

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL MEETING
319 MAIN STREET
June 29, 2006

7:00 PM CALL TO ORDER - Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: Citizens are requested to keep comments to a 3 minute maximum to allow time for everyone to speak. It is also requested that you complete a comment form for further contact.

COUNCILMEMBER COMMENTS

CONSENT AGENDA: The following items are incorporated into the consent agenda and approved by a single motion of the Council.

- 1) Set Public Hearing on the B & O Tax Plan for July 13th during the regular meeting.
- 2) Set Public Hearing on Cable Utility Tax for July 13, 2006 during the regular meeting.
- 3) Refer Ordinances on the level of service to the Planning Board

ACTION ITEMS:

- 1) Skoglund Estates PUD - Resolution 06-09
- 2) AJ's Place Condominiums - Remand Back to Hearing Examiner
- 3) Voucher Approval
- 4) Sale of Property - Authorization for Appraisal

DISCUSSION: Time Permitting

- 1) Park District
- 2) Budget Policies
- 3) Police Bond/Levy

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

COUNCILMEMBER RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

Adjournment - 10:00 PM or at the conclusion of Council business.

ADA NOTICE: City of Sultan Community Center is accessible. Accommodations for persons with disabilities will be provided upon request. Please make arrangements prior to the meeting by calling City Hall at 360-793-2231. For additional information please contact the City at cityhall@ci.sultan.wa.us or visit our web site at www.ci.sultan.wa.us

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: Consent C 1

DATE: June 29, 2006

SUBJECT: B & O Tax Ordinances

CONTACT PERSON: Lee Walton, City Administrator

SUMMARY: The City has discussed the need to generate additional revenue and one of the sources considered is a B & O Tax on certain types of businesses within the City. Attached are copies of the draft ordinances which will be considered at the public hearing. To move this process along, we are requesting that a public hearing be set for July 13, 2006 to be held during the Council meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Set Public Hearing for July 13, 2006 during the regular Council meeting.

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: Consent C 2

DATE: June 29, 2006

SUBJECT: Utility Tax – Cable Service

CONTACT PERSON: Lee Walton, City Administrator

SUMMARY: The City has discussed the need to generate additional revenue and one of the sources considered is to extend the Utility tax to the Cable Service. The City currently imposing a 6% utility tax on electrical, gas, telecommunication service, water, sewer and garbage.
Attached is the draft ordinances which will be considered at the public hearing. To move this process along, we are requesting that a public hearing be set for July 13, 2006 to be held during the Council meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

RECOMMENDED Set Public Hearing for July 13, 2006 during the regular Council meeting.

ACTION:

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: Consent C 3A Ordinance 930-06 Amending Comprehensive Plan

DATE: June 29, 2006

SUBJECT: Ordinance 930-06 Amending Comprehensive Plan

CONTACT PERSON: City Attorney, Thom Graafstra and Rick Cisar, Director of Community Development

SUMMARY: City Council on June 15, 2006 directed Staff to prepared an Ordinance amending the Comprehensive Plan to include Option Two of the Draft Ordinance. Option Two would eliminate the Level of Service (LOS) for Police in Appendix B, page 74 of the Comprehensive Plan.

PREVIOUS SUMMARY: Staff has prepared the attached Ordinance providing for Two Options to amend the Comprehensive Plan. Option One would revise the Comprehensive Plan so the definitions for Capital Facility, adequate Capital Facilities, and available Capital Facilities used in the Plan and defined in Appendix A Definitions page 2.69 are consistent. Option Two would revise Appendix B: Level of Service (LOS) page 74 for Police by revising or eliminating the LOS. The Amending Ordinance would become effective immediately after the City Council conducted an advertised Public Hearing.

FISCAL IMPACT: Staff time in preparing and processing the Ordinance.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Motion to refer Ordinance Number 930-06 to the Planning Board for review and consideration through a Public Participation Process and thereafter forward the Board's Recommendation to the City Council and Director of Community Development.

