

GIG HARBOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 12, 2002

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

CALL TO ORDER: 7:03 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. 2003 Proposed Budget. Mayor Wilbert opened the public hearing at 7:03 p.m. David Rodenbach, Finance Director, explained that this is the first of two public hearings on the proposed budget. He said that this document reflects the changes as a result of the two Budget Workshops. Mayor Wilbert then asked the audience for comments.

Nick Tarabochia – 8021 Shirley Avenue. Mr. Tarabochia voiced his concerns with the language regarding the Harborview Street End project that states that the construction will be consistent with comments made to area residents during design review meetings conducted in 1999. Mr. Tarabochia said that this issue has been on going since before 1994 and it seems the project is back to square one. He said that he knows of no one outside this administration that has come forward to ask that this area be developed. He read comments from letters from citizens in 1993, and others in 1999, voicing their dissatisfaction with the plan to develop the area. He discussed the parking, vandalism, safety and private property access problems, and asked that this area be maintained as a scenic viewpoint and not be developed as a formal park. He asked that the City Council remove this item from the budget. He answered Council's questions, and said that there were improvements that were beneficial, such as the lighting and sidewalks.

Bruce Rogers – 2804 Harborview Drive. Mr. Rogers said he agreed with some of what Mr. Tarabochia said. He said that two years ago he came to Council to ask for improvements to the streets and sidewalks. He said that there are still improvements that could be made with the 100 ft at the end of the street that would be acceptable to all. He added that not making improvements leaves it as an attractive nuisance. He said that the project has been studied to death, and Council should use the \$25,000 to do some simple things to improve the area for pedestrians. He agreed that there should be no beach access.

The public hearing was closed at 7:26 p.m. and the next public hearing opened.

2. 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendments – John Vodopich, Community Development Director, explained that this was the first of two hearings. He said that tonight's hearing would cover updates to the 1994 Transportation Plan, 1993 Sewer Plan, the 1987 Stormwater Plan and the 1993 Water System Plan. He explained that what is being proposed with this draft ordinance is to adopt each plan update individually and then further adopt them by reference and incorporate them in the overall land use plan. He added that representatives from Gray and Osborne, who

provided the consultant services to update the water, sewer and stormwater plan, as well as the Shea Group, who provided the update to the Transportation Plan were present. John explained that the second aspect of the ordinance is the 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendments that were considered by the Planning Commission. He asked that Council consider applications 01-10 this evening, and the remainder of the applications at the next meeting. He said that the second reading and adoption of the ordinance could take place at the December 9th meeting.

John gave an overview of application 01-10, which consists of sixteen individual areas. He further clarified that the county alone has the authority to adopt an Urban Growth Area. He said that the city's ordinance merely reflects those actions already taken by Pierce County and to amend our Comprehensive Land Use Map accordingly. He explained to the members of the audience, that if they did not agree with the amendments, the appropriate action would be to file an amendment to Pierce County. He said that there seems to be a great deal of confusion surrounding these amendments, as Pierce County did not notify the property owners of the action taken back in March.

At Council's request, John described the difference in the City Limits and Urban Growth Boundary and the advantages or disadvantages to being included in the UGA. John used the maps to illustrate and describe the amendments to the city's UGA. John explained that the city had recommended approval of all amendments except items 15 and 16, which were not approved by Pierce County.

The Mayor then asked for public comments.

Paul Citidester – 5303 Hunt – Mr. Citidester voiced his concern that he and other property owners had not been notified that the city made the recommendation to remove the property in area 10 from the city's UGA when the process began. He said that the change wouldn't allow property owners to go ahead with planned projects, and when he recently contacted Pierce County, no one would listen to his concerns. John explained that the changes to area 10 were initiated by the city when they met with Pierce County during the development of the Gig Harbor-Peninsula Community Plan. He said that they group reviewed inconsistencies in the plan, or areas that staff felt should be included or excluded from the UGA. He said that a draft letter of recommendation was reviewed by Council in December of 2002, and he was authorized to forward the letter of recommendation to the county at that time. He said that he relied upon the county to notify property owners of the public process.

