey explained that this would prevent a property to sit dormant for many years and an owner requesting to rebuild to what was there “forty years ago.”

Councilmember Young asked if she thought an ordinance that made 95% of the structures non-conforming is a good ordinance. She responded that realistically, it is something that has happened over time, as thirty years ago there were hardly any regulations. Councilmember Ruffo asked her what a reasonable time should be. Ms. Guernsey suggested one to two years to apply for the necessary permits. John Vodopich pointed out that this is already in the code.

Carol Morris said that the other issue to consider is the shoreline area is regulated by the Shoreline Master Program which adds a non-conforming structure land-use provision. That can be changed, but it must go to DOE for approval first.

Mark Hoppen used the fire at Olympic Village as an example of how long it may take to resolve insurance issues before someone is able to apply for a building permit. He encouraged that Council consider at least a two-year period.

Councilmember Franich asked Carol Morris if it would be possible to do what had been suggested by Ms. Guernsey. Ms. Morris responded positively, explaining that several of these provisions already exist in the code, but what isn't addressed is the ability to rebuild to the existing footprint. This change would have to be approved by DOE, who references the Washington Administrative Code's non-conforming provisions to determine if the change is appropriate.

Alan Renkowski – 3519 Harborview Drive. Mr. Renkowski described the Millville Condos where he lives. He said that there doesn't seem to be any consideration for lot size or configuration. He asked if Council is trying to eliminate large condominiums on the waterfront, and if so, can the zoning be changed to say that you cannot build a multi-family dwelling on the waterfront, but exempt the current ones from the proposed ordinance.

Councilmember Ruffo explained that this is what is being discussed.

Jan Twardowski – 3507 Harborview Drive. Mr. Twardowski clarified that multi-family dwelling owners are not looking for special privileges. He said that not all single-family homes would meet these regulations, but they are not aware of the impact this ordinance would have on them. He thanked Ms. Guernsey for her suggestions.

Councilmember Ruffo suggested directing staff to go back and consider the suggestions made by Jill Guernsey. Several other Councilmembers agreed with this suggestion. John Vodopich asked that this be referred to the Community Development Committee first.

Councilmember Young recommended that they also consider the issue of garages. He said that he is inclined to exempt them from building size if they are completely underground. Councilmember Franich agreed with this statement if it were in the downtown business zone, but not in the Waterfront Millville.

Councilmember Ekberg commented that he listened to the tapes of the meetings he missed, and the message is clear that everyone has the desire to preserve and enhance the community we love, created mostly without design review or zoning. Now, Council is being asked to adopt ordinances to try and preserve this while moving forward. He stressed that this is a difficult task, then thanked the citizens for their comments and insight.

MOTION: Move to table this agenda item.
Ekberg / Ruffo –

Councilmember Young asked for clarification if there would be any building size restriction on non-residential in the WM zone if this ordinance is not passed. John Vodopich explained that currently, there is a maximum gross floor area restriction of 3500 s.f. per lot. This specifically excludes garages.

RESTATED MOTION: Move to table this agenda item.
Ekberg / Ruffo – five voted in favor. Councilmembers Franich and Picinich voted no. The motion carried five to two.

4. Notice of Intention to Commence Annexation Proceedings – Ness, aka Rainbow Burnham LLC Request (ANX 04-03). John Vodopich presented this request for annexation of approximately 34 acres located north of 96th Street. He explained that the legal descriptions have been reviewed and approved by Pierce County and it would be appropriate to set a date to meet with the applicants to proceed with the annexation process. He suggested June 13th.

Councilmember Young suggested asking the applicant to contact other property owners to deal with the irregular boundary. Mr. Vodopich explained that a reasonable approach would be to use the mechanism in the state annexation statute to address the creation of an unincorporated island. This would allow the annexation of the other properties.

MOTION: Move to set the meeting date for June 13th.
Ekberg / Ruffo – unanimously approved.

Mayor Wilbert passed out a map that she asked to have printed that illustrates the city's boundaries. She said that many people don't realize that they do not live in the city.

STAFF REPORT:

Staff Report – Rushmore Water Main Replacement Project – Public Meeting. No verbal report given.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

COUNCIL COMMENTS / MAYOR'S REPORT:

Mayor's Report - Community Participation. Mayor Wilbert said that she wanted to share the comments that come from the community and to invite participation in these projects.

Councilmember Franich asked if it would be possible to change the definition of gross building floor area without a meeting. John Vodopich said this is a text amendment, and the process requires that the Planning Commission review the amendments, and then they would make a recommendation to Council. There is a 60-day noticing requirement to the state. There is an expedite review process that can be requested, that would shorten the period to fourteen days.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OTHER MEETINGS:


Councilmember Ruffo announced that the Peninsula Gateway is sponsoring a Town Hall meeting at the Civic Center on Thursday evening at 7:00 p.m. The purpose is to educate the citizens on what it is like to be involved with the City Council.

Councilmember Young announced that Roger Brooks, from Destination Development, is returning to do another round regarding economic development.

ADJOURN:

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 9:05 p.m.
Franich / Ekberg – unanimously approved.

CD recorder utilized:
Disc #1 Tracks 1 – 13.
Disc #2 Tracks 1 – 22



Gretchen A. Wilbert, Mayor



Molly Towslee, City Clerk