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SULTAN WASHINGTON AMENDING THE CITY OF SULTAN'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVISING PAGE 74 IN APPENDIX B TO DELETE LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) FOR POLICE OFFICERS.

Whereas the City's Comprehensive Plan 2004 adopted on November 22, 2004 contains definitions for capital facility, adequate capital facilities, and available capital facilities that are not consistent at Appendix A – Definitions ;

Whereas the inconsistent definitions raise issues for concurrency determinations for the City in particular as to the level of service for police;

Whereas Appendix B – Level of Service establishes a proposed level of service for “Police officers – ratio per 1,000 population” of 2.6 which may not have been consistent with the ratio considered in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and which the City did not maintain when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted;

Whereas existing deficiencies in the Level of Service have lead the City's Hearing Examiner to find an absence of concurrency and to deny approval to a series of development applications;

Whereas the City is currently undergoing an administrative and financial reorganization;

Whereas the City is a small city with an extremely limited retail sales tax base;

Whereas the City has adopted, or is considering all available revenue options, including utility taxes on its municipal utilities, utility taxes on cable television services, a Business and Occupation tax, and exchange or retail sales tax for increased real estate excise tax;

Whereas the City has an outstanding obligation on Bonds for LID 97-1;

Whereas a major property owner within the LID has filed for bankruptcy relief and payment of the debtor's LID assessment only will be made when development is complete;

Whereas the Notice of a Public Hearing was given as follows:_____.

Whereas the Planning Board conducted a Public Hearing on:_____.

Whereas the notice of a Public Hearing was given as follows:_____.

Whereas the City Council conducted a Public Hearing on:_____.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby ordained by the City Council of City of Sultan, Washington as follows:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Sultan, Washington hereby finds that a financial emergency exists for the City. The City Council further finds that sufficient public notice and public participation occurred in light of the emergency situation.

Section 2. The City of Sultan's Comprehensive Plan 2004 is hereby amended by the substitution of a revised page 74 Appendix B Level of service (LOS).

Section 3. A public emergency having been declared, this Ordinance shall become effective immediately.

PASSED by the City Council and APPROVED by the Mayor this _____ day of _____, 2006.

CITY OF SULTAN

By _____
BEN TOLSON, Mayor

ATTEST:

By _____
LAURA KOENIG, City Clerk

Approved as to form:

By _____
THOM H. GRAAFSTRA, City Attorney

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: Consent C 3B Ordinance 931-06 Amending Sultan Municipal Code
Concurrency Management System

DATE: June 29, 2006

SUBJECT: Proposed Ordinance 931-06 Amending Sultan Municipal Code
Concurrency Management System

CONTACT PERSON: City Attorney, Thom Graafstra and Rick Cisar, Director of Community
Development

SUMMARY: Staff, at the direction of City Council, has finalized Ordinance 931-06
deleting the Police Concurrency provisions of the Sultan Municipal
Code.

**PREVIOUS
SUMMARY:** Staff has prepared the attached Ordinance 931-06 Amending the
Concurrency provisions of the Sultan Municipal Code (SMC)
deleting Police Protection from Section 16.108 Concurrency
Management.
Staff has prepared a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)
Checklist and issued a Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) for
the proposed Ordinance. The end of the Appeal period is July 10,
2006. In addition the proposed Ordinance has been sent to the
Department of Community Trade and Economic Development
(CTED) for their 60-day review which will end on August 12, 2006.
Upon completion of the above time lines, a Public Hearing will be
scheduled before the Planning Board.

FISCAL IMPACT: Staff time in preparing and processing the Ordinance.

**RECOMMENDED
ACTION:** Motion to refer Ordinance Number 931-06 to the
Planning Board for Review and Consideration through a Public
Participation Process and thereafter forward the Board's
Recommendation to the City Council and Director of Community
Development.

