7:00 p.m. Call to Order

Mayor Matthes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mayor Tim Matthes and Councilmembers Jeff Cartwright, John Clauson, Fred Chang, Bek Ashby, Cindy Lucarelli, and Jerry Childs were present. Development Director Nick Bond, Assistant City Engineer Andrea Archer-Parsons, City Treasurer Allan Martin, City Clerk Brandy Rinearson, and Office Assistant II Jenine Floyd were also present.

Absent: Councilmember Putaansuu

**Mayor Matthes** led the audience and Council in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. **Discussion: Meeting with Legislators**

City Clerk Rinearson reported the City's lobbyist would like the council to appoint two councilmember's to join her in meeting with legislators.

In response to Councilmember Lucarelli, City Clerk Rinearson noted in the past we have scheduled meetings for the entire council to meet with the delegation. To encourage a more frank and honest conversation about our priorities, the City's lobbyist would like to recommend only two councilmember's be appointed to participate in these meetings.

City Treasurer Martin stated he spoke to the City's lobbyist, and she was asking for two councilmembers because she was worried about a quorum and this might be a lengthy session. In addition, if the need to testify to the legislatures arise having a quorum could be problematic. She included the Mayor as part of this team.

Councilmember Lucarelli stated if there are three councilmembers interested, that is not a quorum.

Mayor Matthes suggested two main councilmembers, and a third as an alternate.

**Council Direction:** Council directed staff to inform the City's lobbyist that Councilmembers Lucarelli, Ashby, and Putaansuu are interested in attending the legislative meetings.

2. **Discussion: Proposed Budget**

City Treasurer Martin gave a brief update of the City’s budget process and timeline, discussed the 2015 Cost Drivers, 2015 Supplemental Budget Storm Drainage Utility, and Your Tax Dollars at Work forms.
Council and staff continued to discuss the proposed budget including roads and paving, Bay Street path funding, work at City Hall, staff additions, IT thermal rack, Wi-Fi updates, mobile devices, network servers, city's website, and police cars.

Councilmember Ashby wondered if we could use part of the park impact fees to develop a parks plan during this next year while we do the comp plan. We have struggled with Public Properties moving forward, and when we looked at our comp plan and updates, there were issues brought forward on the parks. The result is that we don't really have a plan, and have not done any public outreach.

Development Director Bond stated public outreach tends to be somewhat expensive. The bones of the plan are good, but the public outreach component is not there. We need to identify what people want each of these parks to be, and what specific improvements are needed.

Councilmember Cartwright would like to hear from the citizens on what they want for the parks.

Council discussed the Cascade Natural Gas franchise agreement, the paving management system, wayfinding signs, the comprehensive parks plan, prisoner confinement, HR module, profits from liquor board and liquor tax, and paving Bethel.

**Council Direction:** Council directed staff to find out what the community would like for the City's parks in reference to the comprehensive parks plan.

3. **Discussion: Mixed-Use Zone Changes**

Development Director Bond noted at the September work study session, it was discussed that the densities allowed in our current mixed use zone were not viable for the development or for supporting the cost of development a mixed use structure. He has come up with a recommendation for an interim fix to this regulation, and is asking Council for direction if they want this to go to the Planning Commission for review or if they do not want to consider it at this time. The recommendations would be to change the density allowed in all mixed use zone districts from 12 units per acre to 30 units per acre. However, there is a footnote to allow for an even higher density in the central downtown overlay district of 48 units per acre.

**Council Direction:** Council directed staff to bring this to the Planning Commission for recommendation.

4. **Discussion: Wayfinding Sign and Logo Selection**

Development Director Bond noted we are under contract, which is expiring at the end of the year. Per the terms of the contract, we need to select a preferred alternative and have the contactor finish the project. If we don't do that, we need to extend the contract so the
work can continue into the next year and adjust the budget accordingly, or to terminate the project. What has to still be done is putting together the bid specs for each of the sign types, programming in all the locations for the signs, determining which type of sign would go where, and lastly what is on that sign.

In response to Councilmember Lucarelli, Development Director Bond noted no minutes were kept during the wayfinding sign committee.

Mayor Matthes stated Councilmember Lucarelli voted against this, but a majority of the Council approved the contract.

Councilmember Lucarelli has issues with the transparency of this project. She and the citizens would like to know more about the process and the designs chosen.

Development Director Bond said the contract specifies the consultant would provide three alternatives per an advisory committee process. The consultant has performed in accordance with the contract. If there is a problem with the three alternatives, or if you want to go back and do more concept design work, that is outside the scope of the project and could potentially drive the price up.

Councilmember Childs thought the $55,000 price included the signs themselves.