Chuck Howe – 13212 Purdy Drive. Mr. Howe asked for clarification on the amount of times area 16 had been rejected. John explained that when Pierce County adopted the plan, this area was rejected. Mr. Howe then asked how it could become part of the UGA. John explained this would only happen if it were annexed to the city. He voiced concerns about the density and ingress/egress to this property. Councilmembers explained that the city has no jurisdiction over the property at all, as it's inclusion to the

UGA was denied by Pierce County, and the only thing the City was doing at this time is updating the maps.

Andrea Mitchell – 6923 54th Ave NW. Ms. Mitchell explained that she owned 30 acres in area 10 and that she agreed with Paul Citidester about lack of notification of what had happened and how it affects the ability to develop her property, as well as others on her road.

Judy Vasconceles – 1918 State Game Road. Ms. Vasconceles said she owns duplexes one block from area 8. She asked how this would affect her property. John Vodopich explained that the city has no jurisdiction over the property, and that he believed the density range for area 8 will be 2-6 dwellings per acre. She then asked questions about who is responsible for road improvements on Peacock Hill. Staff addressed her question.

Clark Davis – 300 Pt. Fosdick Place. Mr. Davis explained that he was representing the homeowners association for Henderson Bay Heights. He said that the group does not oppose the recommendations for area 4, but asked for clarification of what parcels will be affected by the change. He then asked for clarification on the split zoning of one parcel adjacent to the neighborhood. John addressed his questions.

Diane Clifford – Henderson Bay Heights. Ms. Clifford explained that their homeowners' organization spoke with Mr. Davis because of their concerns about that one parcel. She said that the notification was somewhat unclear.

Carl Halsan – 7766 52nd Place. Mr. Halsan said he was present representing the property owner for area 4. He asked for clarification on the notification that went out regarding the employment center designation. He showed Council an approved subdivision plan, adding that the property owner didn't want homes in an industrial zoned area. He said that they would like the line to follow the plat boundary line, which won't happen until next summer when the plat is recorded. He said that the concern is a strip of property that is 100-150 feet wide that is residential zoned, in between an industrial zoned parcel and finished plat. He said it would make more sense to push the industrial zone line to match the plat-line. Councilmembers recommended that he approach Pierce County after the plat is done to make the amendment.

Paul Cyr. Mr. Cyr said he represented Fred Paulson. He asked for reconsideration for community commercial zoning for area 16, as was supported by Council last year in the form of a staff recommendation to the Planning Commission. He added that the request failed at the county level. He thanked the city for the notice of the map changes, as the county had not notified the property owners of any amendments.

Howard Hawley – 5715 40th Ave Ct. Mr. Hawley asked about the residential low-density designation in area 11. John explained that this would be 3-4 units per acre. He said he was also present to lobby the city for sidewalks on 38th. Mark Hoppen explained that

this was included in the street improvement plans, but without the passage of R-51, the timeline for the project, which relies upon matching grant funds, is not definite.

Nicky Mosier – 3920 59th St. Ct. NW. Mr. Mosier asked about annexing to the city and hooking up homes in area 11 to the city sewer system. Mark Hoppen explained that the annexation process and the process to hook to city sewer are separate, and not necessarily dependant upon each other. Mr. Mosier asked about ownership of streets after an annexation. Mr. Hoppen explained that if the streets are currently private, they would remain that way.

Marilyn Naylor – Plum Tree Neighborhood. Ms. Naylor asked if the annexation of her neighborhood would happen in 2003. Mark Hoppen explained that the action to include area 11 in the Urban Growth Area did not mean that the annexation would automatically occur. The process to annex was described in more detail.

Florence (?) - She asked if she did not want her property to become commercial, (in area 6), what could be done. She said that two of the three property owners do not want the change, and they are concerned that the third party would be able to get the zoning changes. She was advised to approach Pierce County with her concerns.

John Vodopich explained that the other half of the public hearing would be on the updates to the Transportation, Stormwater, Sewer, and Water System Plans, reminding Council that the consultants were present to answer any questions.

Councilmember Ruffo asked about the timing and cost to deal with the odor at the Wastewater Treatment Plant and the best way to keep the public informed on what steps were being taken.