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

ORDINANCE NO. 931-06

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SULTAN, WASHINGTON MAKING THE CITY'S CONCURRENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INTERNALLY CONSISTENT, CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY'S UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE AND CONSISTENT WITH CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT BY AMENDING SULTAN MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 16.108.070 TO DELETE SUBSECTION D. POLICE PROTECTION AND REPEALING SULTAN MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 16.108.120

Whereas, the City has established a Concurrency Management System in Chapter 16.108 Sultan Municipal Code; and

Whereas, 16.108.010 indicates that the purpose is to meet the concurrency requirements of the City's Comprehensive Plan and the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070; and

Whereas, 16.108.010 indicates that a further purpose is to ensure that "adequate public facilities" exist; and

Whereas, the Growth Management Act defines public facilities at RCW 36.70A.030 (12) to include various streets, highways and other facilities; and

Whereas, Section 36.70A.070 requires concurrency for transportation facilities only; and

Whereas, the City's Comprehensive Plan likewise defines "concurrency" in terms of capital facilities only; AND

Whereas, the City's Comprehensive Plan does not establish a concurrency requirement for capital facilities for police services;

Whereas, the City wishes to make its concurrency system internally consistent, consistent with the balance of the City's Unified Development Code, consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan, and consistent with the Growth Management Act;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby ordained by the City Council of the City of Sultan as follows:

Section 1. Sultan Municipal Code Section 16.108.070 is amended to read as follows:

16.108.070 Facilities subject to concurrency

A concurrency test shall be made of the following public facilities for which level of service standards have been established in the comprehensive plan:

- A. Roadways;
- B. Potable water;
- C. Wastewater;
- D. Parks and recreation.

Section 2. Sultan Municipal Code Section 16.108.120 is hereby repealed.

Section 3. If any section of this ordinance shall be declared unlawful, the balance of this ordinance shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 4. This ordinance shall become effective on: _____.

PASSED by the City Council and APPROVED by the Mayor this ____ day of _____, 2006.

CITY OF SULTAN

By _____
BEN TOLSON, Mayor

ATTEST:

By _____
LAURA KOENIG, City Clerk

Approved as to form:

By _____
THOM H. GRAAFSTRA, City Attorney

Date of Publication: _____

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: A-1

DATE: June 29, 2006

SUBJECT: Resolution Number 06-09A Approving the Skoglund Estates Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat Application. File Number No. FP-PUD-05-005 and incorporating the Applicants and Staff Recommendations and Interpretations and Resolution Number 06-09 B Accepting the Hearing Examiner Recommendation deny the Skoglund Estates Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat Application.

CONTACT PERSON: Rick Cisar, Director of Community Development

SUMMARY: City Council conducted a Meeting/Closed Record Hearing on the Skoglund Estates Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development on June 15, 2006. City Council deferred their Decision on the matter until a Special City Council Meeting on June 29, 2006. Council received both verbal and written testimony concerning this Development Application. Recommended actions for City Council's consideration are based on the information provided at the Meeting/Hearing:

1) Approval of Resolution 06-09A Approving the Skoglund Estates PUD including acceptance of the Applicant's analysis and Staff's interpretation of SMC 16.10.110(B)(2)(d) Transit and find the project compliant. Find the project meets the Park, Recreation, and Open Space LOS based on the recent acquisitions of Park and Open Space properties. Approve the project subject to a Condition that Police Concurrency be in place concurrent with the impacts of the development based on the Council's previous actions taken to address the Police LOS issue.

(2) Approval of Resolution 06-09B accepting the Hearing Examiner's May 2, 2006 Recommendation Denying the Skoglund Estates Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Subdivision and returning it to the Applicant for modification as necessary to meet Approval criteria for Transit and compliance with Concurrency Management for Police Services and Parks, Recreation and Open Space.