Development Director Bond said we are preparing bid specifications. When you go to build a park, we design everything we are going to build and the engineers will provide an engineers estimate, and then we take it to bid. What we are doing right now is designing the entire system; getting the quantities of signs; specifying materials the signs are going to be made out of; and we are getting bid specs for each one of these signs and the quantities. The project that we are paying $55,000 results in a system that has dollar amounts attached to it. At the end of this project, you are going to have an entire system throughout the City that says these are the signs we are going to have and these are the top priorities. Right now, we are designing the signs so they can be bid. As for the initial dollar amount of the contract, it was brought before the Economic Development Committee in October 2013, and it was talked about initially being $20,000. He then went back after doing some research, and noted if we are going to do this right it is going to cost $40,000 for the signs. Once we selected a contractor to do this, they said the City asked for wayfinding signage, but designing a logo is not the same as designing a wayfinding sign, and this is our recommendation for how to do this project. He then took that recommendation to the Council and said the consultant has recommended we do $40,000 to design the signs, but in order to have the logo work done, this is the cost of the logo design, but this is an option, you don’t have to do it. Council opted to do it at the same time because they wanted to see consistency between the signage and a logo that could be used in other applications.

In addition, when we selected design consultants, we went to the City’s professional services roster. You have to be on that roster in order to be eligible, unless we do a full
RFQ which is expensive; we chose this as the most efficient option. We then selected three consultants, and got two back by the deadline. As a committee, we met with the Mayor, and selected one of the two firms, and said we would like to negotiate the price.

Councilmember Lucarelli asked if the green color of the lights and benches were taken into consideration.

Development Director Bond noted this is not just a downtown project; this is a City-wide project. He thinks there is a benefit to the contrast of the colors. All your other signs are mostly green. You need something to contrast with the landscape to be highway visible. They did have green alternatives, but ultimately it was discussed by the Committee, and noted it was not the direction they wanted to go.

Council and staff continued to discuss the process it took to get where they are at right now, and they also offered their suggestions on which of the three alternative signs and colors they like.

**Council Direction:** Council gave staff their recommendations to provide to the contractor, which included a combination of colors and fonts of each of the three different signs.

### 5. Update: Development Agreements Ordinance

Development Director Bond stated we are working currently with a developer on a development agreement and we have learned the City has not adopted any local guidelines on how to bring forward a development agreement. Our interim attorney’s recommendation is that we establish an ordinance which lets developers know what the process is, and also lets City staff know what the process is. The attorney developed this ordinance for AWC and it has been vetted through Risk Management and was found to protect the City. This is being introduced, as we have a pending development agreement. In addition, this also lays out the provisions for phasing a plat.

In response to Councilmember Childs, Development Director Bond noted the general recommendation is not to discuss specific projects. If you approve this, you should make it available to everyone in the City instead of one specific applicant. This is only the process to put into place on how to handle a development agreement. You are not actually considering a development agreement at this point.

Also, the council will need to figure out how many years’ development agreements are limited to, as well as public noticing requirements. There is always a public hearing on a development agreement, but it is up to local cities to determine who we are going to tell.

Carol Morris, the city’s interim attorney, joined the meeting at 9:15 p.m.
In response to Councilmember Clauson, Ms. Morris said the development agreement is for providing flexibility.

Council and staff continued to discuss development agreements.

Councilmember Childs would be comfortable with the attorney and Mr. Bond coming up with an answer for how long development agreements should be valid.

Development Director Bond noted he would like to bring this back to Council before the end of the year. In addition, he will include language for public noticing in the ordinance.

**Council Direction**: Council directed staff to move forward with the ordinance to include to a public hearing process; include ‘Up to 20 years’ in the draft ordinance; and include the language of noticing the public within 300 feet.

**6. Discussion: Building Permit Extensions**

Development Director Bond noted the City issues building permits for site improvements such as water tanks, sewer pump stations, and retaining walls which are associated with a major site development activity permit. Often the developer wants to pick up all their permits at one time and to develop a site over a period of years. In some cases, significant site work must be performed prior to doing any work on the structure subject to a building permit. When work hasn’t been performed on the structure, the building permit expires after 180 days and a new permit is required. This is the case even though the Site Development Activity Permit (SDAP) is valid for 3 years and can be extended for a full 5 years. It is the desire of the department to allow for building permit extensions in cases like these whereby the building permit can be extended so long as the SDAP is active.

The proposed changes ties the expiration of a building permit with the underlying SDAP when that permit is for water, wastewater, stormwater or street improvements.

**Council Direction**: Council directed staff to move forward with the ordinance and schedule a public hearing.

**Councilmember Clauson MOVED and Councilmember Childs seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. Upon vote the motion passed unanimously.**

At 9:33 p.m., Mayor Matthes adjourned the meeting.

Brandy Rinearson, CMC, City Clerk

Timothy C. Matthes, Mayor