Jim Patton, Gray & Osborne, explained that the Wastewater Comprehensive Plan was written over several years, and is the first phase for these improvements. He said that the next stage is the Facilities Plan, drafted by EarthTech Engineers, which is currently under review by the city. He added that he was not familiar with the provision in their plan to deal with the odor concerns.

David Skinner, The Shea Group, explained that there are both long-term and short-term plans to handle the odor. He said that communication with the public could be addressed with Mark Hoppen.

There were no further public comments and this public hearing was closed at 8:47 p.m.

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 October 28, 2002.
2. Correspondence/Proclamations:
 - a) Proclamation – DUI Task Force Day.
 - b) Proclamation – Education Week.

3. Rushmore Watermain Replacement – Consultant Services Contract.
4. Liquor License Renewals; The Green Turtle, Marco's Restaurant.
5. Approval of Payroll for the Month of October.
Checks #2133 through #2190 in the amount of \$212,372.36.
6. Approval of Payment of Bills for October 28, 2002.

MOTION: Move to approve the consent agenda as presented.
Ruffo/Picinich – unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Second Reading of Ordinance – 2002 Property Tax Levy Ordinance. David Rodenbach, Finance Director, presented the second reading of this ordinance proposing a 1% increase.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 917 as presented.
Picinich/Dick - unanimously approved.

2. Second Reading of Ordinance – Providing for the Issuance and Sale of a Limited Tax General Obligation Bond for Financing the Acquisition of Real Estate. David Rodenbach explained that this bond is intended to take out the note being carried by the Skansie Brothers to purchase property. He said that language would be amended to reflect the correct budget fund.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 918 as amended
Ruffo/Picinich - unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. First Reading of Ordinance – Adopting the 2003 Budget. David Rodenbach explained that he had nothing to add from the public hearing.

Councilmember Franich suggested an amendment to the parks and recreation goals to include funding to construct a Maritime Pier. David explained that this amendment would not be necessary, as there is no dollar amount connected with this goal, allowing it to be developed as the year progresses.

Councilmember Ruffo recommended leaving in the \$25,000 for the Harborview Drive Street Viewpoint, but to delete the specific language on what would be constructed to allow further discussion and flexibility. Councilmember Picinich agreed with this recommendation.

Councilmember Owel said that she understood from the public comments that they would like to eliminate the beach access and the seeking of grant funds from consideration, but not the inclusion of storm-drainage improvements or safety features.

Councilmember Franich agreed to leave in the funding to allow for in-house improvements to finish the limited goals discussed at previous meetings. He said that disagreed with the hiring of any more consultants or architects for design work.

Councilmember Ruffo suggested that staff re-write the goal to leave the funds in, but to delete any specifics to how the money would be spent before the second reading. Councilmember Ekberg agreed.

Councilmember Dick said that he attended some of the hearings, and though some residents were vocal in opposition to the improvement, several community members spoke in favor. He stressed that the purpose of the budget is to give direction to spend funds, and even a modest proposal to allow the area to be used as a viewpoint would require grant funding. He continued to explain that some design would be necessary to obtain grants, adding that \$25,000 wouldn't make much in the way of improvements. He said a decision would have to be made to either do nothing or to go forward with improvements. He concurred that it is a difficult decision to make and several issues would need to be reconciled. He said that a vague budget proposal would not be helpful.

Councilmember Franich asked for Council consensus based upon public input asking that the area be left as an informal place, stating that the only decision left to be made is whether to close the road off at the barricade.

Councilmember Ekberg recommended leaving in the \$25,000 and listing it as improvement to the street end. That would allow the decision to be made at a later time, whether it would be to hire a consultant to get a grant or to just do pavement repairs and install benches. He said that everyone is in agreement to leave the money in the budget.

MOTION: Move to leave the \$25,000 in the budget for street improvements to the Harborview Drive Street End.
Ekberg/Ruffo – six voted in favor. Councilmember Franich voted no.

Mayor Wilbert suggested amending the budget to include a 3-way stop sign at the intersection of Vernhardson and Harborview Drive for safety concerns. Councilmember Young recommended seeking the comments of the city's traffic engineer on the subject.