PREVIOUS SUMMARY: The Hearing Examiner held an Open Record Hearing on April 25, 2006, and considered a request for Reconsideration on May 12, 2005 for the Skoglund Estates Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development– File Number No. FP-PUD-05-005. Based on the Findings of Fact, Principles of Law, Discussion and Conclusions the testimony and evidence submitted at the Hearing, the Hearing Examiner's site visit the Examiner RECOMMENDS that the Skoglund Estates Planned Unit Development be DENIED and that the Skoglund

Estates Preliminary Subdivision be RETURNED TO THE APPLICANT FOR MODIFICATION as necessary to meet approval criteria and to demonstrate compliance with Section 16.10.110 (B) (2)(d) regarding Transit and Chapter 16.108 SMC, concurrency Management System, regarding police services and parks, recreation, and open space. The Examiner, on Page 3 beginning with findings #3 through # 9 reviews Police Services Level of Service (LOS) and on page 6, beginning with findings #10 through #16 reviews Park, Recreation and Open Space Level of Service (LOS). On page 7, the Examiner in findings #17 # 18 reviews PUD Locational Requirements for Transit.

The CONCLUSIONS of the Examiner for Concurrency-General begin on page 13 #1 through #7, Concurrency–Police Services, page 15, # 8 through #11, Concurrency-Parks, Recreation, and Open Space page 15, # 12 through #16. Conclusion #17 provides a Concurrency-Summary. The CONCLUSIONS for PUD Locational Criteria (Transit) begin on page 16, with #18 through # 22 and Summary #23.

The Applicant on, May 12, 2006 submitted a Reconsideration Request to the Hearing Examiner requesting Reconsideration of his May 2, 2006 decision. The Hearing Examiner on May 15, 2006 denied the request for Reconsideration and reaffirmed the Recommendation issued on May 15, 2006.

Staff, as noted in the attached May 18, 2006 memo to the Hearing Examiner does not concur with the Hearing Examiner’s conclusions regarding SMC 16.10.110(B)(2)(d). The language in this Section certainly may leave it open to interpretation and in this instance has led to different conclusions by the Hearing Examiner, the Applicant and Staff. Unfortunately, Staff’s written interpretation could not be submitted as part of the reconsideration request by the Applicant.

Therefore, the City Council has the option to follow (1) the (Hearing Examiner’s Recommendation, (2) the Applicants request (page 6 of Appeal) (3) to Approve or Deny the request based on the Council’s own set of findings and conclusions. To assist City Council in their evaluation of this project and the Recommendations, Staff has attached the April 15, 2006 staff report that provides a project overview.

FISCAL IMPACT: Processing of request.

RECOMMENDATION ACTION: In consideration of the information provided at the Meeting/Hearing held on June 15, 2006 move for adoption of Resolution 06-09 A Approving the Development or 06-09 B Deny the Development.

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

CITY OF SULTAN

Sultan, Washington

RESOLUTION NO. 06-09A

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SULTAN REJECTING THE HEARING EXAMINER'S RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVING THE SKOGLUND ESTATES PRELIMINARY PLAT AND PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND PRELIMINARY PLAT APPLICATION

WHEREAS Sultan 144 LLC filed an application for approval of the Skoglund Estates Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat Application;

WHEREAS an open record hearing occurred before the City's Hearing Examiner on April 25, 2006;

WHEREAS the Hearing Examiner made a recommendation dated May 2, 2006;

WHEREAS Sultan 144 LLC sought reconsideration of the Hearing Examiner's decision as it pertains to issues relating to concurrency;

WHEREAS the Hearing Examiner denied reconsideration on May 15, 2006;

WHEREAS Sultan City Staff by Memorandum dated May 18, 2006 advised the City Council that the Staff did not agree with the Hearing Examiner's interpretation of SMC 16.10.110(B)(2.)(d.);

WHEREAS Applicant, Sultan 144 LLC, filed an Appeal of the Hearing Examiner's Decision Denying Motion for Reconsideration to the City Council dated May 25, 2006,

WHEREAS the application came before the City Council for a closed record hearing on June 15, 2006;

WHEREAS the City Council has determined based upon the law and the facts to accept the Hearing Examiner's findings of fact in part, to reject the Hearing Examiner's Conclusions of Law, and to reject the Hearing Examiner's recommendation and approve the application;

NOW, THEREFORE:

1. The City Council rejects the recommendation of the Hearing Examiner and approves the Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development of Skoglund Estates With Conditions as set out in the Staff Report dated April 17, 2006, pages 11-17, and as modified below.