Councilmember Ruffo said that he had done research on the Information Systems Assistant position and that the city was at the point of needing assistance in this department. He added that the salary range was also in line. Councilmember Ekberg reminded Council that this position was requested a year ago, but due to space constraints at the old building, it was put off. After further discussion, Councilmember Dick said that he was confident of the need for the additional position.

2. First Reading of Ordinance – Adopting the Amendments to the States Uniform Codes, the State Energy, Ventilation, and Air Quality Codes. Dick Bower, Building Official/Fire Marshal, introduced this ordinance to adopt amendments to these codes so that the city will be on the same track as other jurisdictions that have already adopted these amendments. This will return for a second reading at the next meeting.

3. First Reading of Ordinance – 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. This was a continuation of the discussion that occurred during the public hearing.

Councilmember Owel asked to amend the language on page 18 to correct the reference to her comments regarding the comp plan amendments. She added that she has more information on this issue, which she would distribute to staff and Councilmembers for consideration in asking staff to prepare development guidelines. Carol Morris added that the ordinance could be amended to support the low development guidelines as guidelines only, not as a requirement, then at a later date, forward the low development guidelines to the Planning Commission to be considered as a development regulation, as they would require a SEPA process. She continued to say that the guidelines could be a stand-alone ordinance or an amendment to the existing development regulations.

Councilmember Owel explained that low-impact development is a land use development strategy to emphasize maintaining or restoring pre-watershed hydrologic functions, which is also an objective of the Comprehensive Plan. Councilmember Young said that he would consider this a high-priority item, as the ultimate goal is to give the builders the tools to accomplish this. Councilmember Dick was also supportive of this effort to address expensive storm-drainage issues.

John Vodopich explained that the remaining updates to the Comprehensive Plan updates would come at the next meeting, with the second reading of the ordinance at the December 9th meeting.

STAFF REPORTS: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Nick Tarabochia - 8021 Shirley Avenue. Mr. Tarabochia asked for clarification on what language would be included in the budget regarding the Harborview Street Viewpoint. He said that approximately 25 people on the street and 40 on the beach asking him for information, and that he would like to work with the city on this. He asked to be kept informed of upcoming issues.

David Skinner – The Shea Group. Mr. Skinner took the opportunity to applaud the Council and staff on the new facility. Councilmember Ekberg thanked Dave for his part in the process.

Marline Drucker – 3421 Harborview Drive. Ms. Drucker asked if Council had received the letter she sent in regards to her husband, Robert Puratich. Steve Osguthorpe,

Planning/Building Director, explained that her letter had been forwarded to him, and he was in the process of responding to her concerns. He said that his letter would describe the process to request an amendment to the height overlay. Steve recommended that she call to set a time to come in and talk to him.

Don Bennett – 9713 41st Ave NW – Mr. Bennett said that Mark Schaeffer could not attend the meeting, but he wanted to share information regarding the progress in the meetings between the Sportsmans Club and surrounding neighbors. He said that Mark and Doug Tensler have met several times and there has been good exchange of information. He said the meetings have been productive in the sense that each have come to understand the others' positions better. He said that they are trying to negotiate the hours of operation, but this remains difficult. He said Council should be prepared to receive a final recommendation from both parties by the end of the week. He said that there should be enough input for Council to make a final decision.

Mr. Bennett then recommended a sign to be placed outside the council room doors reminding people that there is a meeting in progress to minimize disruption.

COUNCIL COMMENTS / MAYOR'S REPORT:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OTHER MEETINGS:

1. 2nd Public Hearing on the 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendments.
2. 2nd Public Hearing on the 2003 Budget on November 25th at 7:00 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: For the purpose of discussing property acquisition per RCW 42.30110(b).


MOTION: Move to adjourn to Executive Session at 9:40 p.m. for approximately five minutes.
Picinich/Ruffo - unanimously approved.


MOTION: Move to return to regular session at 9:45 p.m.
Picinich/Ruffo - unanimously approved.

ADJOURN:

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 9: 50 p.m.
Picinich/Ruffo - unanimously approved.

Cassette recorder utilized:
Tape 664 Side A 070 - end.
Tape 664 Side B 000 – end.
Tape 665 – Both Sides.
Tape 666 – Side A 000 – end.
Tape 666 – Side B 000 – 237.


Gretchen A. Wilbert, Mayor


City Clerk