2. Commencing at page 3 of the Hearing Examiner's Recommendation, the Hearing Examiner made 20 Findings of Fact. The Council adopts the Hearing Examiner's Findings of Fact 1-17. Finding of Fact 18 is rejected. Based upon the evidence in the record and judicial notice the Council makes the following additional Findings of Fact:

18. Community Transit routes 270, 271 and 271 service the Sultan Park & Ride on US 2 east of 10th Street approximately 1.0 mile from the site. Service is provided through the City and to and from Everett via Snohomish and Monroe. Development of the type herein will facilitate and increase the prospect of a direct route along Sultan Basin Road. The Council finds that the site is in sufficient proximity in light of these facts to be approved as a PUD.

19. Subsequent to the open record hearing in this matter on April 25, 2006, the City Council enacted Ordinance 922-06 annexing 35 acres adjoining the City's water treatment plant to the City and designating said property for public use, including public parks. This property is suitable for public park use, and should be counted in the land available as public park in the City. The

addition of this acreage provides sufficient additional public park facilities in the City so that the City's level of service for parks is still met, notwithstanding this application.

20. Applicant offered at the open record hearing a developer agreement to pay the developer's pro rata share for one year of the cost of a police officer to mitigate the impacts of this development. Thereafter, the revenues from real estate taxes on the increased value of the property will be available to the City's general fund.

3. Beginning at page 13 of the Hearing Examiner's Recommendation are 25 Conclusions of Law. The Council rejects all 25 Conclusions of Law and makes the following Conclusions of Law and Conditions:

Conclusions of Law and Conditions:

1. The proposed Preliminary PUD and Plat is found to be in conformance with the general purposes of the Comprehensive Plan and Planning Standards and specifications as adopted by the laws of the State of Washington and the City of Sultan.
2. Based upon Finding of Fact 19 above, this proposed development does not lower the existing level of service for parks below the adopted LOS in the comprehensive plan.
3. The City's existing level of service for police is below the adopted LOS in the comprehensive plan. The LOS failure for police, however, was not caused by this proposed development, and further reduction in the LOS caused by this proposed development is modest by comparison to the existing deficiency.
4. The Council takes notice of the recommendations in the Prothman Report accepted by the Council and Ordinance 900-06. The City has adopted a utility tax applicable to its municipal utilities and has received recommendations for additional tax options, including a utility tax on cable television service, an increased real estate excise tax, and a B & O tax. Other funding sources include potential developer loans to advance the receipt of payment of needed funds, and monies contributed by proposed development for their impacts on the LOS. A combination of developer agreements and public funds will put in place the required public services for police concurrent with development impacts, and provide appropriate strategies for the six years from the time of development to achieve the necessary police LOS as now established or as subsequently revised.
5. The Council takes notice of the Applicant's offer at the open record hearing to deliver to the City a Developer Agreement to pay Applicant's incremental share for a police officer for one year.
6. Based upon the foregoing, this proposed development is deemed concurrent.
7. Based upon finding of fact 18, this application satisfies the locational requirements for a PUD.
8. The Council accepts Conditions 1 through 40 beginning at page 11 of the Staff Report, with the following modifications:
 - a. The word "shall" will replace the word "should" in Conditions 15, 17, and 19.
 - b. The word "shall will replace the word "may" in Condition 20.
 - c. Condition 30 is amended to include the word "frontage" between the words "subdivision" and "and".
 - d. Condition 35 is deleted.

PASSED BY THE Sultan City Council and **APPROVED** by the Mayor this ____ day of _____ 2006.

CITY OF SULTAN

By _____
Ben Tolson, Mayor

Attest:

By _____
Laura Koenig, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

Thomas Graafstra, City Attorney

CITY OF SULTAN

Sultan, Washington

RESOLUTION NO. 06-09B

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SULTAN DENYING SKOGLUND
ESTATES PRELIMINARY PLAT AND PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT
AND PRELIMINARY PLAT APPLICATION**

WHEREAS Sultan 144 LLC filed an application for approval of the Skoglund Estates Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat Application;

WHEREAS an open record hearing occurred before the City’s Hearing Examiner on April 25, 2006;

WHEREAS the Hearing Examiner made a recommendation dated May 2, 2006;

WHEREAS Sultan 144 LLC sought reconsideration of the Hearing Examiner’s decision as it pertains to issues relating to concurrency;

WHEREAS the Hearing Examiner denied reconsideration on May 15, 2006;

WHEREAS Sultan City Staff by Memorandum dated May 18, 2006 advised the City Council that the Staff did not agree with the Hearing Examiner’s interpretation of SMC 16.10.110(B)(2.)(d.);

WHEREAS Applicant, Sultan 144 LLC, filed an Appeal of the Hearing Examiner’s Decision Denying Motion for Reconsideration to the City Council dated May 25, 2006,

WHEREAS the application came before the City Council for a closed record hearing on June 15, 2006;

WHEREAS the City Council has determined based upon the law and the facts to accept the Hearing Examiner’s recommendation;

NOW, THEREFORE:

3. The City Council accepts the Recommendation of the Hearing Examiner to deny the Skoglund Estates Planned Unit Development, and

2. Remands the Application to the Applicant, Sultan 144 LLC, for modification as necessary to meet the approval criteria and to demonstrate compliance with Chapter 16.108 SMC, Concurrency management System, regarding police services, and parks, recreation and open space.

PASSED BY THE Sultan City Council and **APPROVED** by the Mayor this ____ day of _____ 2006.

CITY OF SULTAN

By _____
Ben Tolson, Mayor

Attest:

By _____
Laura Koenig, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

Thomas Graafstra, City Attorney

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NUMBER: A-2
AJ's Place Remand Request to Hearing Examiner

DATE: June 29, 2006

SUBJECT: Request to remand AJ's Place Binding Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to Hearing Examiner

CONTACT PERSON: Rick Cisar, Director of Community Development

SUMMARY: I received the attached letter dated June 16, 2006 from Dennis Jordon regarding the Hearing Examiner's May 12, 2006 Recommendation for the AJ'S Place Development. The Hearing Examiner in his Recommendation noted (1) a deficiency in the traffic analysis; (2) a disagreement with the Recommendation of the Design Review Board; and (3) the issue of compliance with Concurrency Standards for Parks and Police. Remanding the Application back to the Hearing Examiner will allow the Applicant to provide the information the Hearing Examiner requested on the Traffic analysis and Design Review Board and thereafter prepare a Recommendation to the City Council. Staff estimates remanding the Application back to the Hearing Examiner at this time will save 30 to 45 days in processing and review time. A tentative meeting before the Hearing Examiner has been scheduled for July 10, 2006.

FISCAL IMPACT: Processing request.

RECOMMENDATION ACTION: In consideration of the request from Mr. Jordon, remand the AJ's Place Binding Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit to the Hearing Examiner in order to provide the additional documentation requested by the Hearing Examiner.

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: Action A 3

DATE: June 29, 2006

SUBJECT: Voucher Approval

CONTACT PERSON: Laura Koenig

SUMMARY: Staff is currently preparing vouchers for payment on June 29, 2006 and will provide the backup documentation at the meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Authorization to issue payment on the approved vouchers.

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: Action A 4

DATE: June 29, 2006

SUBJECT: Voucher Approval

CONTACT PERSON: Mayor Tolson

SUMMARY: The City owns a building lot on Date Street which is the current location for emergency siren. Discussion has been held regarding relocating the siren and surplusing the lot. At this time we would like to request an appraisal on the lot to determine the market value and are requesting authorization to expend the necessary funds.

FISCAL IMPACT:

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Authorization to expend funds for an appraisal on the parcel.

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE: