

Longview City Council Agenda

November 9, 2006 – 7:00 p.m.

The City Hall is accessible for persons with disabilities. Special equipment to assist the hearing impaired is also available. Please contact the City Executive Offices at 360.442.5004 48 hours in advance if you require special accommodations to attend the meeting.

01. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Dennis Weber

02. INVOCATION/FLAG SALUTE

Calvin Mustion, Victory Center

03. ROLL CALL

**04. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 26, 2006
([LINK TO PAPERWORK](#))**

05. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

06. PRESENTATIONS & AWARDS

**A. PROCLAMATION: NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK
([LINK TO PAPERWORK](#))**

B. PRESENTATION: RECOGNIZING CITY SPECIAL PROGRAM SPONSORS

**C. YOUTH & FAMILY LINK COMMUNITY CENTER PHASE 2 PLANNING PROJECT
REPORT -2005 CDB PLANNING GRANT**

The Toutle River Ranch/Youth and Family Link Program received a 2005 Community Development Block Grant for \$16,500 to develop a plan to expand structured youth activities and programs within a new gymnasium for youth K-12. The agency recently completed construction of Phase 1 comprising program offices and youth activity areas located at 907 Douglas St. In preparation for Phase II of their facility, the agency has completed the report entitled “*Planning for Phase II, Youth and Family Link’s Community Center Project.*” The report contains an overview of the goals and strategies which it was designed around, community partnerships involved, an analysis of community needs, defined uses and priorities, funding possibilities, design concept, proposed facility operations and sustainability, and next steps.

In addition to the Report, a large binder of Appendices provides planning report documentation of subcommittee meetings, focus groups, a Youth and Recreational Facilities grant application to CTED (recently awarded), Longview Parks & Recreation Teen Surveys (2005 & 2006), Washington State Nutrition and Physical Activity Plan, and a series of reports and strategic plan from Cowlitz on the Move. The accompanying Appendices document is available for Council & public review in the City of Longview Executive Office and the Community Development Department.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

No action required.

([LINK TO PAPERWORK](#))

07. CONSTITUENTS COMMENTS – (30 MINUTES)

08. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING ON UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

At the October 26, 2006 regular meeting, the City Council voted to continue the public hearing on the draft Comprehensive Plan Update to their November 9, 2006 meeting. The purpose of this agenda summary is to provide the Council with information or testimony received since the October 26 hearing. You may have already received some of the attached testimony but City staff wanted to make sure it was available in one place and/or available electronically.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt the Final Draft of the Comprehensive Plan Update (to be called City of Longview 2006 Comprehensive Plan) and direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance for City Council approval.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

09. BOARD & COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS - None

10. ORDINANCES & RESOLUTIONS

A. ORDINANCE NO. 2963, AMENDING UPDATING SECTION 7.36.070 TO ALLOW THE CITY MANAGER, OR HIS DESIGNEE, THE AUTHORITY TO APPROVE ANY PROMOTION, CONCERT, SHOW, SALE OR DISPLAY OF MERCHANDISE WITHIN A PUBLIC PARK OF THE CITY

Ordinance No. 2963 is presented for the purpose of amending and updating LMC § 7.36.070. This item follows up on council discussion and direction from three months ago. Under that section of the municipal code, any promotion, concert, show, sale or display of merchandise requires the permission of the City Council. The amendment would allow such activities upon the approval of the City Manager, or his designee. In addition, the ordinance updates the title to more closely identify the contents of that section from “Exhibitions of works of art.” to “Displays and sales” as well as updates the title of “park superintendent” to that of “director of parks and recreation.”

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2963.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

B. ORDINANCE NO. 2965, AMENDING 11.63.040, REGARDING SENIOR PARKING

The Parking Committee has met with representatives of the Senior Center, and downtown area businesses in an effort to address the issue of providing senior citizens attending events at the Senior Center with adequate nearby parking, while at the same time ensuring continued adequate parking for downtown customers and employees. To this end, the Parking Committee recommends providing an exemption to the three hour time limit in the parking lot located half a block away at the corner of 12th Avenue and Florida Street, commonly referred to as Lot #78S, for persons who obtain and display in their vehicles the same type of parking permit issued by the Parks and Recreation Department that authorizes senior citizens to park in the parking lot immediately adjacent to the Senior Center.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2965.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

C. ORDINANCE NO. 2966, AMENDING AND UPDATING SECTION 7.36.070(1) OF THE LONGVIEW MUNICIPAL CODE, TO ALLOW FOR FIXED WORK OF ART IN THE PUBLIC PARKS UPON APPROVAL BY THE CITY COUNCIL

Ordinance No. 2966 is presented for the purpose of amending and updating LMC § 7.36.070(1). Under that section of the municipal code “no fixed work of art shall be placed in any public park.” Fixed works of art already exist in our public parks. Thus, the amendment would update the section of the code to allow for such art upon approval of the City Council.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2966.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

D. ORDINANCE NO. 2967, ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT RE: WAY-FINDING SIGNS IN D-C DOWNTOWN COMMERCE DISTRICT

The attached ordinance was prepared at the direction of the City Council on October 26, 2006, to allow way-finding signs in the Downtown Commerce (D-C) district and elsewhere in the City.

The Ordinance includes the following amendments:

19.12.050 Power of board – Special property use.

(The following subsection added)

(4) The placement, construction, erection and maintenance of way-finding signs, as defined in LMC 16.13.040(73), in all use districts, shall be deemed a special property use.

19.52.100 Signs

(The following subsection added)

(6) Way-finding Signs, as described in LMC section 16.13.040(73), and as approved by the Appeal Board of Adjustment in accordance with LMC section 16.13.020, shall be permitted in the D-C District.

16.13.020 Amendments to Uniform Sign Code

(The following new paragraph added to Section 103.3 Board of Appeals)

In order to provide for reasonable interpretation of the provision of this Chapter, and in order to approve the placement, construction, erection and maintenance of Way-finding Signs as defined in LMC 16.13.040, the Appeal Board of Adjustment shall have the authority and powers provided by LMC section 19.12.050 to grant Special Property use permits for the placement, construction, erection and maintenance of Way-finding Signs in all use districts.

16.13.040 New chapter added to Uniform Sign Code

(The following new paragraph added to Section 1503 Exempt signs)

(16) Way-finding Signs as approved by the Appeal Board of Adjustment

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2967.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

E. RESOLUTION NO. 1846, AUTHORIZING AN INCREASE IN THE 2007 REGULAR PROPERTY TAX LEVY

Referendum #47 (now codified as RCW Chapter 84.55) limits ad valorem taxes to 100% of the previous year’s levy, plus the value of new construction and improvements; this is called a “limit factor”. In order to exceed the “limit factor,” Section 209 of Ref. 47 requires cities to adopt a

Resolution authorizing any increase in the ad valorem tax levy to a “limit factor” established by the city, which cannot exceed the lesser of one percent or inflation, as defined by the Implicit Price Deflator (IPD). This Resolution complies with the language of Initiative 747 approved by voters on November 6, 2001 in that it represents a one percent increase over the highest allowable levy since 1985. This Resolution authorizes a levy for 2007 in an amount which is 101.5615% of the 2006 levy, which constitutes 101.0% of the statutory maximum levy from previous years. In addition, the City is requesting an additional levy increase of 0.5615% in accordance with RCW 84.68.040 for the purpose of a tax refund made to the QWEST Corporation, authorized by the Washington State Supreme Court on April 17, 2006. The City of Longview's share of this refund levy amounts to \$38,803.42. Pursuant to WAC 458-19-085, a refund levy is exempt from the 101% levy limitation. Such a Resolution must follow a public hearing regarding revenue sources. The public hearing for the 2007 General Fund Revenue Sources was held on October 26, 2006.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 1846.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

F. ORDINANCE NO. 2968, FIXING AMOUNT TO BE RAISED BY AD VALOREM TAXES FOR THE 2007 BUDGET

The attached ordinance fixes the estimated amount to be raised by ad valorem taxes for the 2007 Budget. For 2007, the requested ad valorem tax rate is \$3.13 per \$1,000 of assessed value. The \$3.13 per \$1,000 represents a \$0.47 reduction from the \$3.60 ad valorem tax rate levied in 2006. Based on the preliminary assessed value of \$2,308,297,158 provided by the Cowlitz County Assessor's office the estimate for 2007 taxes payable is \$7,227,143. The attached Ordinance sets the 2007 ad valorem tax levy rate at 101.5615% above the 2006 ad valorem tax levy rate. An ordinance setting the 2007 levy rate must be in the hands of the County Commissioners by November 30, 2006; if not, the maximum rate that can be levied is the same as the 2006 rate.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2968.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

G. ORDINANCE NO. 2969, CONSTRUCTION PERMIT FEES

In an effort to minimize the impact of permit fees to our community, the building, mechanical and plumbing permit fee schedules are assessed annually for adjustment based on local inflationary trends and submitted to Council for fee schedule amendment consideration. The codes and ordinances adopted by the City of Longview regulating the built environment require the Department of Community and Economic Development to perform certain reviews, issue permits and inspect new construction and existing occupancies to assure compliance with codes and ordinances. In accordance with Council's goal of defraying the city's costs and expenses in processing construction applications, reviews, permits, and inspections, staff is proposing an amended schedule of permit fees. The CPI (Consumer Price Index) numbers for 2006 to date for our community equate to an approximate 2.4% increase. Staff requests Council approval for increasing building, plumbing, and mechanical permit fees accordingly.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2969.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

H. ORDINANCE NO. 2970, PLANNING FEES

The codes and ordinances adopted by the City of Longview concerning land use, development, and zoning require the Department of Community Development to perform certain review, approval and inspection to support land development and new construction, issue permits and periodically inspect existing occupancies to assure compliance with land use codes and ordinances. In 2005, in accordance with Council's goal of defraying the city's costs and expenses in processing land use applications, including the publication and mailing of notices required by law and the holding of land use hearings and appeals, staff proposed an amended schedule of land use application and permit fees. A comparison of adjoining jurisdictions and jurisdictions of similar size resulted in the amended planning fee schedule identified as Table 19-A of the Longview Municipal Code. The Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of this fee increase. At the request of the Lower Columbia Contractor's Association representing the local construction industry, Council agreed to phase implementation of the proposed fees, 65% in 2006 and the remaining 35% in 2007. This fee schedule completes the agreed upon phasing.

In an effort to minimize the future impact of fees to our community, the land use fee schedule will be assessed annually for adjustment based on local inflationary trends and submitted to Council for fee schedule amendment consideration.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2970.

[*\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)*](#)

I. ORDINANCE NO. 2971, FIRE INSPECTION FEES

In an effort to minimize the impact of fees to our community, the Fire Code permit, plan review and inspection fee schedules are assessed annually for adjustment based on local inflationary trends and submitted to Council for fee schedule amendment consideration. In accordance with Council's goal of defraying the city's costs and expenses in processing construction applications, reviews, permits, and inspections, staff is proposing an amended schedule of permit fees. The CPI (Consumer Price Index) numbers for 2006 to date for the Northwest region equate to an approximate 2.4% increase. Staff requests Council approval for increasing Fire Code permit, plan review and inspection fees accordingly.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2971.

[*\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)*](#)

J. ORDINANCE NO. 2972, ENVIRONMENTAL FEES

The codes and ordinances adopted by the City of Longview concerning SEPA, Critical Areas, Shoreline Management, and Storm Water/Erosion Control require the Department of Community and Economic Development to perform certain review, approval and inspection to support land development and new construction, issue permits and periodically inspect to assure compliance with applicable codes and ordinances. In 2005, in accordance with Council's goal of defraying the city's costs and expenses in processing environmental reviews and permits, staff proposed the establishment of a schedule of environmental application, review and permit fees. A comparison of adjoining jurisdictions and jurisdictions of similar size in resulted in the creation of a proposed environmental review and permit fee schedule identified as Table 17-A of the Longview Municipal Code. At the request of the Lower Columbia Contractor's Association representing the local construction industry, Council agreed to phase implementation of the proposed fees,

65% in 2006 and the remaining 35% in 2007. This fee schedule completes the agreed upon phasing.

In an effort to minimize the future impact of fees to our community, the environmental review and permit fee schedule will be assessed annually for adjustment based on local inflationary trends and submitted to Council for fee schedule amendment consideration.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2972.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

11. MAYOR'S REPORT AND COUNCILMEMBERS' REPORTS

A. NLC CONGRESS OF CITIES – VOTING DELEGATE

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

12. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. APPROVAL OF CLAIMS

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

B. LIABILITY CLAIMS

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

C. PROJECT COMPLETION CERTIFICATION: LONGVIEW LIBRARY ELEVATOR REPLACEMENT

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

D. STREET USE PERMIT NO. S-06-24: JUMBO'S TOY RUN

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

13. LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATIONS

A. NEW APPLICATION

Scott Turnell Klemetsrud has requested a Liquor License from the Washington State Liquor Control Board requesting to sell Spirits/beer and/or wine in a restaurant/lounge at a new restaurant to be called Metro. This restaurant will be located at 933 15th Ave., the former site of Specialty Dry Cleaning. The police department has no concerns with either the applicant or the location.

An extension until November 16, 2006 was granted by the Washington State Liquor Control Board due to the timing of the receipt of this request.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion as desired by Council.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

B. SPECIAL OCCASION APPLICATION

This special occasion liquor license request shown on the exhibit is for the fourth annual wine tasting event to be held in conjunction with a silent auction for Hospice at the Moose Lodge on Washington Way. It is scheduled for November 18, 2006 from 5 PM to 10 PM. They will be selling wine by the glass as well as by the bottle (that a purchaser can take off premises) in the dance floor area, away from the regular bar. Hors d'oeuvres will be served as well. The police department has no concerns in reference to this request.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion as desired by Council.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

14. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

A. SET PUBLIC HEARING (11/30/06) FOR 2007-2008 BUDGET

RCW 35A.34.110 requires cities to conduct a formal public hearing on the proposed biennial budget. Copies of the 2007-2008 Biennial Budget and 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Plan will be made available to Council and to members of the public prior to the public hearing. This review shall be held at a public hearing that has been duly advertised to the public. Public hearing notices on the proposed 2007-2008 Biennial Budget and 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Plan are scheduled for publication on November 10, 2006 and November 15, 2006.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to set Public Hearing on proposed 2007-2008 Biennial Budget and 2007 - 2011 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) on November 30, 2006 and December 14, 2006.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

B. REQUEST TO HIRE FIRM TO CONDUCT ENUMERATION FOR RICK & COLUMBIA HEIGHTS ASSEMBLY OF GOD CHURCH ANNEXATION AREAS

Per RCW 35A.14.700, whenever any territory is annexed to a code city, a census of that territory must be submitted to the Office of Financial Management within thirty days of the effective date of annexation. The count of population and housing in annexations shall be made in "accordance with practices and policies, and subject to the approval of The Office of Financial Management (OFM)."

City staff is requesting authorization to hire Glenn MacGilvra to conduct the required census for both the Rick and Columbia Heights Assembly of God annexations. These annexations total 553 acres with 586 tax parcels and an estimated population of 1,800. The Rick Annexation has numerous apartment buildings which are more difficult to get a population count. Staff does not have the resources to conduct the required enumerations without severely impacting normal duties.

Glenn MacGilvra was highly recommended by Office of Financial Management staff. He also received a very positive recommendation from the City of Bonney Lake. He has conducted numerous enumerations in the Puget Sound area and elsewhere and is very familiar with OFM census requirements. City staff conducted a search for alternative firms. Municipal Research and Services Center, the City of Vancouver and others were contacted. Staff also explored hiring a local firm. No other viable options were found.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to authorize the City Manager to contract with Glenn MacGilvra to conduct a census for both the Rick Annexation and the Columbia Heights Assembly of God Annexation and appropriate \$15,000 in the 2005-06 Supplemental Budget Amendment. Each census must meet OFM census standards. The contract amount is not to exceed \$15,000 without further approval from the City Council.

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

15. MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION

A. BUSINESS LICENSES

[\(LINK TO PAPERWORK\)](#)

16. ADJOURNMENT

NEXT COUNCIL MEETINGS:

SPECIAL MEETING THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2006 AT 7 P.M. REPLACES
REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 23 *CANCELLED* DUE TO THANKSGIVING
HOLIDAY

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2006 AT 7 P.M.

SPECIAL MEETING THURSDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2006 AT 4:00 P.M., PAY BILLS ONLY

NEXT COUNCIL WORKSHOP:

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16 OR DECEMBER 21, 2007 AT 7 P.M. – CITIZENS
SUMMIT/LEGISLATIVE ISSUES FOR 2007

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION
OF THE LONGVIEW CITY COUNCIL
HELD THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2006

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Weber.

2. INVOCATION/FLAG SALUTE

The invocation was pronounced by Bill Wells, First Baptist Church. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. ROLL CALL

Present:

Mayor Dennis Weber
Councilman Kurt Anagnostou
Councilman Andy Busack
Councilman Don Jensen
Councilwoman Ramona Leber
Councilman Chet Makinster
Councilwoman Mary Jane Melink
City Manager Bob Gregory
City Attorney Marilyn Haan
City Clerk Ann Davis

City Staff Present

David Campbell, Assistant City Manager; Robbie Berg, Human Resources Director; John Brickey, Director of Community Development; Jeff Cameron, Public Works Director; Daryl McDaniel, Fire Chief; Alex Perez, Police Chief; Kurt Sacha, Finance Director; Chris Skaugset, Library Director; Julie Hourclé, Community Development Entitlement Coordinator; Al George, Parks Maintenance Supervisor; Steve Langdon, Principal Planner, Community Development; and Susie Meyers, Public Information Specialist.

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

On a motion duly made and passed, the reading of the minutes of the regular Council meeting held October 12, 2006, copies of which had been submitted to the Mayor and members of the City Council, was waived and the minutes were approved as if read.

5. CHANGES/REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

Due to the number of constituents present tonight wishing to speak regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update, Mayor Weber announced that he would like to postpone Constituents' Comments until after all four public hearings have been held.

6. PRESENTATIONS & AWARDS

A. Presentation of Thirty-Year Service Awards to City Employees.

City Manager Gregory asked Council to come down in front of the dais in order to shake hands with each of the employees being recognized tonight. He introduced Director of Human Resources Robbie Berg to present these awards.

Director of Human Resources Robbie Berg noted it was her pleasure to honor long-time City employees for their work, community service and dedication. Since Longview is a Tree City, USA, staff felt it would be appropriate to award each of these long-time employees a cypress tree seedling; the cypress symbolizes faithfulness. When planted, each small tree will “represent the limitless potential of the City and its residents.”

Mrs. Berg read a short biography of each employee’s history with the City. Employees then received their cypress trees from City Manager Gregory, shook hands with Mr. Gregory and with the entire Council.

Employees present for the awards were: Bobbie Whitmire, Water/Sewer; Jimmy Walke, Water/Sewer; Jerry Richie, Library; Terry Kegler, Community Development; Janet Jacobs, IT; Steve Harris, Street/Transit; Dean Hammond, Parks Maintenance; Frank Cox, Parks Maintenance, and Don Barnd, Police. Also honored but unable to attend this meeting were Melody Worth, Finance; Jim Morkert, Fire Department; Mark Burchim, Engineering; and Dan Bishop, Finance.

Human Resources Director Robbie Berg also had service awards to present to Councilmembers: Mayor Dennis Weber was presented with a pin and certificate honoring 15 years of service; Councilwoman Ramona Leber, ten years; and Councilmembers Don Jensen and Kurt Anagnostou, each five years of service.

B. Proclamation: CAP Weatherization Day.

Mayor Weber asked CAP representative Marie Robbins come forward to the podium while he read the Proclamation declaring October 30, 2006, ‘Weatherization Day’ in the City of Longview. The Proclamation urged all citizens of Longview to join in a “special observance of energy conservation programs provided by Lower Columbia Community Action Council (CAP).”

Ms. Robbins thanked Council for supporting the weatherization program at CAP. It is a very important part of the programs CAP furnishes. CAP has a lengthy list of people waiting to obtain weatherization services so they can afford to heat their houses.

7. CONSTITUENTS' COMMENTS – Held after Public Hearings.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 2007 Projected Revenue Sources and Ad Valorem Taxes.

City Manager Gregory stated this public hearing is part of the annual budget process. He asked Finance Director Kurt Sacha to make this review of projected revenue sources.

Finance Director Sacha recapped that state law requires municipalities to present their projected revenue sources and hold a public hearing. Using a series of PowerPoint slides, Mr. Sacha

pointed out the principal source of revenue as taxes (81%), followed by licenses and permit fees; intergovernmental charges; charges for services; and fines and forfeitures. Of the tax monies, the property tax revenues contribute the most, followed by sales tax, and B & O taxes. Total revenue is estimated to be \$28,137,380 for the year 2007.

Several pie charts illustrated the proportions of revenues by source and the distribution of those monies in the General Fund.

Mr. Sacha stated the 2006 Ad Valorem tax levy was \$3.60/thousand valuation of real property. He proposed a 2007 Ad Valorem tax levy of \$3.13/thousand, a decrease of 47¢ per thousand. By law imposed by I-747, the City can collect only 1% more in property taxes than the previous year. Mr. Sacha showed the calculations by which he derived the reduced Ad Valorem rate, citing increases in sales taxes, building permit fees, etc., as helping to decrease the overall rate and yet raise an additional 1% in total revenues.

The reduced Ad Valorem rate of \$3.13/thousand would be \$470 on a \$150,000 house. In 2006, taxes on a \$150,000 house were \$540 at the \$3.60/thousand rate.

The Mayor opened the public hearing for comment at 7:41 p.m. There being no comments, either written or oral, the public hearing was closed.

Councilman Makinster moved to direct the City Attorney to prepare the appropriate Ordinance adopting the 2007 Ad Valorem Tax rate. This motion was seconded by Councilman Anagnostou. Upon a vote duly held, the motion was unanimously approved.

B. Annexation No. ANX 2006-2, West Pine II, 60% Petition.

City Manager Gregory asked Director of Community Development John Brickey to give Council a recap on this item.

Mr. Brickey explained petitioner Gloria Marthaller had submitted a 60% petition to annex 50± acres into the City. The City Council accepted that petition on August 10, 2006. During staff review, staff added several more parcels to the proposed annexation area in order to make the boundary more regular. The proposed annexation area involves properties that are west of the existing City limits between Ohio Street and Pennsylvania Street and east of 48th Avenue. A map of the proposed annexation area was included in Council's agenda packet.

This public hearing is required pursuant to RCW 35A.14.130.

Staff received the Cowlitz County Assessor's certification and determination of sufficiency for petition for annexation on September 1, 2006.

The 1993 Comprehensive Plan designates the area as Low Density Residential. The Draft 2006 Comprehensive Plan Update does not propose any changes to that designation.

The Planning Commission has not yet had the opportunity to recommend what the subject property should be zoned. As such, City staff is recommending that the area, if annexed, be

zoned R-1 Residential District. Prior to the City Council adoption of an annexation ordinance, the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing on the zoning designation.

The Longview School District has expressed an interest in being included in the annexation area; the School District had been a party to two prior failed attempts at annexation. Mr. Brickey advised the Robert Gray School could be brought into the annexation area by the Cowlitz County Boundary Review Board (BRB). At Council's direction, staff will prepare a letter to the BRB asking them to invoke jurisdiction.

Mr. Brickey showed an overhead of the currently proposed annexation area; this version included the several extra parcels included by staff. Some of these included property owners had previously signed annexation agreements with the City.

Noting there are difficulties inherent in attempting annexation of large areas, Mr. Brickey said the Rick annexation currently taking place is the largest the City has attempted in both area and population. Staff will be coming to Council at a later date to request \$15,000 to fund the enumeration of the population in this area, a requirement for annexation.

Councilman Jensen noted he thought it would be appropriate to draw the boundary across 48th Avenue. Mr. Brickey showed two additional maps: version 2 was greatly expanded from the first version shown; and version 3 encompassed all property encompassed by the dike.

Following the public hearing, staff's recommendation was to approve the annexation and City staff's recommendation as to zoning, and to direct the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance annexing the property into the city to be zoned as R-1 Residential District, to be presented for passage upon approval by the Cowlitz County Boundary Review Board, and to direct the staff to forward the 60% Petition for Annexation to the BRB for its review.

The Mayor opened the public hearing for comment at 7:51 p.m.

Annexation sponsor Gloria Marthaller asked several questions about the status of her initial proposal if the BRB invoked jurisdiction and included a large area and a large number of people who do not wish to join the City. "If there was a lot of public outcry, . . . will it stop my process?"

City Attorney Marilyn Haan reported the Boundary Review Board has the final say on the size and boundaries of the annexation area. The Board can add additional properties, can accept the parcels added by staff, or could leave it as originally presented by Ms. Marthaller.

There being no further comments, either written or oral, the public hearing was closed at 7:54 p.m.

Councilman Anagnostou moved to approve the annexation, approve the zoning recommendation by staff, direct the City Attorney to prepare the Ordinance, and ask the Boundary Review Board to invoke jurisdiction and look at the expanded Version 3 (all

properties within the dike). This motion was seconded by Councilman Busack. Upon a vote duly held, the motion was unanimously approved.

C. 2005 HOME and CDBG Programs Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) Longview-Kelso HOME Consortium and Longview Community Development Block Grant Program.

Entitlement Program Coordinator Julie Hourclé was asked to present this report.

Ms. Hourclé explained the City of Longview as a CDBG Entitlement community and lead agency for the Longview-Kelso HOME Consortium is required to produce a Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) to HUD within 90 days of the completion of each program year which ends July 31st. The Report also requires a minimum 15-day public comment period. This comment period began October 12th and ended on October 26, 2006.

The public received notice of the comment period and this public hearing through the CDBG/HOME mailing list, *The Daily News* and Neighbors Edition Display Ads and legal ads. During this comment period, Ms. Hourclé said the CAPER was available for public review at the Longview Public Library, Longview Community Development Department, Longview Housing Authority, Kelso Community Development Department, Kelso Public Library, and the Kelso Housing Authority.

Ms. Hourclé expressed the hope all Councilmembers had received their copies of the report and had had an opportunity to review it. She recapped the requirements for the entitlement program, the need to benefit low- to moderate-income persons, and Council's expressed desire to stress homeownership programs. Additional narrative was included in the report at the request of Mayor Weber, who had asked for more information on program goals.

Ms. Hourclé discussed the list of programs funded and those completed. Maps of all project locations were segregated by program, HOME or CDBG. She concluded her portion of the presentation by thanking the community partners – including Lower Columbia Community Action Council (CAP), Longview Housing Authority, Habitat for Humanity, The Progress Center, Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments, and Youth & Family Link.

The Mayor opened the public hearing for comment at 8:18 p.m.

Doris Disbrow, 1639 – 21st Avenue, asked whether the expansion of HOME projects to areas of the City outside Highlands would include the Old West Side? Ms. Hourclé said yes, if the person were eligible.

Adam Wolfer, Executive Director of Cowlitz County Habitat for Humanity, thanked Council for its support and gave some updates of their progress in the community. International Habitat for Humanity has granted adequate funds to allow Cowlitz County Habitat to hire a full-time Executive Director.

Representing the Mental Health Center, Ron Lehto thanked Council for funding their project. The Center was able to construct separate waiting rooms so children could be isolated from

adults and the chronically mentally ill. The project also constructed a staff room and therapy rooms that are age appropriate for children. "It has meant a lot to our users."

There being no further comments, either written or oral, the public hearing was closed at 8:24 p.m.

No Council action was necessary or taken.

D. Comprehensive Plan Update.

Prior to commencing the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Update, Mayor Weber had asked City Attorney Marilyn Haan to research and report on the status of the proposed ethanol plant. Mrs. Haan said a grading permit has been applied for with the City. Once a permit has been applied for, the applicant has a vested interest in the codes and regulations that were in effect at the time the permit was issued. No changes made in the Comprehensive Plan would affect their right to proceed under the already issued permit. Ms. Haan stated she was aware the ethanol plant would have to obtain several other permits from other agencies; she was unaware of the status of those permits at this time. She advised, however, that any changes made to the Draft Comprehensive Plan Update would not affect the vested rights of the project owner

Ms. Haan further stated her opinion that the zoning in effect for this parcel overrides the Comp Plan designation.

The Mayor then declared a brief recess at 8:27 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 8:34 p.m.

Mayor Weber introduced this public hearing by remarking that 18 months ago Council had decided to move forward on updating the 1993 Comprehensive Plan. Planning documents are essential to managing growth. The commitment was made to solicit and encourage the public's participation in development of the plan. Jones & Stokes, the consultants engaged to assist with development of the Comprehensive Plan Update, held numerous public meetings. The Mayor noted public comment was still welcome tonight at this hearing.

City Manager Bob Gregory noted to Council that less than 14 days notice of this public hearing had been provided to the public. Since opponents of the update feel they were not given adequate time in which to prepare, Mr. Gregory recommended Council hold the public hearing tonight and then continue it until the next Council meeting on November 9, in order to allow citizens ample time to prepare their remarks and to dispel any criticism that the City was "rushing this through." The updated Comprehensive Plan can be adopted on November 9; its adoption is not time sensitive.

City Manager Gregory acknowledged all of staff's hard work on this project – this work included input from Public Works Departments, Planning staff and Community Development staff. Mr. Brickey said Principal Planner Steve Langdon had done an excellent job shepherding the project. Thanks also went to Susie Meyers, Public Information Specialist, for the public outreach assistance, and to Ruth Butch, IT/GIS, for the maps. Mr. Brickey acknowledged City Manager Gregory for presenting the process to service organizations. All maps, policies and goals are currently posted on the City's website for citizen access.

Mr. Brickey introduced Lisa Grueter, Senior Planner with Jones & Stokes. Ms. Grueter defined a Comp Plan as a blueprint for the future – a plan to direct how Longview will grow. Ms. Grueter showed a list of state laws that had to be taken into consideration during the development process, and a list of the optional considerations Longview chose to include. She detailed the process taken by Jones & Stokes to obtain citizen input, to develop economic development goals, and determine plan priorities. Shorelines management and critical areas regulations were taken into account. The Comp Plan is important, and zoning will be updated to be consistent with it.

Citizen participation indicated a preference for the node concept of growth rather than the corridor concept; these concepts had been discussed in a public hearing before Council in January 2006.

The Longview Planning Commission spent many, many hours listening to citizen input. Chairman Jim Barnett briefly addressed Council. Planning Commission members Lyle Smith and Ray Van Tongeren were also in the audience. Once the Updated Comprehensive Plan is adopted, additional detail work will have to be undertaken to update some zoning codes.

Mr. Brickey noted the Comp Plan needs to be a living document, and needs to change as conditions change. It is recommended a Comp Plan be reviewed on a 7-year schedule.

At 8:54 p.m., the Mayor opened the public hearing for comment.

Jeff Wilson, 4723 Mt. Solo Road, expressed several concerns about the West Longview portion of the Comp Plan. He hoped Council had had an opportunity to picnic in the West Longview area to see what is actually out there. He felt some opportunities had been missed to make recommendations for park areas. He also spoke about a pre-existing industrial landfill that was not mentioned in the Comp Plan; he felt it should be mentioned. He also spoke about buffer zones. Since Barlow Point consists of mostly wetlands, he wondered what would happen to that area if it is turned into residential area.

Steve Madsen, Governmental Affairs Director with the Building Industry Association of Clark County, stated he had met with City staff and given his organization's input. He spoke about Clark County's experience under the Growth Management Act (GMA), and noted Cowlitz County was the only county in the I-5 corridor not currently under GMA. Clark County has added growth management fees to its permits that have increased the cost of housing up to \$30,000 per residence; he felt certain developers would soon start looking at less expensive and less restrictive building sites. Mr. Madsen recommended Longview should decide on its standards very carefully. He encouraged a periodic Comp Plan review every five years.

Charlotte Persons, 3993 Estate Drive, said she represented 'Neighbors for Livability,' an organization formed 16 days ago. This group has two goals: (1) to ask for a different siting of the ethanol plant; and (2) seek a change in zoning for the Mint Farm.

'Neighbors for Livability' are opposed only to the location of the ethanol plant. She expressed disagreement with City Attorney's Haan's earlier statement that zoning outweighs the Comp Plan designation. She felt the Comp Plan should take precedence over zoning.

She recalled Jones & Stokes representative Lisa Grueter had earlier stated the zoning will be made consistent with the updated Comp Plan. She pointed out the Mint Farm zoning had remained inconsistent with the Comp Plan for thirteen years.

Longview Resident Mike Wallin spoke about exclusionary versus inclusionary zoning plans, and how these mandates do not work other than to drive up the cost of housing.

Real Estate agent Steve Pulliam reported he represented five property owners immediately east of the Lowe's facility on Ocean Beach Highway. These five families would like their parcels to have a commercial designation. He suggested houses normally do not neighbor Lowe's sites. Due to the location of the state highway, and increased lighting, noise and traffic, he felt these parcels should be zoned commercial to allow for increasing Longview's restaurant and lodging bases.

Margaret Green, 1318 – 25th Avenue, said she had participated in the Comp Plan update process. She also met with staff members. For the public record, she presented the City Clerk with copies of letters she had written to City staff dated May 5; a letter to the Council dated October 6; and a letter to City Manager Bob Gregory dated October 12, 2006. These letters enumerate her objections to the ethanol plant and the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Ruth Deery, 3148 Laurel Road, expressed fear the ethanol plant would be very loud. She asserted she can hear traffic from the freeway – estimated at 80 decibels – at her residence two miles away. She alleged the noise level from an ethanol plant would be 100 decibels outside the plant walls. She further asserted there have been five fires at five ethanol plants. If this plant is allowed to be constructed, it “will greatly lower the quality of life in the Highlands and the Old West Side.”

Ryan Schrock, 4425 Ocean Beach, explained he also owns 4413 Ocean Beach. He applied to Cowlitz County and had been successful in getting his parcels rezoned commercial from residential. He would like the County's designation to carry over to the City's Comp Plan. The new Comp Plan lists his property as High Density Residential.

Councilman Jensen asked whether this zoning was being changed in the updated Comp Plan.

Principal Planner Steve Langdon explained the classification for these parcels has been the same in the City's Comprehensive Plan since at least 1993. No changes were made to the updated Comp Plan to change that designation. It was Mr. Langdon's understanding that Cowlitz County had, in fact, rezoned the property. Cowlitz County and the City do not necessarily agree with one another's land use designations.

Mr. Langdon stated the Planning Commission was not made aware of Cowlitz County's Comp Plan change to commercial. Residents whose properties under the Cowlitz County Comp Plan differed from that of the City's Comp Plan were invited to attend a Planning Commission meeting and request their zoning be carried over into the City. The Schrocks did receive such a notice, but believed the notice referred to the Rick Annexation, to which they had no objection. They did not attend the Planning Commission meeting to request their commercial zone be

continued in the City's Comp Plan. Thus, the Planning Commission was never made aware of the Schrocks' desire to have their properties zoned as commercial.

John Green, 1318 – 25th Avenue, commented the current Comp Plan designates the Mint Farm Phase II light industrial, and now the City wants to allow a heavy industrial use to locate there. He read a quote from the Comp Plan "City Values," and commented he did not see how placing heavy industry next to neighborhoods fulfills that promise.

L. S. Wagle recommended beheading for retailers.

Doris Disbrow, 1639 – 21st Avenue, representing Old West Side Association, was asked about membership in her group. She stated all residents of the Old West Side are members; however only dues-paying members can vote. She asked that a buffer zone of light industrial use be placed between neighborhoods and heavy industrial uses. She further asked that the density of housing on 19th and 21st Avenues in the Old West side should remain single-family residential, while she felt it would be appropriate to permit higher density uses on 20th Avenue. She also asked the Planning Commission to consider an objective in Chapter 9 regarding developing the historic district of the Old West Side neighborhood.

Councilman Makinster, a resident of the Old West Side, remarked to Mrs. Disbrow that she did not have the authority to speak on his behalf.

Sam Wardle, owner of 2440 Ocean Beach Highway and local attorney, said it was difficult to believe the Mint Farm property had always held a M-2 zoning designation.

Karen Witherspoon said she had been in a position similar to that of Ryan Schrock: she had received a Comprehensive Plan designation change and zoning change from Cowlitz County to commercial. She attended the Planning Commission meeting regarding conflicting designations, and her problem was addressed and the appropriate change made to the Comp Plan Update. She supported the wishes of the Schrocks and the owners of Stonescapes to retain their commercial zoning.

Mr. Langdon reported it is the land use designation being discussed at present, not the specific zoning of the property. The City's Comp Plan land use designation has been high-density residential since at least 1993. "The County has no obligation to follow our Comp Plan designations." Since the Schrocks did not attend the Planning Commission hearing, their concerns were not raised, and no changes to the Comp Plan designation of their properties was suggested. Mr. Langdon reported that when he looked at it from a land use point of view, the existing fruit stand and Stonescapes buildings are not considered a substantial development.

Mr. Langdon further indicated "this is only a staff recommendation." The Planning Commission did not consider any change. Staff is still recommending an R-4 designation. Mr. Langdon confirmed that any nonconforming uses on County property that comes into the City is grandfathered in, unless that nonconforming use is abandoned.

Mayor Weber wondered whether all property abutting the Ocean Beach corridor should be designated commercial. Mr. Langdon recalled the public hearings that were held that determined the citizens' preference for node development rather than corridor development.

Councilman Jensen expressed his unwillingness to prevent the Schrocks from future commercial development of their property.

Steve Sharp, Cathlamet resident and Longview property owner, urged the Planning Commission to keep the Comp Plan flexible and review it often.

Craig Tremble, Oriole Court, identified himself and his wife as the owners of Stonescapes. They started the business in 2003 with the knowledge they were locating on commercial property. The Trembles have invested substantially in their business; he did not see how this “huge oversight” could have occurred. Why wasn’t the Planning Commission aware that Cowlitz County had changed the Comp Plan designation and zoning to commercial?

Rick Hightower expressed his belief there had been a gross miscarriage of justice in this instance. He asserted these folks “ought to be able to stay there [and continue their commercial activities].”

Ken Spring remarked that if Mrs. Deery was correct and the ethanol plan would be operating at 100 decibels, “it would destroy the quality of life in Longview.”

Councilwoman Leber asked to establish some groundwork for continuing the hearing on November 9. She asked whether Council would entertain repeated testimony from the same individuals. She would be open to receiving testimony on new information. Mayor Weber acknowledged he would prefer to hear new information, but did not think that requirement could be imposed on the citizens. Councilman Anagnostou said if new opponents wished to speak, they could speak on whatever issues they desired. Opponents who testified tonight should be encouraged to provide new insights or more comprehensive information.

Margaret Green confirmed with the Mayor that testimony on additional information would certainly be welcomed.

Councilman Anagnostou moved to continue the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Update to November 9, 2006, at 7:00 p.m., in the Council Chamber. This motion was seconded by Councilman Busack. Upon a vote duly held, the motion was unanimously approved.

Councilman Jensen inquired what would now happen to the problem with the Schrocks and Stonescapes. Staff will present its recommendation, and Council can make whatever changes are deemed necessary or appropriate. Once the Updated Comp Plan is adopted, it can also be amended.

The Mayor declared a recess at 10:18 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 10:27 p.m.

7. CONSTITUENTS’ COMMENTS.

A. Liberty.

L. S. Wagle spoke about Neptune, Baptists, housing, and public funding going to churches.

B. Ethanol Plant.

Doris Disbrow, representing only herself this time, repeated some of her earlier comments regarding the 3,700 people who will be affected by the ethanol plant's noise, pollution, odors, etc., and asserted there is no way to mitigate the danger of fire or explosion.

Margaret Green repeated some of her earlier comments regarding the plant's close proximity to residents, schools, and no available mitigation for fire and explosions.

C. Bad Road.

Ken Spring reported he moved one block, from Florence Avenue to 33rd Avenue, and would like to see the City repair 33rd Avenue. This road has been in bad condition for forty years. He would like to see the road smoothed out and blacktopped over.

D. Ethanol Plant.

John Green stated 'Neighbors for Livability' have been out talking to people. "90% of the people didn't even know about this plant and where it's going to be placed." The vast majority of people signed our petition when we told them that [located in Mint Farm Phase II]".

Charlotte Persons stated their purpose is to prevent some problems. She has been researching ethanol plants, and said "I believe we don't want to start that process. We want to relocate this plant to somewhere else." She said her group is serious because they believe this plant is a serious danger. She gave reports on five ethanol plant fires to the City Clerk for the record. The plant produces a volatile substance and also uses volatile substances in its process. She urged Council to consider the consequences of a derailment of a train carrying those dangerous materials.

Councilman Anagnostou asked Mrs. Persons to provide Council with the information she gathered on the communities who had sued and been successful in dismantling ethanol plants.

Councilwoman Leber asked some questions about where the corn and raw materials would be coming from. City Manager Gregory advised those materials would be trucked to the site. The finished ethanol would be shipped out by rail on the Weyerhaeuser/Columbia & Cowlitz tracks since this track currently serves the Mint Farm.

She further inquired "is there any reason for us to imagine that we wouldn't use every legal avenue we have to make sure that this plant or any other plant, or any other business, wouldn't be built up to code or – if there are any violations. There has been some indication that we should, you know, use every legal avenue to make sure this is done right. Well, don't we do that anyway?" City Manager Gregory affirmed "absolutely." Staff follows every fire code, every mechanical, electrical, and fire/life safety code for every development. The risk of explosions will be looked at.

Councilwoman Leber conceded that if what Council is being told about the particulate level being emitted by the ethanol plant is true, she did not believe the Southwest Clean Air Agency would grant them an emissions permit.

Councilman Jensen, who serves as Chair of the Southwest Clean Air Agency, said he would report Council's concerns to Mr. Elliott, the technical director of the agency.

Staff was directed to obtain more information on ethanol plants for the next Council meeting. City Manager Gregory about the possibility of doing some citizen outreach/education.

9. BOARD & COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

A. PC 2006-13, Zoning Text Amendment in LMC Pertaining to Wayfinding Signs.

The City's Downtown Advisory Committee asked the City to consider amending the City's municipal code to allow wayfinding signs in the Downtown Commerce (D-C) District and elsewhere in the City. They believe wayfinding signs are needed to direct travelers into the downtown area. At their September 6, 2006 regular meeting, the Planning Commission agreed to initiate the process for reviewing the proposed zoning text amendment.

At their October 4, 2006 regular meeting, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed text amendment. Following the hearing, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the amendment.

Staff recommended Council accept the Planning Commission's recommendation and direct the City Attorney to prepare an Ordinance effecting the zoning text amendment.

On a motion made by Councilman Jensen, seconded by Councilman Makinster, and passed by a vote of 7 "Aye" votes by Mayor Weber and Councilmembers Anagnostou, Busack, Jensen, Leber, Makinster, and Melink, and no "Nay" votes, the Council unanimously agreed to concur with the Planning Commission's Recommendation No. PC 2006-13.

10. ORDINANCES & RESOLUTIONS

A. Resolution No. 1845, Adopting House Bill 1756, Fire Emergency Resource Deployment and Response Time Objective.

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Longview adopting the performance policy, standards and objectives outlined in Substitute House Bill 1756 as Longview Fire Department's emergency resource deployment and response time objectives, was introduced and read by title only.

Fire Chief Daryl McDaniel gave a brief presentation on this item. The Fire Department has established standards for emergency response time. Chief McDaniel believes the Department can meet these performance objectives.

Councilwoman Melink moved adoption of the foregoing resolution which motion was seconded by Councilwoman Leber and on a vote duly held and recorded with 7 "Aye" votes by Mayor Weber and Councilmembers Anagnostou, Busack, Jensen, Leber, Makinster and Melink, and no "Nay" votes, the Mayor declared the resolution adopted

and passed, affixed his signature of approval thereon and the resolution was assigned the No. 1845, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

11. MAYOR'S AND COUNCILMEMBERS' REPORTS

A. Cost Estimates to Implement Initiative I-933 if Passed on November 7.

Mayor Weber pointed out he had included a letter from the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) estimating the cost impacts to implement Initiative I-933 if the voters approve it on election day. This letter was tailored to reflect the costs pertinent to Longview.

12. CONSENT CALENDAR

There being no items the Council wished removed from the Consent Calendar, a motion was duly made and passed approving the items on the Consent Calendar as though acted on individually.

A. Accounts Payable

Based upon the authentication and certification of claims and demands against the city, prepared and signed by the City's auditing officer, and in full reliance thereon, it is moved and seconded as shown in the minutes of this meeting that the following vouchers/warrants are approved for payment:

Second Half October, 2006 A/P Claims \$1,786,826.96 (Check Nos. 267903 – 268326, inclusive)
First Half October, 2006 Payroll \$793,428.08 (\$139,134.36, Check Nos. 194689 – 194781, inclusive; \$371,695.69, direct deposits; and \$282,598.03, wire transfers)

B. Liability Claims

The claim(s) for damages listed below was/were received by the City and have been/are being researched and/or reviewed by Washington Cities Insurance Authority (WCIA) and claim status is as noted:

- 1) *New*: Rodney Ericksen, Property Damage - \$3,260.00
- 2) *New*: Diane Crockett, Property Damage - \$419.06
- 3) *New*: Antoinette Delyea, Property Damage - \$941.50
- 4) *Settled*: Carl Reisig, Property Damage - \$844.37
- 5) *Settled*: Connie Lang, Property Damage - \$67.36

C. Board & Commission Minutes

- 1) Planning Commission Minutes, October 4, 2006

13. LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATIONS

A. Renewals.

The following listed establishments possess liquor licenses which will expire end of January, 2007. The Police Department has reviewed this list and has reported no violations at any of these businesses since their last renewal, and, therefore, expressed no concern relative to their renewal.

<i>Licensee</i>	<i>Business Name and Address</i>	<i>Privileges</i>
Li's Canton Corp.	Canton Restaurant 1310 Commerce Avenue	Spirits/Br/Wn Rest Lounge
Chinese Village Restaurant Inc.	Chinese Village Restaurant 3061 Ocean Beach Highway	Spirits/Br/Wn Rest Lounge
Longview Country Club	Longview Country Club 41 Country Club Drive	Private Club – Spirits/Beer/ Wine, Non-Club Event
Mint Valley Golf, Inc.	Mint Valley Golf Course 4002 Mint Valley Way	Beer/Wine Rest – Beer
Longview Toyota, Inc.	The Carriage Restaurant & Lounge, 1334 – 12 th Avenue	Spirits/Br/Wn Rest Lounge
Duling, Glenda Kay	Stuffy's II 804 Ocean Beach Highway	Beer/Wine Rest, Beer/Wine

No Council action was taken.

B. Change of Privileges.

Country Folks, Inc., dba Country Folks Deli, have applied for an additional privilege of sales for off-premises consumption from their restaurant located at 1329 Commerce Avenue. A Longview Police background check revealed no problems with either the owners or the location, therefore LPD expressed no concerns with this expanded privilege.

No Council action was taken.

14. CITY MANAGER'S REPORTS

A. Set Public Hearing (11/30/06): Vacation of Right-of-Way Within Longview 6, Block 207.

A request to vacate a 12' wide section of unimproved right-of-way lying between Lots 1, 2 and 44, Block 207, Plat of Longview #6 has been received by the Engineering Division and reviewed by appropriate City staff and utility companies. The right-of-way was dedicated with the plat as a 12' section adjacent to the 20' wide improved alley. These 12' wide unimproved right-of-way spurs within the Longview Plats are mainly used for utility access purposes and are of a size substandard to be improved as alleys.

This item had initially been presented with a public hearing date of November 9. Double-checking publication requirements caused staff to prepare and pass out to Council an amended Agenda Summary Sheet establishing a public hearing date of November 30, 2006, so adequate lead time could be provided.

City Manager Gregory asked Council to set the public hearing on this right-of-way vacation for the Special meeting scheduled for November 30, 2006.

On a motion made by Councilman Makinster, seconded by Councilman Anagnostou, and unanimously passed with 7 "Aye" votes by Mayor Weber and Councilmembers Anagnostou, Busack, Jensen, Leber, Makinster, and Melink, the City Manager's recommendation was accepted and approved.

B. Proposed Supplement to Interlocal Agreement for Wastewater Treatment and Disposal.
The proposed supplement to the Three Rivers Regional Wastewater Agreement was intended to provide a legal means to make emergency repairs on a timely basis should the need arise. The impetus for the proposal arose from just such a situation this summer when a critical piece of equipment at the regional wastewater treatment plant failed over a weekend, which potentially could have jeopardized its ability to treat wastewater and our investment in the facilities.

This supplement would allow the TRRWA board to shift funds among the operating and capital portions of the approved overall budget in these sorts of situations, and to empower the plant superintendent to initiate emergency repairs. Prior approval by all the parties (meaning the four elected boards and councils) would still be required in the event there were insufficient available and unexpended funds within the overall budget to make such repairs. Expenditures would be made from the Sewer Utility fund.

On a motion made by Councilman Makinster, seconded by Councilwoman Melink, and unanimously passed with 7 "Aye" votes by Mayor Weber and Councilmembers Anagnostou, Busack, Jensen, Leber, Makinster, and Melink, the City Manager's recommendation was accepted and approved.

15. MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION ONLY

A. Business Licenses.

B. Meeting Reminders.

Workshop: 7:00 p.m., Thursday, November 2, 2006: 2007-08 Budget

Regular Council Meeting: 7:00 p.m., November 9, 2006

Special Council Meeting: 7:00 p.m., November 30, 2006 – in lieu of Regular
November 23 meeting (Thanksgiving Holiday)

Regular Council Meeting: 7:00 p.m., December 14, 2006

Workshop: 7:00 p.m., November 16, 2006: Citizens Summit/Legislative Issues for
1007

16. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Council at its regular session, the meeting was adjourned at 11:17 p.m.

THE CITY OF LONGVIEW

Ann Davis, City Clerk

APPROVED: _____
Mayor

Proclamation

City of Longview, Washington

National Family Week *November 19 – 25, 2006*

WHEREAS, strong families form the backbone of strong communities; and

WHEREAS, the City of Longview considers the health and well-being of its children and youth to be a top priority; and

WHEREAS, the City of Longview joins the National League of Cities to recognize November 19 through 25 as National Family Week; and

WHEREAS, the City of Longview recognizes that safety, economic development, fiscal stability, a strong workforce, recreational opportunities and an educated citizenry all depend on the investments and efforts made to help families and children succeed; and

WHEREAS, municipal leaders can play a decisive role by taking action on behalf of children, youth, and families; and

WHEREAS, the National League of Cities has developed a plan, “Strengthening Families and Improving Outcomes for Children and Youth”, which outlines tasks necessary for sustained progress, including identifying needs and priorities, promoting effective city-school collaboration, encouraging and supporting youth voice and leadership, and measuring progress over time; and

WHEREAS, the City of Longview is committed to supporting current action steps that city departments are taking to support youth and families, and

WHEREAS, the City of Longview joins cities and towns across America in this nationwide movement to promote family and youth-friendly communities;

Now, Therefore, I, Dennis Weber, Mayor of the city of Longview, Washington, do hereby proclaim the week of Sunday, November 19 through Saturday, November 25, 2006, to be

“National Family Week”

in the city of Longview, and urge all citizens to join in supporting the plan for “Strengthening Families and Improving Outcomes for Children and Youth”, by providing the essential infrastructure for a sustained community effort to achieve objectives for families and youth.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Longview to be affixed this 9th day of November 2006.

Dennis Weber, Mayor

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE

Youth and Family Link Community Center Phase 2
Planning Project – 2005 CDBG Planning Grant

Agenda Item: _____ 6.C

Dept. of Origin: _____ Community Development

For Agenda of: _____ 11-09-06

Clearances:

Originator: _____ John Brickey, Director

City Atty. Review Necessary? _____

Date/Initials of City Attorney: _____

Deputy City Manager: _____

EXHIBITS:

Planning for Phase II, Community Center Project
(under separate cover previously received in early
October)
2005 CDBG Project Allocations

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

Develop mechanisms to promote a healthy
community.

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

The Toutle River Ranch/Youth and Family Link Program received a 2005 Community Development Block Grant for \$16,500 to develop a plan to expand structured youth activities and programs within a new gymnasium for youth K-12. The agency recently completed construction of Phase 1 comprising program offices and youth activity areas located at 907 Douglas St. In preparation for Phase II of their facility, the agency has completed the report entitled “*Planning for Phase II, Youth and Family Link’s Community Center Project.*” The report contains an overview of the goals and strategies which it was designed around, community partnerships involved, an analysis of community needs, defined uses and priorities, funding possibilities, design concept, proposed facility operations and sustainability, and next steps.

In addition to the Report, a large binder of Appendices provides planning report documentation of subcommittee meetings, focus groups, a Youth and Recreational Facilities grant application to CTED (recently awarded), Longview Parks & Recreation Teen Surveys (2005 & 2006), Washington State Nutrition and Physical Activity Plan, and a series of reports and strategic plan from Cowlitz on the Move. The accompanying Appendices document is available for Council & public review in the City of Longview Executive Office and the Community Development Department.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

No action required.

City of Longview CDBG Entitlement Funding 2005

2005

CDBG Federal allocation	\$419,944.00
CDBG Administration - up to 10%	\$ 41,994.00
CDBG Planning Activities - up to 10%	\$ 41,994.00
Public Service Set Aside – up to 15%	\$ 62,991.60
Entitlement Available	\$289,673.75
Base Entitlement	\$272,964.40
Unobligated from 2004	\$ 16,709.35
From Planning Activities	

2005 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Project Awards

(Public Hearing March 24, 2005 continued from March 10, 2005)

<i>Main Entitlement Projects</i>	<i>Public Service Projects</i>	<i>Planning Projects</i>
Available: \$289,673.75	Available: \$ 62,991.60	Available: \$ 41,994.00
<p>CAP 22-HOME Self-Sufficiency Engineering – Prepare engineering for streets and infrastructure for the Windemere #7 Subdivision. Lower Columbia Community Action Council \$21,300 <i>Fully Funded</i></p> <p>Columbia Theatre Stage Improvement – Replacement of overhead stage rigging to modern safety standards and provide continued economic viability of the theatre. Columbia Theatre \$23,000 <i>Requested \$175,000</i></p> <p>Downtown Commercial District Illumination Project, Phase I - Install new pedestrian friendly street lighting in support of the Downtown Plan and to improve security. City of</p>	<p>Downtown Policing – Add a police and security presence throughout downtown. Longview Downtowners Not Funded <i>15% Public Service Limit met.</i></p> <p>Help Warehouse – Support food bank services to Longview residents. Lower Columbia Community Action Council \$50,039.60 <i>15% Public Service Limit met.</i></p> <p>Home Ownership Counseling for Low-Income Families – Improve family credit history and spending habits of renters to prepare for homeownership. Family Finance Resource Center \$12,952 <i>15% Public Service Limit met.</i></p> <p>Preferred Renter Program –</p>	<p>Chronic Homeless Strategy for the Cowlitz Continuum of Care – Develop a chronic homeless strategy for the City of Longview to examine options and solutions to reduce the extent of homelessness and improve social service resource delivery. Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments \$10,000 <i>Fully Funded</i></p> <p>Youth and Family Link Community Center Phase 2 Planning Project – Plan to expand structured youth activities and programs within a new gymnasium for youth K-12. Toutle River Ranch \$16,500 <i>Fully Funded</i></p>

<p>Longview Public Works / Longview Downtowners \$43,000 <i>Fully Funded for this Request. Budget noted 2006 CDBG Funding to complete project.</i></p> <p>Progress Center Addition – Construct a building addition in order to expand services for medically fragile newborns, infants and toddlers at-risk or experiencing abuse and neglect, and/or are in need of specialized infant mental health services. Progress Center \$217,867.75 <i>Requested \$326,809.26</i></p>	<p>Promote renters’ fiscal and civic responsibility, and home ownership options by earning a Preferred Renter Certificate. Family Finance Resource Center in partnership with the Longview Housing Authority Not Funded <i>15% Public Service Level met</i></p>	
<p>Total Funded: \$305,167.75</p>	<p>Total Funded: \$62,991.60</p>	<p>Total Funded: \$26,500.00</p>
<p>Includes remaining Planning funding available: \$15,494.00 moved to Main Entitlement</p>		

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Public Hearing (continuation) for Draft
Comprehensive Plan Update

Agenda Item: _____ 8.A _____

Dept. of Origin: _____ Community Development _____

EXHIBITS:

1. Memo from Lisa Grueter regarding
testimony received at 10/26 public hearing
2. Letter from Weyerhaeuser Co.
3. Letter from Building Industry Association of
Clark County
4. E-mail from Jim and Bridget VanFleet
5. E-mail from Michael Wallin

For Agenda of: _____ November 9, 2006 _____

Clearances:

Originator: _____ John Brickey, Director _____

City Atty. Review Necessary? _____

Date/Initials of City Attorney: _____

Deputy City Manager: _____

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

Update of Comprehensive Plan

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

At the October 26, 2006 regular meeting, the City Council voted to continue the public hearing on the draft Comprehensive Plan Update to their November 9, 2006 meeting. The purpose of this agenda summary is to provide the Council with information or testimony received since the October 26 hearing. You may have already received some of the attached testimony but City staff wanted to make sure it was available in one place and/or available electronically.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt the Final Draft of the Comprehensive Plan Update (to be called *City of Longview 2006 Comprehensive Plan*) and direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance for City Council approval.

Memorandum

Date: October 30, 2006
To: Steve Langdon, City Planner, City of Longview
From: Lisa Grueter, Senior Planner
cc:
Subject: Follow Up to Questions or Comments at 10/26/06 City Council Public Hearing

Overview

Several citizens testified at the City Council Public Hearing addressing the proposed Comprehensive Plan Update, addressing issues such as:

- Planning for Parks, Habitat, Wetlands and Land Use Buffers
- Population Projections
- Inclusionary Housing
- Density in Old West Side
- Mint Farm industrial zoning and comprehensive plan classification; along with the proposed ethanol plant
- Commercial classifications at Ocean Beach Highway and 44th
- Commercial classifications east of Loewe's
- Node versus Corridor Approach

Background information regarding the Mint Farm, ethanol plant, and commercial classifications at various points along Ocean Beach Highway were discussed at the hearing or in Planning Commission and staff recommendations.

This memo follows up on the first four topics regarding parks/habitat, population projections, inclusionary housing, and Old West Side designations. It also clarifies a response to a question from the Mayor regarding Ocean Beach Highway at 40th.

Planning for Parks, Habitat, Wetlands and Land Use Buffers

The proposed Comprehensive Plan Update addresses the commenter's concerns regarding parks planning, wetlands protection and habitat, as well as buffers between land uses. The Plan policies provide guidance for future regulation amendments and for the SEPA process to condition development to reduce potential impacts.

- Chapter 5 contains the Natural Environment Element. That Element includes goals, objectives, and policies that promote the protection and mitigation of impacts to wetlands and other habitats. In the Barlow Point Area, the larger Mixed Use Residential/Commercial designation promotes a “a planned development process, which encourages creativity in site planning by allowing flexibility in lot and building arrangements and a mix of uses.” This flexibility will allow for clustering and impact avoidance or creative mitigation to meet the land use and natural environment goals, objectives, and policies as well as the City's critical areas regulations.
- Chapter 2, the Land Use Element, includes policies to promote buffers between land uses of different intensities such as industrial and residential. See for example, Goal LU-B, Objective LU-B.1 and Policy LU-B.1.1.
- Chapter 7, Public Facilities, Utilities, and Services Element, addresses Parks and Recreation in the Element background section. Parks objectives and policies are reserved pending the completion of Longview's 6-Year Parks and Recreation Plan Update. The 6-Year plan will include goals and objectives and planned parks and recreation projects to meet the City's needs. It will be folded into the Comprehensive Plan when it is completed. A draft is expected this Fall. That Parks and Recreation Plan will identify future parks or recreation facilities. The Land Use Map in Chapter 2 identifies existing publicly owned parks. Public/Quasi Public designations are applied at the time a property is publicly owned, since prior to that time, the City needs to provide for a reasonable use of private property.

Population Projections

In early stages of the Comprehensive Plan Update preparation, population projections were prepared to help guide the update effort. The Planning Commission reviewed the population projections. We understand that the City Council was briefed as well.

A one percent growth rate was assumed based on trends between 1990-2000 (which was higher than the growth rate between 2000 and 2004) and also based on building permit activity trends. The overall growth between 2005 and 2025 is a 22% increase. This is described in the Land Use Element on pages 2-5 and 6. A capacity analysis conducted to help identify the distribution of land use for transportation modeling indicated a greater capacity than the minimum needed to accommodate the Plan growth rate. This allows for some flexibility to respond to changed conditions.

In addition, the Plan recognizes that changed circumstances will likely arise, and promotes comprehensive reviews no less frequently than every 7 years, and individual area specific reviews more frequently (Objective LU-A.1).

Inclusionary Housing

A commenter was concerned about “inclusionary housing” policies requiring set asides of units for low-income housing, and that the idea was from our Bellevue Office.

In fact, the Housing Element was prepared by the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments and is based on their assessment of local housing conditions and needs in Longview. For example, the background analysis shows that in Longview “[o]ne in five households are cost-burdened, meaning that its wage earners pay more than 30% of total income to cover housing costs.” The background discussion in the COG’s recommended Housing Element also indicates that “[t]he Washington State Affordable Housing Advisory Board has identified several strategies and recommendations for addressing housing affordability that local jurisdictions can adopt. . . . Promote inclusionary zoning requirements for affordable housing or voluntary programs with density bonuses and other incentives for developers.” The wording of proposed policy HO-C.3.2 is the same as the advisory recommendation. The policy gives the City the choice of inclusionary requirements or voluntary programs with bonuses/incentives:

Policy HO-C.3.2 Promote local inclusionary zoning requirements for affordable housing *or voluntary programs* with density bonuses and other incentives for developers. (emphasis added)

The City Council may leave the policy with choices or modify the policy if it is inclined to focus only on the voluntary programs.

Density in Old West Side

A commenter was concerned about high-density designations proposed in the Old West Side. The high-density classification exists in the 1993 Comprehensive Plan and continues in the proposed Comprehensive Plan Update. No new areas are added in the Old West Side.

The variety in housing choices was a need expressed in the community preference open houses and as part of the economic development strategies (“include development of high quality multi-family housing” and “residential with mixed use as a more important . . . economic strategy – attracting retirees & workers from nearby metro areas”). Housing variety is also expressed as a need in the Housing Element.

Node vs. Corridor Approach

At the hearing, there was discussion about the plan concept along Ocean Beach Highway.

In Fall 2005 two alternative concepts were prepared for Planning Commission and City Council review illustrating nodes and corridors. The concept maps showed bubbles and squares around potential areas of change. The Planning Commission reviewed the alternative concepts in September 2005. A joint meeting was held with the City Council on October 6, 2005. Following these reviews, the alternatives were proposed to the public for feedback at two public Open Houses on October 25, 2006.

The two alternative concepts can be described as follow:

Alternatives Descriptions

Alternative A - Nodes	Alternative B - Corridors
Diversifies land uses adding commercial and mixed uses	The "corridor" approach examines key transportation routes in Longview and comprehensively looks at the associated land use, design and circulation issues for the length of the identified transportation corridors. The corridor approach would specify different land use districts and provide direction on transition/buffers between uses and strategies for phasing from lower to higher intensity uses.
Decreases the amount of industrial lands that are substantially vacant	
Regional and community oriented commercial development at expanded nodes	
Promotes mixed light industrial and commercial in area bordered by California Way, Oregon Way, and Industrial Way	Greater commercial focus on major corridors
Accommodates additional areas for medium density and high density residential	Supports Economic Development Options A and B, which maintain existing industrial lands but increases commercially designated areas along the corridors
PUD/mixed use and commercial along Columbia River	Accommodates additional areas for medium and high density residential
Potential for small lot single family and cluster development (i.e. cottage housing)	PUD/mixed use and commercial along Columbia River
Increases pedestrian connections between downtown and Cowlitz River	Accommodates additional areas for medium density and high density residential (less than Option A)
Provides public access along water front and some limited locations for commercial, and	Potential for small lot single family and cluster development (i.e. cottage housing)
Identifies and develops attractive Gateways	Provides public access along water front and some limited locations for commercial, and
	Identifies and develops attractive Gateways

The alternatives were evaluated with the following results:

- Urban growth location, sprawl reduction, transportation, housing, and historic preservation issues – more favorable for Alternative A

- Economic development in Alternative A supports the hybrid economic development approach recommended at the economic forum in June 2005, recognizing changing market forces. Issue - size of nodes and co-location of larger commercial opportunities
- Alternative B maintains present industrial focus with some commercial additions. Issue – potential for incremental and dispersed larger commercial sites.

The feedback we received on the concepts at the October 2005 workshops generally favored the node concept (Attachment A provides a summary). The concept that received the more favorable feedback (Node) was developed into a preliminary parcel specific map. That map was the subject of a Planning Commission public hearing in January 2006. That hearing was followed by meetings with the Planning Commission and City Council in February and March, at which point staff and consultants received direction to proceed developing the comprehensive plan around the node-based preliminary parcel map.

Other Clarifications

City staff transmitted our thoughts on comments and questions posed by the Mayor in a memo dated October 25, 2006. One of the Mayor's questions focused on Area G that stretches between 40th and 42nd along Ocean Beach Highway. The question was about commercial uses near the dealership and vet clinic, particularly a lot across the street. My comment was that "if the other 3 corners are commercial, it seems appropriate to show commercial here." I had misunderstood the comment and my comment pertained to the intersection of 42nd and Ocean Beach Highway, and not the intersection at 40th.

Attachment A: Alternative Feedback, October 25, 2006 Workshops Summary of Written Comments

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use the entry point beautification. Would want traffic issues addressed. Use the mid-entry housing – condo's etc... Need good zoning so they aren't just stuck in the middle of undesirable areas. ▪ If adopted, the multi-family designation should run from 15th to Lowe's. ▪ Recommend "node" approach; with more medium to hi density houses in between nodes. This approach supports Longview's role in region as a bedroom and potential destination community at northern end of region. Also better control, more focus on downtown of development nodes. ▪ Bandaid. ▪ Love the look of it. Keeping nodes of commercial is better than swamping Ocean Beach with massive commercial that interferes with family homes and school areas. Longview will look better with plan A. ▪ I support this plan. No mix of commercial and homes in west Longview. We need a 53rd and 54th Avenue. No big box stores. ▪ This is the only viable concept to pursue. Good, solid base to satisfied multiple interests and support community integrity for the residents of Longview. ▪ What does this do to advance goals of EDC? Advantages/disadvantages weren't clear. ▪ Definitely prefer alternative A but feel strongly that plan does not adequately provide for commercial growth opportunities. ▪ Preferred – offers more variety to potential developers. Spreads out development. Especially like purple areas for converting from light industrial to mixed use. ▪ Nodes – I like the idea of community commercial in nodes. I think we need to focus major commercial to downtown triangle LCC area. ▪ This plan seems to be okay but needs to have adjustments. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change on houses on south side of OB between 30th & 28th. 2. Leave it up to the property owners on the north side between 30th and the Methodist church to decide. ▪ Vastly preferable. ▪ Node approach provides for more integrated community. More mixed use and high density residential makes for closer community relationships. ▪ My first choice. Please make (prioritize) pedestrian friendly planning a top consideration. Plant more trees. ▪ Make the nodes pedestrian/bicycle/public transit friendly & require landscaping in parking lots and well designed lots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too much reliance on OB Highway. Would like to see Industrial Way more emphasized. ▪ Prefer this alternative. Property owners between Lowes and 15th on North side of OB highway want commercial land use. (Multiple proponents voice this.) ▪ This is the plan that should be adopted!! Give me a call, I'll buy the coffee and tell you why. ▪ Too much risk of unrelated, haphazard commercial development in corridor approach – nodes better suited to compliment commercial locations within nodes and support local needs around nodes. ▪ Go for it. Do it all. Do it right. Do it soon. ▪ Vacant land west of 52nd Avenue needs to be used for single-family dwelling homes. Need a 53rd & 54th Avenue. ▪ Corridor approach seems logical to me. Ocean Beach is a major arterial and already has a lot of commercial development. This is where other businesses will want to locate. ▪ Seems not to address growth issues, e.g... What's going on in Beaverton with Nike where might this be a barrier to development? ▪ Commonalities with plan A are good if someone can make them happen. I don't like one long strip of commercial use. ▪ Corridors. Q – How does this mesh with Washington DOT's desire to limit access to SR4? ▪ I do not like commercial spread out on SR4. ▪ This separates different aspects of community activities and more intense traffic in some areas. ▪ Feels like sprawl. Thumbs up to waterfront development with trails, cafes etc... Cottage housing, cluster etc... is really nice when well designed.

ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B
<p>that encourage non-automobile transportation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good idea to have nodes not continuous developments. ▪ Prefer the node version ▪ Upon review of the three land use alternatives currently being considered by the City, there really is only one that identifies an appropriate balance of concepts that'll meet the long-term needs of the community. The preferred alternative of choice would be that of "A" the Node Approach. <p>The conceptual strengths of Alternative "A" include:</p> <p>Moving some of the city's asset base from industrial to commercial for a balance of opportunities in both. The City has been sitting on the Mint Farm and other mixed light industrial assets. This will move will provide a return long over due. Promoting the California Way , Oregon Way and Industrial Way triangle strengthens the existing anchor to the Downtown / Triangle Mall commercial zone, while revitalizing the area. Commercial zones in or near the I-5 corridor will be most successful from a regional draw perspective, provided the City ensures travel corridor improvements permit easy access. Distinction between regional and community-oriented nodes.</p> <p>A few opportunities recommended for Alternative "A" include:</p> <p>Boulevard beautification. Increased green zones and trail networks throughout the city. Greater public access to river front areas. A need to move overhead power lines and other utilities underground along our commercial corridors and residential neighborhoods. Expansion of the Walmart "Regional" commercial node to include all of 38th Avenue between Ocean Beach and Industrial Way, thus tying the western Mint Farm proposal together with an anchor store. Expansion of City policy and grants programs to accelerate rehabilitation and improvement of the highlands residential area. Expand housing and yard maintenance code concept to entire City.</p> <p>Independent of the Planning Commission public hearings and open meetings, expand public involvement in development type proposals to include a public advisory group. The membership would be specific to each proposed development. A set off guidelines and/or charter would establish a mandate for such advisory groups.</p>	



3401 Industrial Way
P.O. Box 188
Longview, Washington 98632-7117
Tel (360) 425-2150

October 25, 2006

Steve Langdon
Principal Planner
City of Longview

Weyerhaeuser is writing to support the adoption of the revised Comprehensive Plan. It is important to Weyerhaeuser to have the Mint Farm industrial area zoned for heavy industry.

It is also important to the community for a variety of reasons. A heavy industry designation is consistent with current use and the joint marketing effort jointly managed by the City and Weyerhaeuser. This designation allows both heavy and light uses. Having the option for both is vital to attracting stable, family wage jobs to the area.

The long term viability of the community depends upon a solid economic base built upon diversity of industries. Having the Mint Farm zoned for heavy industries supports this base.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael A. Karnofski".

Michael A. Karnofski
Regional Services Manager

Hon. Dennis Weber, Mayor
City of Longview
1525 Broadway
Longview, WA 98632

RE: Comments on the City of Longview Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mayor Weber,

On behalf of the over 1000 members of the Building Industry Association of Clark County (BIA), I would like to thank the City of Longview for the opportunity to submit comments on the City's proposed Comprehensive Plan (CP) as set forth below.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Building Industry of Clark County is supportive of the comprehensive planning efforts of the City of Longview. The BIA recognizes the need for development planning as a mechanism to create and enhance both commercial and residential development and has long been critical of Cowlitz County for failing to adequately revise its existing Comprehensive Plan.

Of concern, however, is the general trend towards prescriptive and inflexible design standards and other requirements, which, while politically expedient, fail to recognize an ever-changing market for real estate products. Performance standards should be used in place of numerical and date-specific standards. The CP contains a number of what the BIA believes to be unrealistic and even draconian elements along these lines. Based on existing and projected budget and staffing levels (as well as the political realities of Longview), the BIA is skeptical that the City has or will have the resources to achieve many of the CP's date-specific benchmarks. The BIA is concerned that, particularly with a 7-year review period, the City is once again setting itself up for failure as has happened with previous revitalization efforts. Furthermore, overly specific CP designations make it very difficult to tailor zoning ordinances to specific market, population and political needs.

ELEMENT-SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Ch. 3. Housing. Longview's surrounding geography places numerous constraints on the development of new housing. Infill and redevelopment will likely be a larger supply of housing than will be development of currently vacant land in the future. The BIA is concerned about the CP's characterization of Longview's existing housing in that there is little mention of it's quality. Lack of regulation and enforcement of City nuisance and maintenance issues have done much to create the current unfavorable conditions in a number of neighborhoods. Much of Longview's more "affordable" housing stock is functionally obsolete or in extreme disrepair. It is recommended that before Longview looks to specious mechanisms such as "inclusionary zoning" to improve its affordable housing stock, it first address existing causes of neighborhood

deterioration which, if corrected, would do much to encourage investment in redevelopment and/or improvement of these areas.

The BIA is also critical of the 1% projected population growth rate. The third quarter statistics from Clark County indicate a rise in "newcomers" (defined as out-of-county drivers reissued local licenses) increased 8.8% from the third quarter of 2005. The CP is void of any real analysis of the potential impacts that the rapid growth occurring in north Clark County will have on Longview. History has shown that artificially low growth planning rates only serve to create artificial inflation in housing prices as well as inadequate capital facilities plans. Furthermore, a 1% growth rate is inconsistent with current public perception of the area's rate of development. It is recommended that the CP provide more thorough analysis of the potential impacts of projected growth rates in north Clark County on Longview's population growth rate.

Ch. 4. Economic Development. The BIA supports the use of "mixed-use" development, particularly in existing high-density areas that are in need of "revitalization" (ie the Highlands and along the north side of Ocean Beach Highway at Northlake). It is unfortunate that a small but vocal group of opponents continue to resist redevelopment in this latter area.

Ch. 7. Public Facilities. The BIA supports "reality-based" capital facilities planning. It is recommended that any allocation of additional fees to "new development" be mitigated by broad-based rate increases as the large number of upgrades projected (primarily for sewer and water) will benefit both existing as well as potential future users.

Ch. 8. Transportation Mitigation Fees. The majority of existing and projected traffic congestion is on SR 4 and SR 433. Both of these transportation corridors are under WSDOT jurisdiction and would not normally be the subject of Transportation Improvement Programs under GMA. A unique feature of Cowlitz County is that it is the only county on the I-5 corridor not subject to GMA. It is recommended that Longview seriously consider the potential chill on new commercial activity that may come with a SEPA-based mitigation fee system where it is not otherwise required by state law and where it may not even address the primary traffic congestion issues facing the City.

Ch. 10. Action Plan. The BIA is concerned that the CP does not include any kind of cost component. In reviewing the responsibilities allocated to city staff along with its ambitious timelines, the BIA is skeptical that Longview will be able to meet its objectives within existing staffing and budgetary constraints. It is recommended that the plan provide an estimate of implementation costs. Additionally, a 7-year review period is far too long between reviews, particularly during the initial implementation period. It is recommended that initial review occur every two years for the first ten years of the CP planning period.

CONCLUSION

The BIA looks forward to a continuing relationship with the City of Longview in developing sound planning policies. We strongly recommend regular Comprehensive Plan reviews in order to adapt planning policies to a rapidly changing economic and demographic climate. As always,

the BIA is committed to a positive and active working relationship with City staff, as well as interested stakeholders and the public at large.

Sincerely,

Steven B. Madsen, MBA JD
Governmental Affairs Director
Building Industry Association of Clark County

E-mail received on October 26, 2006 at 11:39 p.m.

We are concerned with the development of commercial businesses on the South side of Ocean Beach Highway from Walgreen's Drug Store to 2 lots after 28th Avenue for the following reasons

1. Traffic is heavy on Ocean Beach Highway, as the city has stated previously, especially from Olympic Way to 30th Ave. We do not need more traffic.
2. Businesses cause noise, especially a restaurant, and can increase in the evening hours.
3. At the present time, we get the smell of food cooking at Burger King, which is approximately 1 and 1/2 blocks away. Another restaurant would increase the smell of food being prepared, I.E. French Fries.
4. In the past, Maryland St. has been relatively quite and an wonderful place to live, but it is slowly eroding and increased commerce and traffic will only lead to a futher decline.
5. Finally, what type of businesses would be allowed in this area?, can a tavern, an adult store, etc. be allowed? This does not fit the image of Longview. Let the least desirable types of businesses be located elsewhere

Finally, a lot of us will not be around for long, but what will this area be like 10 to 20 years from now.

Please forward this to Longview City Council members as we will not be available for the next City Council meeting.

Thank you for your help in the past.

Jim and Bridget VanFleet
2824 Maryland St.
Longview

From: Michael Wallin [mailto:michaelwallin@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2006 11:07 AM

To: Kurt Anagnostou; andy.busak@ci.longview.wa.us; Don Jensen; Ramona Leber; Chet Makinster; Mary Jane Melink; Dennis Weber

Cc: Bob Gregory

Subject: Longview Comprehensive Plan

Importance: High

Mr. Mayor, Honorable Councilmembers,

Could inclusionary zoning (IZ) work in Longview? The Longview Planning Commission and the consulting firm of Jones and Stokes of Bellevue seem to think so...even though the City of Bellevue repealed their IZ ordinances in 1996.

Mayor Mosher of Bellevue said of the onerous policies: "housing costs actually increased for 90 percent of the community in order to support the other ten, and city homeowners do not favor subsidizing housing for others while having to sacrifice for their own." This is because home prices were raised to cover the mandates made by selling some homes below the market value.

As you may know, market conditions determine whether the builder can pass the costs of the IZ units to other market-rate units. In strong markets the builder can pass the costs of IZ along, but in weak markets he must absorb these costs.

Generally, IZ policies require developers to allocate a percentage of all newly-built homes to low-income individuals. The housing developer must then figure out a way to produce all the homes at the same cost while selling a percentage of them below cost.

The law of supply and demand has proven in most, if not all cases, that mandated low-income housing results in fewer total units built.

Inclusionary zoning policies have failed across that nation. From Bellevue, WA to Madison, WI and from San Diego, CA to Bristol-Norfolk, MA inclusionary zoning has not achieved the goals it was designed to.

Instead of inclusionary zoning, the City of Longview and others should consider the policy of filtering. When local government promotes the building of mid and high-cost housing, the availability of low-cost housing also increases since the people currently occupying those units want to move up.

Low-income housing is not produced by new construction- developers make no money, it's just not a viable business practice. Low-income housing is better produced in the marketplace as mid-quality units deteriorate to low-quality levels.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Mike

Michael K. Wallin
283 Beech Street
Longview, WA 98632
Main: 360-560-3636
Work: 360-687-0877

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE: Ordinance 2963 amending
7.36.070 of the Longview Municipal Code.

Agenda Item: _____ 10.A _____

Dept. of Origin: _____

EXHIBITS: Ordinance No. 2963

For Agenda of: _____ November 9, 2006 _____

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

Clearances:

Originator: David Campbell, Asst. City Manager

City Atty Review Necessary? _____ Yes _____

PRESENTED BY:

Robert Gregory, City Manager

Date/Initials of City Attorney: mkh 10/23/2006

Asst. City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT: Ordinance No. 2963 is presented for the purpose of amending and updating LMC § 7.36.070. This item follows up on council discussion and direction from three months ago. Under that section of the municipal code, any promotion, concert, show, sale or display of merchandise requires the permission of the City Council. The amendment would allow such activities upon the approval of the City Manager, or his designee. In addition, the ordinance updates the title to more closely identify the contents of that section from “Exhibitions of works of art.” to “Displays and sales” as well as updates the title of “park superintendent” to that of “director of parks and recreation”.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
--------------------------	--------------------	---------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2963.

Ordinance No. 2963

An Ordinance amending and updating section 7.36.070 of the Longview Municipal Code, to allow the City Manager, or his designee, the authority to approve any promotion, concert, show, sale or display of merchandise within a public park of the City, updating the title of park superintendent to director of parks and recreation, and updating the title to more closely identify the content of that section as “Displays and sales”.

WHEREAS, LMC 7.36.070(3) has required the approval of the City Council for any promotion, concert, show, sale or display of merchandise to occur within a public park of the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined it appropriate that the City Manager, or his designee, be granted the authority to approve such activities within the public parks of the City; and

WHEREAS, LMC 7.36.070 has been titled “Exhibition of works of art”. The title “Displays and sales” more thoroughly describes the content of that section; and

WHEREAS, LMC 7.36.070 contains the reference to “park superintendent”, which position is no longer the chief administrative position for the parks and recreation department,; and thus, the reference should be amended to reflect the appropriate title of “director of parks and recreation”; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that said amendments should be adopted;

The City Council of the City of Longview do ordain as follows:

Section 1. That Section 7.36.070 of the Longview Municipal Code shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

7.36.070 ~~Exhibition of works of art.~~ Displays and sales.

- (1) No fixed work of art shall be placed in any public park. No portable works of art shall be placed in any public park without prior written permission of the ~~park superintendent.~~ director of parks and recreation.

(2) It is unlawful for any person to display advertisements or articles for sale on or within any public park without the prior written permission of the ~~park superintendent.~~ director of parks and recreation.

(3) It is unlawful for any group or organization of persons to use any public park within the city for any promotion, concert, show, sale or display of merchandise, or food stands during recognized public holiday celebrations, without the prior written permission of the city council; city manager, or his designee. ~~provided, food stands during recognized public holiday celebrations may be allowed by prior written approval of the city manager.~~

Section 2. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after thirty (30) days from the date of its passage and publication as provided by law.

Passed by the City Council this ___ day of _____, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this ___ day of _____, 2006.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Published: _____

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Ordinance No. 2965, an ordinance adding a new section to Chapter 11.62 of the Longview Municipal Code.

Agenda Item: 10.B

Dept. of Origin: Legal

For Agenda of: 11/9/2006

Clearances:

Originator: Steve Shuman, Asst. City Attorney

City Atty. Review Necessary? yes

Date/Initials of City Attorney: mkh 10/23/2006

Assistant City Manager: _____

EXHIBITS:

Ordinance No. 2965

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

Addressing the needs of senior citizens and equitably managing the use of off-street parking spaces within the downtown area.

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

The Parking Committee has met with representatives of the Senior Center, and downtown area businesses in an effort to address the issue of providing senior citizens attending events at the Senior Center with adequate nearby parking, while at the same time ensuring continued adequate parking for downtown customers and employees. To this end, the Parking Committee recommends providing an exemption to the three hour time limit in the parking lot located half a block away at the corner of 12th Avenue and Florida Street, commonly referred to as Lot #78S, for persons who obtain and display in their vehicles the same type of parking permit issued by the Parks and Recreation Department that authorizes senior citizens to park in the parking lot immediately adjacent to the Senior Center.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
--------------------------	--------------------	---------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to approve Ordinance Number 2965.

ORDINANCE NO. 2965

An Ordinance relating to regulation of time limits for off-street parking in the downtown area of Longview, allowing for parking in excess of three hours for vehicles parking in the designated A/B parking lot located at the corner of 12th Avenue and Florida Street within the city of Longview while displaying a valid Senior Center parking permit issued pursuant to Section 11.63.040 of the Longview Municipal Code.

WHEREAS, parking is limited by the Senior Center; and

WHEREAS, the Parking Committee has determined there is a need for additional parking to allow senior citizens the ability to attend events at the Senior Center; and

WHEREAS, an exemption to the three hour time limit in the parking lot located by the Senior Center, referred to as Lot #78S, by senior citizens displaying a parking permit issued pursuant to 11.63.040 of the Longview Municipal Code would allow for the additional parking; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that the addition of a section to Chapter 11.63 of the Longview Municipal Code is appropriate to address the parking needs of the Senior Center;

The City Council of the City of Longview does ordain as follows:

Section 1. A new section, designated as Section 11.62.032, is hereby added to Chapter 11.62 of the Longview Municipal Code. The text of Section 11.62.032 shall read as follows:

11.62.32 Special exemption to time limit.

The three hour time limit for A/B for off-street parking facilities set forth in Longview Municipal Code subsection 11.62.030(3)(b) shall not apply to motor vehicles parking in the A/B parking lot described in Longview Municipal Code subsection 11.62.100(3)(g) which display a valid senior citizen center parking permit issued pursuant to Section 11.63.040 of the Longview Municipal Code.

Section 2. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after thirty (30) days from the date of its passage and publication.

Passed by the City Council this _____ day of _____, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this _____ day of _____, 2006.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Date Published:_____

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE: Ordinance 2966 amending
7.36.070(1) of the Longview Municipal Code.

Agenda Item: _____ 10.C _____

Dept. of Origin: _____

EXHIBITS: Ordinance No. 2966

For Agenda of: _____ November 9, 2006 _____

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

Clearances:

Originator: Marilyn Haan, City Attorney

City Atty Review Necessary? _____ Yes _____

PRESENTED BY:

Robert Gregory, City Manager

Date/Initials of City Attorney: mkh 10/23/2006

Asst. City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT: Ordinance No. 2966 is presented for the purpose of amending and updating LMC § 7.36.070(1). Under that section of the municipal code “no fixed work of art shall be placed in any public park.” Fixed works of art already exist in our public parks. Thus, the amendment would update the section of the code to allow for such art upon approval of the City Council.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2966.

Ordinance No. 2966

An Ordinance amending and updating section 7.36.070(1) of the Longview Municipal Code, to allow for fixed work of art in the public parks upon approval by the City Council.

WHEREAS, LMC 7.36.070(1) does not allow fixed work of art to be placed in any public park; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has previously approved fixed work of art in our public parks; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined it appropriate to amend and update this section to allow fixed work of art in our public parks upon approval by the City Council; and

The City Council of the City of Longview do ordain as follows:

Section 1. That Section 7.36.070(1) of the Longview Municipal Code shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

7.36.070 Displays and sales.

(1) ~~No~~ Fixed work of art shall may be placed in any public park upon approval by the City Council. No portable works of art shall be placed in any public park without prior written permission of the director of parks and recreation.

(2) It is unlawful for any person to display advertisements or articles for sale on or within any public park without the prior written permission of the director of parks and recreation.

(3) It is unlawful for any group or organization of persons to use any public park within the city for any promotion, concert, show, sale or display of merchandise, or food stands during recognized public holiday celebrations, without the prior written permission of the city manager, or his designee.

Section 2. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after thirty (30) days from the date of its passage and publication as provided by law.

Passed by the City Council this ___ day of _____, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this ____ day of _____, 2006.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Published: _____

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE: An Ordinance amending §19.12.050, 19.52.100, 16.13.020 and 16.13.040 of the LMC to allow wayfinding signs.

Agenda Item: 10.D

Dept. of Origin: Community Development

For Agenda of: November 9, 2006

Clearances:

Originator: John Brickey, Dir. of Comm. Devel.

City Atty Review Necessary yes

Date/Initials of City Attorney: 11/2/06 mkh

Asst. City Manager: _____

EXHIBITS: Ordinance No. 2967

PRESENTED BY:

Bob Gregory, City Manager

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The attached ordinance was prepared at the direction of the City Council on October 26, 2006, to allow wayfinding signs in the Downtown Commerce (D-C) district and elsewhere in the City.

The Ordinance includes the following amendments:

19.12.050 Power of board – Special property use.

(The following subsection added)

(4) The placement, construction, erection and maintenance of Wayfinding signs, as defined in LMC 16.13.040(73), in all use districts, shall be deemed a special property use.

19.52.100 Signs

(The following subsection added)

(6) Wayfinding Signs, as described in LMC section 16.13.040(73), and as approved by the Appeal Board of Adjustment in accordance with LMC section 16.13.020, shall be permitted in the D-C District.

16.13.020 Amendments to Uniform Sign Code

(The following new paragraph added to Section 103.3 Board of Appeals)

In order to provide for reasonable interpretation of the provision of this Chapter, and in order to approve the placement, construction, erection and maintenance of Wayfinding Signs as defined in LMC 16.13.040, the Appeal Board of Adjustment shall have the authority and powers provided by LMC section 19.12.050 to grant Special Property use permits for the placement, construction, erection and maintenance of Wayfinding Signs in all use districts.

16.13.040 New chapter added to Uniform Sign Code

(The following new paragraph added to Section 1503 Exempt signs)
(16) Wayfinding Signs as approved by the Appeal Board of Adjustment

Expenditure	Amount	Appropriation
Required:	Budgeted	Required

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Motion to Adopt Ordinance No. 2967

An Ordinance amending Sections 19.12.050, 19.52.100, 16.13.020 and 16.13.040 of Longview Municipal Code, to allow wayfinding signs. The purpose of this ordinance is to allow wayfinding signs in the Downtown Commerce (D-C) District and elsewhere in the City, as well as set the approval process for such signs.

WHEREAS, the City Council believes it is appropriate that wayfinding signs be allowed in the Downtown Commerce (D-C) District and elsewhere in the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined amendments to the Longview Municipal Code is appropriate as it relates to wayfinding signs; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that said amendments should be adopted; The City Council of the City of Longview do ordain as follows:

Section 1. That Section 19.12.050 of the Longview Municipal Code shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

19.12.050 Power of board – Special property use.

(1) Recognizing that there are certain uses of property that may or may not be detrimental to the public health, safety, morals and general welfare, depending upon the facts in each particular case, a limited power to issue special permits for such uses is vested, by special mention in this title, in the board.

(2) The board shall have an exercise original jurisdiction in receiving, granting or denying all applications for such special property uses as are provided for in this title and shall have the power to place in such permits, conditions or limitations in its judgment required to secure adequate protection to the zone or locality in which such use is to be permitted. No special permit shall be issued by the board until after public hearing, as hereinafter provided, and until after the building official has found that all other provisions of this code, with which compliance is required, have been fulfilled.

(3) No such special property use permit shall be granted by the board unless it finds:

(a) That the use for which such permit is sought will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety, morals and general welfare;

(b) In making such determination the board shall be guided by the following considerations and standards:

(i) That the use will not be detrimental to the character and use of adjoining buildings and those in the vicinity,

(ii) That the use will not create a hazard in the immediate area either for pedestrian or vehicular traffic,

(iii) That adequate ingress and egress will be available for fire and other vehicular emergency equipment,

(iv) That adequate off-street parking will be provided to prevent congestion of public streets.

(4) The placement, construction, erection and maintenance of Wayfinding Signs, as defined in LMC 16.13.040(73), in all use districts, shall be deemed a special property use.

Section 2. That Section 19.52.100 of the Longview Municipal Code shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

19.52.100 Signs.

The following signs, when displayed in accordance with this section, are allowed within the downtown commerce (D-C) district.

(1) Permanent Signs – General Provisions for Permanent Signs. The total number and area of permanent signs in this district shall conform to the following:

(a) The total aggregate area of all signs per building frontage shall not exceed an area equal to one and one-half square feet per each lineal foot of building frontage elevation or 32 square feet, whichever is greater. The maximum total aggregate sign area permitted for all sign types is 150 square feet per occupancy. For purposes of calculating this area, the maximum height of the building elevation shall be 18 feet.

(b) The total area of all regulated signs within this district shall not exceed 150 square feet per building frontage elevation.

(c) Unless specifically permitted, the height of a sign shall be measured from the finished ground (grade) level, excluding mounds, berms, etc., to the top of the sign or the highest portion of the sign structure or frame, whichever is greater.

(d) Unless otherwise specifically permitted, changeable copy signs, readerboards and letterboards shall not be permitted.

(e) Conforming and/or nonconforming signs in existence at the time of the enactment of the ordinance codified in this section shall be counted in establishing the permitted area or size of all new signs to be permitted on the property.

(2) Types of Permanent Signage Permitted.

(a) Awning, Canopy and Marquee Signs.

(i) Maximum number of signs permitted: The maximum number of signs will be limited by the total aggregate sign area permitted.

(ii) Maximum allowable sign area: The maximum allowable sign area is limited by the total aggregate sign area permitted. Where a sign has two or more faces, the area of all faces shall be included in determining the area of the sign.

(iii) Placement: Anywhere on awning or canopy subject to meeting the maximum sign height restriction. For marquee signs, the sign shall be integral to the marquee. There shall be no extension or embellishments past the edge of the marquee.

(iv) Maximum sign height: 18 feet above grade to the top of the sign or sign structure.

(v) Illumination: Any type of illumination is allowed. Internally illuminated awning, canopy or marquee signs are limited to 40 percent of the maximum sign area otherwise allowed.

(vi) Changeable copy: Changeable copy shall be permitted on theatre marquee signs only.

(b) Directional Signs.

(i) Maximum number of signs permitted: One per driveway entrance/exit. No advertising copy shall be displayed on directional signs.

(ii) Maximum allowable sign area: Six square feet. The area of directional signs shall not be included within the total aggregate sign area permitted.

(iii) Maximum sign height: Five feet above grade elevation to the top of the sign or sign structure.

(iv) Illumination: Internal or indirect illumination is permitted.

(v) Additional requirements: Freestanding signs shall contain landscaping at the base of the sign at the rate of two square feet of landscaping per one square foot of sign face area, where practical. At least 50 percent of the landscaped area must contain live plant material.

(c) Directory Signs.

(i) Maximum number of signs permitted: One sign per entrance, limited to wall-mounted signs only.

(ii) Maximum allowable sign area: Eight square feet. If larger multitenant building requires additional signage, each additional tenant allowed 0.375 square foot of signage per lease foot. The area of all directory signs shall count towards the total aggregate sign area permitted.

(iii) Maximum sign height: 18 feet above grade to the top of the sign or sign structure.

(iv) Illumination: Direct or indirect illumination is permitted.

(v) Additional requirements: Directory signs shall be reserved for use on multitenant buildings only.

(d) Freestanding Signs.

(i) Maximum number of signs permitted: One sign per business frontage for businesses not located on Commerce Avenue.

(ii) Maximum sign face area, per side: 75 square feet.

(iii) Maximum sign face area, total of all sides: 150 square feet.

(iv) Maximum sign height: 18 feet above grade to top of sign or sign structure.

(v) Additional requirements: The sign structure may be either pole or monument type. The sign may be illuminated directly or indirectly. No portion of the sign or sign structure shall extend over the right-of-way. Landscaping shall be provided around the base of the sign at a rate of one-half square foot of landscaping per one square foot of sign face area, where practical. At least 50 percent of the landscaped area must contain live plant material.

(e) Identification Signs – General Requirements. The letters or numerals shall be five inches in height minimum and 12 inches in height maximum. New (not historic) building names may have letters up to a maximum of 18 inches in height. Information on the sign may contain the address and/or the name of building only; the name of business or sign copy “affiliated with a business” will be addressed as a business identification sign and subject to meeting total aggregate sign area permitted. No permit is required for identification signs.

(f) Mural Signs – General Regulations. Murals are exempt from the provisions of this code. However, any advertisement of any kind within a mural will be considered a wall sign and shall be regulated as such. Decorative or artistic murals may be painted or otherwise placed on any building or structure without a sign permit. However, a rendition of the mural shall be reviewed and approved by the community development department prior to placement to ensure that it is not considered a sign or advertising device. Proposed murals may also require a certificate of appropriateness from the historical preservation commission.

(g) Projecting Signs.

(i) Maximum number of signs permitted: One sign per business entrance.

(ii) Maximum allowable sign area: 32 square feet on each sign face, regardless of the number of projecting signs. The area of a projecting sign shall count towards the total aggregate sign area permitted.

(iii) Maximum sign height: 18 feet above grade to top of sign or sign structure. Signs shall observe a minimum clearance of eight feet above grade elevation.

(iv) Illumination: Direct or indirect illumination is permitted.

(v) Changeable copy: Changeable copy shall not be permitted on projecting signs along Commerce Avenue, or on Maple Street, Broadway, Hudson Street, Hemlock Street or Florida Street east of the alley between 14th Avenue and Commerce Avenue, and west of the alley between 12th Avenue and Commerce Avenue; however, changeable copy may be placed on projecting signs located in other areas of the district including both sides of the alleys located between Commerce Avenue and 12th Avenue, and Commerce Avenue and 14th Avenue.

(h) Roof Signs.

(i) General provisions: Roof signs are permitted only if the director of the community development department, or their designee, determines that reasonable circumstances exist to permit a roof sign. A special property use permit shall be required. Special property use permits for roof signs shall be approved by the planning commission and the city council in accordance with LMC [2.27.070](#).

(ii) Location: Roof signs are permitted to be located on the edge of roofs of buildings only, and are subject to review and approval by the city council.

(iii) Maximum number of signs permitted: If approved by the city council, one roof sign may be permitted per business. The area of the roof sign shall count towards the total aggregate sign area permitted. The roof sign must face the main thoroughfare and contain no visible support structure.

(iv) Maximum allowable sign area: Roof signs shall not exceed a maximum of 15 percent of the area of the building elevation facing the main thoroughfare.

(v) Maximum sign height: Eight feet above the roof parapet to the top of sign or sign structure.

(vi) Illumination: Internal and external illumination is permitted. Internally illuminated signs are limited to 40 percent of the maximum sign area otherwise allowed.

(i) Sandwichboard Signs.

(i) Maximum number of signs permitted: One per street frontage per business on private property. The business must possess a current sidewalk business license.

(ii) Maximum allowable sign area: Six square feet.

(iii) Maximum sign height: Six and one-half feet, measured vertically (90 degree angle with the ground). [The sign, when set at an angle of 23 degrees from the ground will measure six feet in height.]

(iv) Minimum sign height: 30 inches.

(v) Maximum sign width: 30 inches.

(vi) Illumination: Self-contained illumination is permitted. No other type of illumination shall be permitted.

(vii) Placement: Each sandwich board must be placed on the sidewalk in front of or within 15 feet of the main entrance of the business or multitenant building. Sandwichboard signs may be placed near markings separating parking spaces, but not within a crosswalk and not closer than 15 feet from the intersection of the extension of the curb lines (edge of curbs on the vehicular traffic side) of each intersecting street. Signs may be placed within locations shown on the sidewalk usage map, which is on file in the community development department. No sandwichboard sign may be placed where the unobstructed space for the passageway of pedestrians is reduced to less than five feet. Trees, landscaping planters, poles, other signs, hydrants, trash receptacles, tree grates, etc., are all considered obstructions. Questions as to the placement of sandwichboard signs shall be determined by the community development director or their designee.

(viii) Display hours: The sign may be displayed during business hours only. Sandwichboard signs must be removed when the business closes for the day.

(j) Wall Signs and Cabinet Signs. Tenant directory signs, projecting signs, marquee signs and incidental signs are not considered wall or cabinet signs.

(i) Maximum number of signs permitted: The number of signs will be limited by the total aggregate sign area permitted. Flat signs are preferred.

(ii) Maximum allowable sign area: 20 percent of the area of the building elevation per business.

(iii) Maximum allowable sign height: 18 feet to top of sign or sign structure. No portion of sign shall cover or be placed over any window.

(iv) Placement: Wall signage may be placed on any elevation. Cabinet signs may project from the building elevation a maximum of 14 inches.

(v) Illumination: Direct or indirect illumination is permitted. Sign illumination shall not result in glare being directed toward surrounding properties. The source of illumination shall not be visible from a walkway or street. Internally illuminated cabinet signs are limited to 40 percent of the maximum sign area otherwise allowed.

(k) Window Signs.

(i) Maximum number of signs permitted: The number of signs will be limited by the total aggregate sign area permitted.

(ii) Maximum coverage of window: Signs shall not exceed a maximum of 25 percent of the glass area, per window.

(iii) Additional requirements: Neon signs within windows and glass doors shall be permitted. Nonilluminated letterboard signs shall be permitted (see definitions section). Window signs may be separately illuminated. No permit shall be required for window signs.

(3) Temporary Signs. The total number and area of temporary signs in this district shall conform to the following:

(a) The aggregate area of all signs per building frontage shall not exceed an area equal to 20 percent of the building frontage elevation, with a total aggregate sign area permitted of 150 square feet. For purposes of calculating this area, the maximum height of the building elevation shall be 18 feet.

(b) No temporary sign may be displayed at a height exceeding 18 feet as measured to the top of the sign.

(c) Unless otherwise specifically stated, no individual temporary sign shall be displayed for a period of time exceeding 60 days.

(d) Holiday lights and decorations, including decorations on windows, are not considered signs.

(e) No permits shall be required for temporary signs.

(4) Types of Temporary Signage Permitted.

(a) Business Promotional Signs. Temporary business promotional signs, posters, banners, advertising flags, streamers and clusters of pennants are permitted to be displayed for a period of 60 days each occurrence. All such materials shall be removed immediately at the end of the 60-day time period.

(b) Temporary Window Signs.

(i) Temporary window signs are permitted and may be displayed for a period not to exceed 60 days per sales or service event.

(ii) The maximum area of all permanent and temporary window signs shall not exceed 25 percent of the total exterior window area.

(iii) Community, civic and service club event announcement posters and signs, and nonprofit announcements are exempt from these requirements.

(c) Real Estate Signs, On-Premises.

(i) The maximum number of on-premises real estate signs permitted is two per vacant tenancy.

(ii) The maximum allowable sign area shall be 12 square feet for signs placed on buildings or within windows, and 32 square feet for freestanding signs erected on vacant lots.

(iii) On-premises real estate signs shall be attached to an exterior wall or window in such a manner so as to not be a hazard to pedestrians. Signs may be placed adjacent to the property line, but shall not be placed within the right-of-way.

(iv) All on-premises real estate signs shall be removed within seven days of the property and/or buildings being advertised is sold, rented or leased.

(d) Short-Term Construction or Development Signs.

(i) A maximum of one sign shall be permitted per project. The sign may be freestanding, or be a wall or banner sign attached to the construction fence or structure on the site.

(ii) The maximum sign area permitted is four square feet, unless legally required by government contractors to be larger. No sign shall exceed a height of six feet.

(iii) Construction or development signs shall not be posted on the property until after the issuance of a building permit. All signs shall be removed when construction is complete or upon the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, whichever occurs first. In all instances, the maximum duration any such sign may be displayed is two years.

(iv) Signs may be placed adjacent to the property line, but shall not be placed within the right-of-way.

(v) No off-premises signs shall be allowed.

(vi) Copy and graphics on the sign are limited to identification of the project and participants, and shall only include the site identification, participating professional firms and contractors, and a description and/or purpose of the building or construction project.

(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing, buildings and structures in the D-C district located easterly of 12th Avenue and westerly of 14th Avenue and fronting on Washington Way, containing a single business occupant, and having not less than 10,000 square feet of ground floor area, may maintain and display signs as permitted in this section, and signs as permitted in LMC [19.45.060](#). However, roof signs shall comply with subsection (2)(h) of this section.

(6) Wayfinding Signs, as described in LMC section 16.13.040(73), and as approved by the Appeal Board of Adjustment in accordance with LMC section 16.13.020, shall be permitted in the D-District

Section 3. That Section 103.3 of Section 16.13.020 of the Longview Municipal Code shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Section 103.3. Board of Appeals.

In order to provide for reasonable interpretation of the provisions of this Chapter, the Appeal Board of Adjustment shall have the authority and powers provided by LMC Section 19.12.140, in accordance with the provisions of LMC Chapter [19.12](#).

In order to provide for reasonable interpretation of the provisions of this Chapter, and in order to approve the placement, construction, erection and maintenance of Wayfinding Signs as defined in LMC 16.13.040, the

Appeal Board of Adjustment shall have the authority and powers provided by LMC section 19.12.050 to grant Special Property Use permits for the placement, construction, erection and maintenance of Wayfinding Signs in all use districts.

Section 4. That Section 1503 of Section 16.13.040 of the Longview Municipal Code shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Section 1503. Exempt Signs.

The following signs and/or devices are exempt from the requirement of a sign permit and from the provisions of this Chapter 16.13 except as otherwise provided herein or except as provided in provisions that are set forth with reference to allowable and permissible signs in specific Zoning Districts in Title 19 of the Longview Municipal Code.

(1) Informational signs placed by the City of Longview or by the State of Washington in the publicly owned right-of-way.

(2) Memorial tablets, cornerstones, or similar plaques.

(3) Official national, state, or local government flags.

(4) Religious symbols not exceeding twelve (12) square feet in area.

(5) Historical and landmark signs not to exceed ten (10) square feet in area.

(6) Window displays of merchandise which are not affixed to the window surface, provided that the display is located inside the business and does not involve the use of search lights and laser lights, or revolving or rotating beams of light or stroboscopes.

(7) Building or street address numbers, not exceeding two (2) square feet in area.

(8) Affiliation signs for auto-related uses, motels, and hotels that show notices of service provided or required by law, trade affiliations, credit cards accepted, and the like, provided the signs are attached to an otherwise approved freestanding sign or structure. Signs or notices shall not exceed 1/2 square foot in area per sign, and no more than six (6) such signs are allowed per business.

(9) Names of structures or buildings, commemorative plaques, tables, dates of construction, and the like when carved in stone, concrete or similar materials or made of bronze, aluminum, or other similar permanent material and mounted permanently on a structure. These signs shall not exceed four (4) square feet in area and not mounted higher than six (6) feet in height. Existing building name signs of a historic nature shall be exempt from meeting the specified dimensional requirements.

(10) Billboards as provided in LMC Chapter [16.40](#).

(11) Temporary Political Signs, subject to the provisions of section 1403 of this Chapter 16.13.

(12) Temporary Neighborhood Signs, subject to the provisions of section 1404 of this Chapter 16.13.

(13) Temporary Construction Signs, subject to the provisions of section 1405 of this Chapter 16.13.

(14) Temporary Real Estate Signs, subject to the provisions of section 1406 of this Chapter 16.13.

(15) Historically significant signs declared exempt by Resolution of the City Council.

(16) Wayfinding signs as approved by the Appeal Board of Adjustment.

Section 5. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after thirty (30) days of its passage and publication as provided by law.

Passed by the City Council this _____ day of November, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this ____ day of _____, 2006

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Published:_____

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Resolution No. 1846
Authorizing the Ad Valorem tax levy for
2007

Agenda Item: 10.E

Dept. of Origin: Finance

For Agenda of: 11/9/2006

EXHIBITS:

Resolution No. 1846

Clearances:

Originator: Kurt Sacha

City Atty Review Necessary? yes

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Date/Initial of City Attorney: mkh 11/2/06

Asst. City Manager: David Campbell

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

Referendum #47 (now codified as RCW Chapter 84.55) limits ad valorem taxes to 100% of the previous year's levy, plus the value of new construction and improvements; this is called a "limit factor". In order to exceed the "limit factor", Section 209 of Ref. 47 requires cities to adopt a Resolution authorizing any increase in the ad valorem tax levy to a "limit factor" established by the city, which cannot exceed the lesser of one percent or inflation, as defined by the Implicit Price Deflator (IPD). This Resolution complies with the language of Initiative 747 approved by voters on November 6, 2001 in that it represents a one percent increase over the highest allowable levy since 1985. This Resolution authorizes a levy for 2007 in an amount which is 101.5615% of the 2006 levy, which constitutes 101.0% of the statutory maximum levy from previous years. In addition, the City is requesting an additional levy increase of 0.5615% in accordance with RCW 84.68.040 for the purpose of a tax refund made to the QWEST Corporation, authorized by the Washington State Supreme Court on April 17, 2006. The City of Longview's share of this refund levy amounts to \$38,803.42. Pursuant to WAC 458-19-085, a refund levy is exempt from the 101% levy limitation. Such a Resolution must follow a public hearing regarding revenue sources. The public hearing for the 2007 General Fund Revenue Sources was held on October 26, 2006.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 1846.

RESOLUTION NO. 1846

A RESOLUTION of the City Council of the City of Longview, Washington, pursuant to RCW Chapter 84.55 of the State of Washington, authorizing an increase in the regular property tax levy, in addition to any amount resulting from new construction, improvements and any increase in the value of state-assessed property from the amount that was levied in 2006 to an amount which is 101.5615% thereof.

WHEREAS, RCW Chapter 84.55.120 of the State of Washington, provides for and requires the enactment of an ordinance or resolution of the City Council, after a public hearing, in order to levy ad valorem taxes in an amount and/or percentage higher than that levied in the previous year; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Longview, a city of more than 10,000 population, has properly given notice of the public hearing held on October 26, 2006 to consider the City of Longview's current expense budget for the 2007 calendar year, pursuant to RCW 84.55.120; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, after hearing, and after duly considering all relevant evidence and testimony presented, has determined that the City of Longview requires an increase in property tax revenue from the previous year, in addition to the increase resulting from the addition of new construction and improvements to property and any increase in the value of state-assessed property, in order to discharge the expected expenses and obligations of the City of Longview and in its best interests;

WHEREAS, the Washington State Supreme Court has authorized a tax refund to the QWEST Corporation on April 17, 2006, and the City of Longview's portion of the refund amounts to \$38,803.42, making an additional levy increase of 0.5615% in accordance with RCW 84.68.040, such additional levy being exempt from the 101% levy limitation pursuant to WAC 458-10-085; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that it is in the best interests of and necessary to meet the expenses and obligations of the City of Longview, as well as the refund to the QWEST Corporation, for the property tax revenue to be increased in the next calendar year;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Longview as follows

That an increase in the regular property tax levy, in addition to any amount resulting from the addition of any new construction and improvements to property and any increase in the value of state-assessed property, is hereby authorized for the 2007 levy in the amount of \$69,102 which is a percentage increase of 1.0% from the previous year. This constitutes 101.0% of the statutory maximum levy from previous years. In addition, the City is levying \$38,803, which is a percent increase of 0.5615% which provides for the refund levy in accordance with RCW 84.68.040.

Passed by the City Council this ____ day of November, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this ____ day of November, 2006.

Mayor

Attest:

City Clerk

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Ordinance No. 2968
Setting the ad valorem tax levy rate for 2007

Agenda Item: 10.F

Dept. of Origin: Finance

For Agenda of: 11/9/2006

EXHIBITS:

Ordinance No. 2968

Clearances:

Originator: Kurt Sacha

City Atty Review Necessary? yes

Date/Initial of City Attorney: mkh 11/3/06

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Asst. City Manager: David Campbell

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

The attached ordinance fixes the estimated amount to be raised by ad valorem taxes for the 2007 Budget. For 2007, the requested ad valorem tax rate is \$3.13 per \$1,000 of assessed value. The \$3.13 per \$1,000 represents a \$0.47 reduction from the \$3.60 ad valorem tax rate levied in 2006. Based on the preliminary assessed value of \$2,308,297,158 provided by the Cowlitz County Assessor's office the estimate for 2007 taxes payable is \$7,227,143. The attached Ordinance sets the 2007 ad valorem tax levy rate at 101.5615% above the 2006 ad valorem tax levy rate. An ordinance setting the 2007 levy rate must be in the hands of the County Commissioners by November 30, 2006; if not, the maximum rate that can be levied is the same as the 2006 rate.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
--------------------------	--------------------	---------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2968.

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Published: _____

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Building, Mechanical, and Plumbing Permit Fee
CPI Increase

Agenda Item: 10.G

Dept. of Origin: Community Development

EXHIBITS:

Ordinance No. 2969

For Agenda of: November 9, 2006

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

Cost Recovery
Financial Stability

Clearances:

Originator: John Brickey, Director

City Atty Review Necessary? Yes

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Date/Initials of City Attorney: mkh 11/2/06

Asst. City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

In an effort to minimize the impact of permit fees to our community, the building, mechanical and plumbing permit fee schedules are assessed annually for adjustment based on local inflationary trends and submitted to Council for fee schedule amendment consideration. The codes and ordinances adopted by the City of Longview regulating the built environment require the Department of Community and Economic Development to perform certain reviews, issue permits and inspect new construction and existing occupancies to assure compliance with codes and ordinances. In accordance with Council's goal of defraying the city's costs and expenses in processing construction applications, reviews, permits, and inspections, staff is proposing an amended schedule of permit fees. The CPI (Consumer Price Index) numbers for 2006 to date for our community equate to an approximate 2.4% increase. Staff requests Council approval for increasing building, plumbing, and mechanical permit fees accordingly.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance 2969 .

ORDINANCE NO. 2969

An Ordinance amending sub-sections 108.2.1, 108.2.1.1, 108.2.1.2, 108.2.2, and 108.2.3 of Section 16.02.020 of the Longview Municipal Code, establishing the fees to be charged for permits issued in accordance with the Building Code of the City of Longview and for inspections and plan review thereunder.

The City Council of the City of Longview do ordain as follows:

Section 1. That sub-section 108.2.1 of Section 16.02.020, of the Longview Municipal Code, shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Section 108.2.1 Building Permit Fee

The fee for each building permit shall be as set forth in Table 1-A herein.

Table 1-A – Building Permit Fees

TOTAL VALUATION	FEE
\$1.00 to \$500.00	\$27.00
\$501.00 to \$2,000.00	\$27.00 for the first \$500.00 plus \$3.70 for each additional \$100.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000.00
\$2,001.00 to \$25,000.00	\$86.50 for the first \$2,000.00 plus \$16.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000.00
\$25,001.00 to \$50,000.00	\$445.20 for the first \$25,000.00 plus \$11.50 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000.00
\$50,001.00 to \$100,000.00	\$732.50 for the first \$50,000.00 plus \$8.10 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000.00
\$100,001.00 to \$500,000.00	\$1,130.65 for the first \$100,000.00 plus \$6.60 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000.00
\$500,001.00 to \$1,000,000.00	\$3,679.25 for the first \$500,000.00 plus \$5.50 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000.00

\$1,000,001.00 and up	\$6,381.10 for the first \$1,000,000.00 plus \$4.45 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof
-----------------------	---

Other Inspections and Fees:		
1.	Inspections outside of normal business hours	\$54.25 per hour (minimum charge – two hours)
2.	Reinspection fees assessed under provisions of Section 305.8	\$54.25 per hour
3.	Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated	\$54.25 per hour (minimum charge – one-half hour)
4.	Additional plan review required by changes, additions or revisions to plans	\$54.25 per hour (minimum charge – one-half hour)
5.	For use of outside consultants for plan checking and inspections, or both	Actual Costs ²

1. Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

2. Actual costs include administrative and overhead costs.

Section 2. That sub-section 108.2.1.1 of Section 16.02.020 of the Longview Municipal Code, shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Section 108.2.1.1 Inspection Fee – Park Sited Manufactured Housing

The fees for inspections of manufactured housing situated in a manufactured home park shall be as follows:

- (a) Single-wide \$114.00
- (b) Double-wide \$142.50
- (c) Triple-wide \$170.75

Section 3. That sub-section 108.2.1.2 of Section 16.02.020 of the Longview Municipal Code, shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Section 108.2.1.2 Inspection Fee – Wood Stoves

The fees for inspection of free-standing wood stoves shall be the sum of \$27.00.

Section 4. That sub-section 108.2.2 of Section 16.02.020 of the Longview Municipal Code, shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Section 108.2.2 Mechanical Permit Fee

The fee for each mechanical permit shall be as set forth in Table 2-A herein.

Table 2-A Mechanical Permit Fees

Permit Issuance		
1.	For the issuance of each mechanical permit	\$24.60
2.	For issuing each supplemental permit for which the original permit has not expired, been canceled or finalized	\$12.30

Unit Fee Schedule

(Note: The following do not include permit-issuing fee.)

1.	Furnaces	
	For the installation or relocation of each forced-air or gravity-type furnace or burner, including ducts and vents attached to such appliance up to and including 100,000 Btu/h (29.3 kW)	\$17.00
	For the installation or relocation of each forced-air or gravity-type furnace or burner, including ducts and vents attached to such appliance over 100,000 Btu/h (29.3 kW)	\$21.00
	For the installation or relocation of each floor furnace, including vent	\$17.00
	For the installation or relocation of each suspended heater, recessed wall heater or floor-mounted unit heater	\$17.00
2.	Appliance Vents	
	For the installation, relocation or replacement of each appliance vent installed and not included in an appliance permit	\$8.35
3.	Repairs or Additions	
	For the repair of, alteration of, or addition to each heating appliance, refrigeration unit, cooling unit, absorption unit, or each heating, cooling, absorption or evaporative cooling system, including installation of controls regulated by the Mechanical Code	\$15.70
4.	Boilers, Compressors and Absorption Systems	
	For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor to and including 3 horsepower (10.6 kW), or each absorption system to and including 100,000 Btu/h (29.3 kW)	\$17.00
	For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor over three horsepower (10.6 kW) to and including 15 horsepower (52.7 kW), or each absorption system over 100,000 Btu/h (29.3 kW) to and including 500,000 Btu/h (146.6 kW)	\$31.10
	For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor over 15 horsepower (52.7 kW) to and including 30 horsepower (105.5 kW), or each absorption system over 500,000 Btu/h (146.6 kW) to and including 1,000,000 Btu/h (293.1 kW)	\$42.55
	For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor over 30 horsepower (105.5 kW) to and including 50 horsepower (176 kW), or each absorption system over 1,000,000 Btu/h (293.1 kW) to and including 1,750,000 Btu/h (512.9 kW)	\$63.25
	For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor over 50 horsepower (176 kW), or each absorption system over 1,750,000 Btu/h (512.9 kW)	\$105.50
5.	Air Handlers	
	For each air-handling unit to and including 10,000 cubic feet per minute (cfm) (4719 L/s), including ducts attached thereto	\$12.30
	Note: This fee does not apply to an air-handling unit which is a portion of a factory-assembled appliance, cooling unit, evaporative cooler, or absorption unit for which a permit is required elsewhere in the Mechanical Code.	
	For each air-handling unit over 10,000 cfm (4719 L/s)	\$20.60
6.	Evaporative Coolers	
	For each evaporative cooler other than portable type	\$12.30
7.	Ventilation and Exhaust	
	For each ventilation fan connected to a single duct	\$8.35
	For each ventilation system which is not a portion of any heating or air-conditioning system authorized by a permit	\$12.30
	For the installation of each hood which is served by mechanical exhaust, including the ducts for such hood	\$12.30
8.	Incinerators	
	For the installation or relocation of each domestic-type incinerator	\$20.60
	For the installation or relocation of each commercial or industrial-type incinerator	\$31.10
9.	Miscellaneous	

When Chapter 13 is applicable, permit fees for fuel gas piping shall be:	
For each gas piping system of one to four outlets	\$6.15
For each additional outlet exceeding four, each	\$1.60
When Chapter 14 is applicable, permit fee for process piping shall be as follows:	
For each hazardous piping system (HPP) of one to four outlets	\$6.05
For each hazardous process piping of five or more outlets, for each outlet	\$1.60
For each non-hazardous process piping system (NPP) of one to four outlets	\$2.35
For each non-hazardous piping system of five or more outlets, per outlet	\$1.05
For each appliance or piece of equipment regulated by the Mechanical Code but not classed in other appliance categories, or for which no other fee is listed in the table	\$12.30

Other Inspections and Fees

1.	Inspections outside of normal business hours, per hour (minimum charge – two hours)	\$54.25*
2.	Re-inspection fees assessed under provisions of Section 116.6, per inspection	\$54.25*
3.	Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated, per hour (minimum charge – two hours)	\$54.25*
4.	Additional plan review required by changes, additions or revisions to plans or to plans for which an initial review has been completed (minimum charge – one-half hour)	\$54.25*

*Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

Section 5. That sub-section 108.2.3 of Section 16.02.020 of the Longview Municipal Code, shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Section 108.2.3 Plumbing Permit Fee

The fee for each plumbing permit shall be as set forth in Table 3-A herein.

Table 3-A Plumbing Permit Fees

Permit Issuance		
1.	For issuing each permit	\$24.60
2.	For issuing each supplemental permit	\$12.30
Unit Fee Schedule (in addition to items 1 and 2 above)		
1.	For each plumbing fixture on one trap or a set of fixtures on one trap (including water, drainage piping and backflow protection therefor)	\$7.85
2.	For each building sewer and each trailer park sewer	\$17.20
3.	Rainwater systems – per drain (inside building)	\$7.85
4.	For each private sewage disposal system	\$28.50
5.	For each water heater and/or vent	\$7.85
6.	For each gas piping system of one to five outlets	\$5.75
7.	For each additional gas piping system outlet, per outlet	\$1.60
8.	For each industrial waste pretreatment interceptor including its trap and vent, except kitchen-type grease interceptors functioning as fixture traps	\$7.85
9.	For each installation, alteration or repair of water piping and/or water treating equipment, each	\$7.85
10.	For each repair or alteration of drainage or vent piping, each fixture	\$7.85
11.	For each lawn sprinkler system on any one meter including backflow protection devices	\$7.85
12.	For atmospheric-type vacuum breakers not included in item 13:	
	1 to 5	\$5.75
	over 5, each	\$1.60
13.	For each backflow protective device other than atmospheric type vacuum breakers:	

2 inch (51 mm) diameter and smaller	\$7.85
over 2 inch (51 mm) diameter	\$17.20
14. For each gray water system	\$45.75
15. For initial installation and testing for a reclaimed water system	\$34.20*
16. For each annual cross-connection testing of a reclaimed water system (excluding initial test)	\$34.20*
17. For each medical gas piping system serving one to five inlet(s)/outlet(s) for a specific gas	\$56.80
18. For each additional medical gas inlet(s)/outlet(s)	\$5.75
Other Inspections and Fees	
1. Inspections outside of normal business hours	\$54.25*
2. Reinspection fees assessed under provisions of Section 103.5.6, per inspection	\$54.25
3. Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated	\$54.25*
4. Additional plan review required by changes, additions or revisions to approved plans (minimum charge – one-half hour)	\$54.25*

*Per hour for each hour worked or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is greater. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of all the employees involved.

Section 6. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after the 1st day of January, 2007.

Passed by the City Council this 9th day of November, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this 9th day of November, 2006.

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Published: _____

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Land Use Planning Administration Fees

Agenda Item: 10.HDept. of Origin: Community Development**EXHIBITS:**Staff Report to the Planning Commission
Projected Revenue Comparison
Ordinance No. 2970For Agenda of: November 9, 2006*Clearances:*Originator: John Brickey, Director**COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:**Cost Recovery for Services Rendered
Financial StabilityCity Atty Review Necessary? YesDate/Initials of City Attorney: mkh 11/2/06**PRESENTED BY:**

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Asst. City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

The codes and ordinances adopted by the City of Longview concerning land use, development, and zoning require the Department of Community Development to perform certain review, approval and inspection to support land development and new construction, issue permits and periodically inspect existing occupancies to assure compliance with land use codes and ordinances. In 2005, in accordance with Council's goal of defraying the city's costs and expenses in processing land use applications, including the publication and mailing of notices required by law and the holding of land use hearings and appeals, staff proposed an amended schedule of land use application and permit fees. A comparison of adjoining jurisdictions and jurisdictions of similar size resulted in the amended planning fee schedule identified as Table 19-A of the Longview Municipal Code. The Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of this fee increase. At the request of the Lower Columbia Contractor's Association representing the local construction industry, Council agreed to phase implementation of the proposed fees, 65% in 2006 and the remaining 35% in 2007. This fee schedule completes the agreed upon phasing.

In an effort to minimize the future impact of fees to our community, the land use fee schedule will be assessed annually for adjustment based on local inflationary trends and submitted to Council for fee schedule amendment consideration.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:Motion to adopt Ordinance 2970.

ORDINANCE NO. 2970

An Ordinance amending Section 19.06.060 of the Longview Municipal Code, establishing the fees to be charged for administration of adopted land use laws, to include Appeal Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission actions in accordance with Longview Municipal Code of the City of Longview.

The City Council of the City of Longview do ordain as follows:

Section 1. That Section 19.06.060 of the Longview Municipal Code, shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Sec. 19.06.060 FEES.

The fees to be paid upon the filing of a petition or application relating to land use decisions, Planning Commission actions, and Appeal Board of Adjustment actions shall be as set forth in Table 19-A of the Longview Municipal Code.

Table 19-A – Longview Fee Schedule for Planning Actions

ACTION	FEE
PLANNING COMMISSION & STAFF	
Subdivision – Preliminary Plat	\$1500.00 + \$70.00 per lot
Subdivision – Preliminary Plat Extension	\$300.00
Subdivision – Final Plat	\$1500.00 + \$70.00 per lot
Short Plat	\$1,000.00
Short Plat Appeal	\$1,000.00
Planned Unit Development - Preliminary	\$2,000.00 + \$90.00 per lot
Planned Unit Development - Final	\$2,000.00 + \$90.00 per lot
Planned Unit Development - Amendment	\$600.00
Boundary Line Adjustment	\$300.00
Boundary Line Adjustment Appeal	\$300.00
Vacation Hearing	\$300.00
Rezone request	\$2,000.00
Zoning Text Amendment Request	\$2,000.00
Comprehensive Plan Amendment Request	\$2,000.00
Special Property Use Hearing for D-C District	\$600.00
APPEAL BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	
Appeal of Administrative Decision	\$400.00
Review of the Building Official's Interpretation	\$400.00
Similar Use Determination	\$400.00
Special Property Use Hearing	\$600.00
Variance Hearing	\$1,000.00

Other Inspections and Fees:

- 1. Additional review required by changes, additions or revisions to submitted documents\$54.30 per hour¹
(minimum charge – one-half hour)
- 5. For use of outside consultants Actual Costs²

¹ Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

² Actual costs include administrative and overhead costs.

When submittal documents are incomplete or changed so as to require additional review or when the project involves deferred submittal documents, an additional review fee shall be charged at the rate shown in amended Table 19-A.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after the 1st day of January, 2007.

Passed by the City Council this 9th day of November, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this 9th day of November, 2006.

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Published: _____

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Fire Code Permit, Plan Review and Inspection Fee
CPI Increase

Agenda Item: 10.I

Dept. of Origin: Fire Department

EXHIBITS:

Ordinance No. 2971

For Agenda of: November 9, 2006

Clearances:

Originator: Daryl McDaniel, Fire Chief

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

Cost Recovery
Financial Stability

City Atty Review Necessary? Yes

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Date/Initials of City Attorney: mkh 11/2/06

Asst. City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

In an effort to minimize the impact of fees to our community, the Fire Code permit, plan review and inspection fee schedules are assessed annually for adjustment based on local inflationary trends and submitted to Council for fee schedule amendment consideration. In accordance with Council's goal of defraying the city's costs and expenses in processing construction applications, reviews, permits, and inspections, staff is proposing an amended schedule of permit fees. The CPI (Consumer Price Index) numbers for 2006 to date for the Northwest region equate to an approximate 2.4% increase. Staff requests Council approval for increasing Fire Code permit, plan review and inspection fees accordingly.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2971

ORDINANCE NO. 2971

An Ordinance amending Section 18.10.060 of the Longview Municipal Code, relating to the fees to be charged for permits issued in accordance with the Fire Code of the City of Longview and for inspections and plan review thereunder.

The City Council of the City of Longview do ordain as follows:

Section 1. That Section 18.10.060 of the Longview Municipal code shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Section 18.10.060 Fire Code Permit, Plan Review and Inspection Fees

- (1) For installation or alteration of any of the required construction permits as listed in the fire code, Section 105.7, a permit fee will be assessed based on value as amended by Chapter 16.02_LMC, Table 1-A.
- (2) Plan review fees for required construction permits shall be 70 percent of the permit fee.
- (3) A fee of ~~\$53.00~~ \$54.30 shall be collected for all operational permits required by the fire code, Section 105. Where more than one operational permit is required at the same premises the fee for each additional permit shall be one-half of the original fee.
- (4) A fee of ~~\$53.00~~ \$54.30 shall be collected for all special event reviews and inspections for the purpose of reviewing fire department access routes, general fire protection requirements, life safety requirements or other reviews conducted pursuant to the international codes, standards and ordinances adopted by the city.
- (5) A fee of \$15.00 shall be collected annually for the inspection of certificate of occupancy permits required under International Building Code Chapter 1, Section 110.
- (6) Building plan review fees as required by LMC 18.10.050 for calculation of required fire flows, review of fire department access routes, general fire protection requirements, life safety requirements or other reviews conducted pursuant to the international codes, standards and ordinances adopted by the city shall be five percent of the building permit fee designated by Chapter 16.02 LMC, Table 1-A, except for group R-3 and U occupancies.
- (7) Reinspections, preliminary inspections and other special inspections required or requested shall be calculated at ~~\$53.00~~ \$54.30 per hour.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after the 1st day of January, 2007.

Passed by the City Council this 9th day of November, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this 9th day of November, 2006.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

Deputy City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Published: _____

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Environmental Review and Permit Fees

Agenda Item: 10.J**EXHIBITS:**Ordinance No. 2972Dept. of Origin: Community DevelopmentFor Agenda of: November 9, 2006**COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:**Cost Recovery for Services Rendered
Financial Stability*Clearances:*Originator: John Brickey, DirectorCity Atty Review Necessary? Yes**PRESENTED BY:**

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Date/Initials of City Attorney: mkh 11/2/06

Asst. City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

The codes and ordinances adopted by the City of Longview concerning SEPA, Critical Areas, Shoreline Management, and Storm Water/Erosion Control require the Department of Community and Economic Development to perform certain review, approval and inspection to support land development and new construction, issue permits and periodically inspect to assure compliance with applicable codes and ordinances. In 2005, in accordance with Council's goal of defraying the city's costs and expenses in processing environmental reviews and permits, staff proposed the establishment of a schedule of environmental application, review and permit fees. A comparison of adjoining jurisdictions and jurisdictions of similar size in resulted in the creation of a proposed environmental review and permit fee schedule identified as Table 17-A of the Longview Municipal Code. At the request of the Lower Columbia Contractor's Association representing the local construction industry, Council agreed to phase implementation of the proposed fees, 65% in 2006 and the remaining 35% in 2007. This fee schedule completes the agreed upon phasing.

In an effort to minimize the future impact of fees to our community, the environmental review and permit fee schedule will be assessed annually for adjustment based on local inflationary trends and submitted to Council for fee schedule amendment consideration.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:Motion to adopt Ordinance 2972 .

ORDINANCE NO. 2972

An Ordinance amending Section 17.02.070 of the Longview Municipal Code, relating to the fees to be charged for environmental review and permits in accordance with the Municipal Code of the City of Longview.

The City Council of the City of Longview do ordain as follows:

Section 1. That section 17.02.070 of the Longview Municipal Code, shall be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

Sec. 17.02.070 FEES.

The fees to be paid upon the filing of a petition or application relating to environmental protection review and permits shall be as set forth in Table 17-A of the Longview Municipal Code.

Table 17-A – Longview Fee Schedule for Environmental Review and Permits

ACTION	FEE
PLANNING STAFF REVIEWS	
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) DNS	\$500.00
SEPA MDNS	\$750.00
SEPA DS/EIS	\$4,000.00
SEPA DNS Appeal	\$500.00
SEPA MDNS Appeal	\$750.00
SEPA DS/EIS Appeal	\$4,000.00
Critical Areas Review/Determination	\$100.00
Critical Area Appeal	\$100.00
Floodplain Permit	\$250.00
Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SDP) Application	\$1,000.00
Shoreline Application Revision	\$250.00
Shoreline Exemption	\$100.00
Shoreline Conditional Use	\$500.00
Shoreline Conditional Use with SDP	\$100.00
Shoreline Variance	\$500.00
Shoreline Variance with SDP	\$100.00
Shoreline Appeal	\$250.00

Other Inspections and Fees:

- 1. Additional review required by changes, additions or revisions to submitted documents\$54.30 per hour¹
(minimum charge – one-half hour)
- 5. For use of outside consultants Actual Costs²

¹ Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

² Actual costs include administrative and overhead costs.

When submittal documents are incomplete or changed so as to require additional review or when the project involves deferred submittal documents, an additional review fee shall be charged at the rate shown in amended Table 17-A.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after the 1st day of January, 2007.

Passed by the City Council this 9th day of November, 2006.

Approved by the Mayor this 9th day of November, 2006.

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

Published: _____

To strengthen
and promote
cities as centers
of opportunity,
leadership, and
governance.



**National League
of Cities**

1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20004-1763

202-626-3000

Fax: 202-626-3043

www.nlc.org

2006 Officers

President

James C. Hunt
Councilmember
Clarksburg, West Virginia

First Vice President

Bart Peterson
Mayor
Indianapolis, Indiana

Second Vice President

Cynthia McCollum
Council Member
Madison, Alabama

Immediate Past President

Anthony A. Williams
Mayor
Washington, DC

Executive Director

Donald J. Borut

October 24, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Direct Member Cities
FROM: Donald J. Borut, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Congress of Cities Voting Delegates

Received
OCT 30 2006
Executive Office

The National League of Cities Annual Business Meeting will be held on Saturday, December 9, 2006, at the conclusion of the Congress of Cities and Exposition in Reno, Nevada. As a direct member city, your city is entitled to vote at this meeting. Based on population, each member city casts between one and twenty votes. The number of votes for each population range can be found on the table on the reverse of this memorandum.

To be eligible to cast a city's vote(s), a voting delegate and alternate must be officially designated by the city using the attached credentials form. This form will be forwarded to NLC's Credentials Committee. NLC bylaws expressly prohibit voting by proxy.

At the Congress of Cities, the voting delegate must pick up the city's voting card at the credentials booth before the Annual Business Meeting and must be present at the Annual Business Meeting to cast the city's vote(s). Alternates should visit the credentials booth before the meeting to pick up their stickers which identify them as alternate voting delegates. The credentials booth will be open throughout the Congress of Cities.

City elected officials should be made aware of this request so that decisions can be made as to who will be the voting delegate and alternate(s). **Please return the completed form to NLC by fax at 202-626-3043 on or before November 15, 2006**, and keep the original for your own files. If you have any questions or concerns, contact Ken Rosenfeld, NLC policy manager, at rosenfeld@nlc.org or 202-626-3194.

Thank you.

Past Presidents: Clarence E. Anthony, Mayor, South Bay, Florida • John DeStefano, Jr., Mayor, New Haven, Connecticut • William H. Hudnut, III, Mayor, Town of Chevy Chase, Maryland • Sharpe James, Mayor, Newark, New Jersey • Brian J. O'Neill, Councilman, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania • **Directors:** R. Michael Amyx, Executive Director, Virginia Municipal League • Tommy Baker, Alderman, Osceola, Arkansas • Vicki Barnett, Mayor, Farmington Hills, Michigan • Thomas Bredeweg, Executive Director, Iowa League of Cities • Nora Campos, Councilmember, San Jose, California • Thomas Carlson, Mayor, Springfield, Missouri • James Condos, Council Chair, South Burlington, Vermont • Joseph Donaldson, Mayor, Flagstaff, Arizona • Ted Ellis, Mayor, Bluffton, Indiana • Makia Epie, Council Member, Cedar Hill, Texas • Margaret Finlay, Mayor, Duarte, California • Eddy Ford, Mayor, Farragut, Tennessee • Danny George, Executive Director, Oklahoma Municipal League, Inc. • Gary Graham, Mayor, O'Fallon, Illinois • Matthew Greller, Executive Director, Indiana Association of Cities and Towns • Jim Highton, Executive Director, Georgia Municipal Association • Charles Hughes, Council President, Gary, Indiana • Steven Jeffrey, Executive Director, Vermont League of Cities and Towns • Martin Jones, Council Member, Conyers, Georgia • Ronald Loveridge, Mayor, Riverside, California • Cynthia Mangini, Councilman-At-Large, Enfield, Connecticut • Marcia Marcoux, Councilmember, Rochester, Minnesota • Michael McGlynn, Mayor, Medford, Massachusetts • James Mitchell, Jr., Council Member, Charlotte, North Carolina • Darryl Moss, Mayor, Creedmoor, North Carolina • Ed Oakley, Councilmember, Dallas, Texas • James Perkins, Jr., Mayor, Selma, Alabama • Richard Radcliffe, Councilman, Greenacres, Florida • Dottie Reeder, Mayor, Seminole, Florida • Julie Aberg Robison, Council Member At-Large, Cary, North Carolina • Ron Schmitt, Council Member, Sparks, Nevada • Shirley Scott, Council Member, Tucson, Arizona • Anne Sinclair, Council Member, Columbia, South Carolina • Walter Skowron, Council Member, Loveland, Colorado • Connie Sprynczynatyk, Executive Director, North Dakota League of Cities • Ken Strobeck, Executive Director, League of Arizona Cities and Towns • Charleta Tavares, Council Member, Columbus, Ohio • Lynne Whalen, Council Woman, Casper, Wyoming • Jacques Wigginton, Council Member, Lexington, Kentucky • Evelyn Woodson, Councilor, Columbus, Georgia



NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

2006 CONGRESS OF CITIES
RENO, NEVADA

Number of Votes – Annual Business Meeting

Direct Member Cities

Article IV, Section 2 of the National League of Cities bylaws specifies the number of votes that each NLC direct member city is entitled to cast at the Annual Business Meeting at the Congress of Cities. Member cities are required by the bylaws to cast unanimous votes.

CITY POPULATION (per 2000 Census)	NUMBER OF VOTES
Under 50,000	1 vote
50,000 – 99,999	2 votes
100,000 – 199,999	4 votes
200,000 – 299,999	6 votes
300,000 – 399,999	8 votes
400,000 – 499,999	10 votes
500,000 – 599,999	12 votes
600,000 – 699,999	14 votes
700,000 – 799,999	16 votes
800,000 – 899,999	18 votes
900,000 and above	20 votes

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES CREDENTIALS FORM
2006 CONGRESS OF CITIES · RENO, NEVADA

At the Annual Business Meeting on Saturday, December 9, 2006, each direct member city of NLC is entitled to cast from one to 20 votes based upon the city's population per the 2000 census, through its designated voting delegate. Please indicate below your city and state, voting delegate and alternate(s), and sign and date the form. The form should be faxed to NLC at 202-626-3043, by the November 15, 2006 deadline.

The official voting delegate and alternate(s) for the city/town of:

_____ (type or print the name of your city/town and state)

VOTING DELEGATE:

1. NAME _____

TITLE _____

ALTERNATE VOTING DELEGATE(S):

2. NAME _____ TITLE _____

3. NAME _____ TITLE _____

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
(DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE)

Voting card issued to: _____
(signature)

Votes: _____

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____

PLEASE SIGN AND FAX THIS FORM TO NLC BY NOVEMBER 15, 2006.
FAX: 202-626-3043; ATTENTION: ERIKA HAMILTON, POLICY ASSISTANT

Signature (city representative): _____

Title: _____ Date: _____

APPROVAL OF CLAIMS

Based upon the authentication and certification of claims and demands against the City, prepared and signed by the City's auditing officer, and in full reliance thereon, it is moved and seconded as shown in the minutes of this meeting that the following vouchers/warrants are approved for payment:

Voucher (warrant) totals for First Claims of November 2006: Total \$788,190.15

Pay Period:

Payroll warrant numbers 194782 through 194891	Total \$212,499.56
Payroll direct deposits	Total \$360,544.83
Payroll wire transfers	Total \$528,050.06
Total Payroll Amt	\$1,101,094.45

Pay Period: First Period November 2006

Debt service payments electronically wired for November 2006: None

CLAIMS ACTIVITY

New Claims

Claimant	Incident Date	Incident Description	Amount Claimed
1. Rodney Ericksen	10/06/06	Claimant alleges property damage as a result of a large tree limb falling onto moving vehicle.	\$3,260.00
2. Diane Crockett	9/29/06	Claimant alleges property damage as a result of a banner bracket falling onto her parked vehicle.	\$419.06
3. Antoinette Delyea	10/3/06	Claimant alleges out-of-pocket expenses incurred to clear sewer lines when problem was in City line.	\$941.50

Settled Claims

Claimant	Incident Date	Incident Description	Amount Paid
4. Carl Reisig	8/9/06	Claimant alleged damage to driveway due to tree roots pushing up concrete.	\$844.37
5. Connie Lang	7/24/06	Claimant alleged out-of-pocket expenses incurred to clear sewer line, when problem was in City line.	\$67.36

Denied Claims

Claimant	Incident Date	Incident Description	Amount Claimed
----------	---------------	----------------------	----------------



Memorandum

November 3, 2006

CERTIFICATION **Project Completion**

To: Mr. Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

From: Craig Bozarth, City Engineer

Reviewed By: Jeff Cameron, Director of Public Works

Subject: **City of Longview Library Elevator**
Contract #06-2596-B

This is to certify that the City of Longview Library Elevator project has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications under Contract No. 06-2596-B, entered into between the City of Longview and ThyssenKrupp Elevator, and the same is hereby accepted and approved.

DATED this 3rd Day of November, 2006.



Memorandum

November 2, 2006

TO: Mr. Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

FROM: Craig Bozarth, City Engineer

REVIEWED BY: Jeff Cameron, Public Works Director

SUBJECT: Street Use Request No. S-06-24
Jumbo's Annual Memorial Toy Run

The Engineering Division has received a street use request for the annual Jumbo's Toy Run, scheduled for Sunday, November 26, 2006. This request is sponsored by Cowlitz County ABATE and SWWMA.

The request has been reviewed by the various City Departments and no concerns were expressed. We recommend approval of this request.

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

New Liquor License Application #400882

Agenda Item: _____ 13.A _____

Dept. of Origin: _____ Police _____

EXHIBITS:

Washington State Liquor Control Board
Notice of Liquor License Application

For Agenda of: _____ November 9, 2006 _____

Clearances:
Originator: _____ Alex Perez, Chief of Police _____

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

City Atty Review Necessary? _____

Date/Initials of City Attorney: _____

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Asst. City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

Scott Turnell Klemetsrud has requested a Liquor License from the Washington State Liquor Control Board requesting to sell Spirits/beer and/or wine in a restaurant/ lounge at a new restaurant to be called Metro. This restaurant will be located at 933 15th Ave., the former site of Specialty Dry Cleaning. The police department has no concerns with either the applicant or the location.

An extension until November 16, 2006 was granted by the Washington State Liquor Control Board due to the timing of the receipt of this request.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion as desired by Council.



NOTICE OF LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATION

JAK

RETURN TO: WASHINGTON STATE LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD
License Division - 3000 Pacific, P.O. Box 43075
Olympia, WA 98504-3075
Customer Service: (360) 664-1600
Fax: (360) 753-2710
Website: www.liq.wa.gov

TO: CITY CLERK OF LONGVIEW
RE: NEW APPLICATION

CORRECTED sent to wrong agency 1st

DATE: 10/20/06

UBI: 602-655-555-001-0001

License: 400882 - 1K County: 08

Tradenam: METRO

Loc Addr: 933 15TH AVE
LONGVIEW

WA 98632-2322

APPLICANTS:

KLEMETSRUD, SCOTT TURNELL
1965-04-22

Mail Addr: 2636 GREENWAY AVE
LONGVIEW

WA 98632-5122

Phone No.: 360-430-3201 SCOTT KLEMETSRUD

Privileges Applied For:
SPIRITS, BR/WN REST LOUNGE +



As required by RCW 66.24.010(8), the Liquor Control Board is notifying you that the above has applied for a liquor license. You have 20 days from the date of this notice to give your input on this application. If we do not receive this notice back within 20 days, we will assume you have no objection to the issuance of the license. If you need additional time to respond, you must submit a written request for an extension of up to 20 days, with the reason(s) you need more time. If you need information on SSN, contact our CHRI Desk at (360) 664-1724.

- 1. Do you approve of applicant?
2. Do you approve of location?
3. If you disapprove and the Board contemplates issuing a license, do you wish to request an adjudicative hearing before final action is taken?
4. If you disapprove, per RCW 66.24.010(8) you MUST attach a letter to the Board detailing the reason(s) for the objection and a statement of all facts on which your objection(s) are based.

DATE

SIGNATURE OF MAYOR, CITY MANAGER, COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OR DESIGNEE

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Liquor License Request -
Cowlitz Valley Women of the Moose, Lodge #530

Agenda Item: _____ 13.B _____

Dept. of Origin: _____ Police _____

EXHIBITS:

Washington State Liquor Control Board
Special Occasion # 351692

For Agenda of: _____ November 9, 2006 _____

Clearances:

Originator: _____ Alex Perez, Chief of Police _____

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

City Atty Review Necessary? _____

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Date/Initials of City Attorney: _____

Asst. City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

This special occasion liquor license request shown on the exhibit is for the fourth annual wine tasting event to be held in conjunction with a silent auction for Hospice at the Moose Lodge on Washington Way. It is scheduled for November 18, 2006 from 5 PM to 10 PM. They will be selling wine by the glass as well as by the bottle (that a purchaser can take off premises) in the dance floor area, away from the regular bar. Hors d'oeuvres will be served as well. The police department has no concerns in reference to this request.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion as desired by Council.

WASHINGTON STATE LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD-License Services
3000 Pacific Ave SE - P O Box 43075
Olympia WA 98504-3075

TO: MAYOR OF LONGVIEW

October 23, 2006

SPECIAL OCCASION # 351692

COWLITZ VALLEY WOMEN OF THE MOOSE, LODGE #530
921 WASHINGTON WAY
LONGVIEW WA 98632

DATE: NOVEMBER 18, 2006 TIME: 5 PM TO 10 PM

PLACE: MOOSE LODGE BANQUET ROOM, 921 WASHINGTON WAY, LONGVIEW

CONTACT: BJ MAYCLIN 360-423-5940



SPECIAL OCCASION LICENSES

- * License to sell beer on a specified date for consumption at specific place.
- * License to sell wine on a specific date for consumption at a specific place.
- * Beer/Wine in unopened bottle or package in limited quantity for off premises consumption.
- * Spirituous liquor by the individual glass for consumption at a specific place.

If return of this notice is not received in this office within 20 days from the above date, we will assume you have no objection to the issuance of the license. If additional time is required please advise.

1. Do you approve of applicant? YES__ NO__
2. Do you approve of location? YES__ NO__
3. If you disapprove and the Board contemplates issuing a license, do you want a hearing before final action is taken? YES__ NO__

<u>OPTIONAL CHECK LIST</u>	<u>EXPLANATION</u>	YES__ NO__
LAW ENFORCEMENT	_____	YES__ NO__
HEALTH & SANITATION	_____	YES__ NO__
FIRE, BUILDING, ZONING	_____	YES__ NO__
OTHER:	_____	YES__ NO__

If you have indicated disapproval of the applicant, location or both, please submit a statement of all facts upon which such objections are based.

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Set Public Hearing: Proposed 2007-2008
Biennial Budget and 2007-2011 Capital
Improvement Plan (CIP)

Agenda Item: 14.A

Dept. of Origin: Finance

For Agenda of: November 9, 2006

EXHIBITS:

None

Clearances:

Originator: Kurt Sacha

City Atty Review Necessary?

Date/Initials of City Attorney:

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

Asst. City Manager: David Campbell

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

RCW 35A.34.110 requires cities to conduct a formal public hearing on the proposed biennial budget. Copies of the 2007-2008 Biennial Budget and 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Plan will be made available to Council and to members of the public prior to the public hearing. This review shall be held at a public hearing that has been duly advertised to the public. Public hearing notices on the proposed 2007-2008 Biennial Budget and 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Plan are scheduled for publication on November 10, 2006 and November 15, 2006.

Expenditure Required:	Amount Budgeted	Appropriation Required
----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to set Public Hearing on proposed 2007-2008 Biennial Budget and 2007 - 2011 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) on November 30, 2006 and December 14, 2006.

AGENDA SUMMARY SHEET

Business of the City Council City of Longview, Washington

SUBJECT TITLE:

Request to hire firm to conduct census for two annexations: Columbia Heights Assembly of God and Rick Annexations.

Agenda Item: _____ 14.B

Dept. of Origin: _____ Community Development

EXHIBITS:

For Agenda of: _____ November 9, 2006

COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESSED:

Comprehensive Plan - Annexations

Clearances:

Originator: _____ John Brickey, Director

PRESENTED BY:

Robert J. Gregory, City Manager

City Atty. Review Necessary? _____

Date/Initials of City Attorney: _____

Deputy City Manager: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT:

Per RCW 35A.14.700, whenever any territory is annexed to a code city, a census of that territory must be submitted to the Office of Financial Management within thirty days of the effective date of annexation. The count of population and housing in annexations shall be made in "accordance with practices and policies, and subject to the approval of The Office of Financial Management (OFM)."

City staff is requesting authorization to hire Glenn MacGilvra to conduct the required census for both the Rick and Columbia Heights Assembly of God annexations. These annexations total 553 acres with 586 tax parcels and an estimated population of 1,800. The Rick Annexation has numerous apartment buildings which are more difficult to get a population count. Staff does not have the resources to conduct the required enumerations without severely impacting normal duties.

Glenn MacGilvra was highly recommended by Office of Financial Management staff. He also received a very positive recommendation from the City of Bonney Lake. He has conducted numerous enumerations in the Puget Sound area and elsewhere and is very familiar with OFM census requirements. City staff conducted a search for alternative firms. Municipal Research and Services Center, the City of Vancouver and others were contacted. Staff also explored hiring a local firm. No other viable options were found.

Expenditure	Amount	Appropriation
Required: \$15,000	Budgeted \$0	Required

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Motion to authorize the City Manager to contract with Glenn MacGilvra to conduct a census for both the Rick Annexation and the Columbia Heights Assembly of God Annexation and appropriate \$15,000 in the 2005-06 Supplemental Budget Amendment. Each census must meet OFM census standards. The contract amount is not to exceed \$15,000 without further approval from the City Council.

New Business License Applications

11/02/2006

AMERICAN POWER SYSTEMS, LLC
26507 79TH AVE S
KENT WA 98032

BEN GILLILAN
SALES AND SERVICE OF POWER PRODUCTS

COMPUSTYLE COMPUTERS
3324 PENNSYLVANIA ST
LONGVIEW WA 98632

WILLIAM CARNAHAN
COMPUTER REPAIRS

COTTON HOMES
19020 S MATTON RD
ESTACADA OR 97023

JARED COTTON
GENERAL CONTRACTOR

DAVID STOCK ELECTRIC, LLC
965 TYINN ST. #5
EUGENE OR 97402

DAVID STOCK
ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR

DECORATOR MOLDING
1024 14TH AVE SUITE 200
LONGVIEW WA 98632

KAY BOCKNESS
DISTRIBUTOR OF CROWN MOLDING

ELIZABETH PSYCHIC GALLERY
1220 OCEAN BEACH HWY
LONGVIEW WA 98632

NANCY STEVENS
PSYCHIC

HEALTHY HOME BUILDER.COM
305 NE PALMBLAD DR
GRESHAM OR 97030

CECIL SMITH
GENERAL CONTRACTOR

HUBBARD'S FINISH CARPENTRY
640 19TH AVE
LONGVIEW WA 98632

JEFFREY HUBBARD
GENERAL CARPENTRY WORK

KEL-TEC BUILDERS, INC.
12000 NE 95TH ST #510
VANCOUVER WA 98682

ALLISTAIR KETTLEWELL
GENERAL CONTRACTOR

KELLIE MC CLURE AT AMBIENCE
1422 12TH AVE SUITE B
LONGVIEW WA 98632

KELLIE MC CLURE
HAIR STYLIST

LIBERTY CONCRETE PUMPING LLC
12404 NE 153RD ST SUITE 200
BRUSH PRAIRIE WA 98606

JON WARNKE
CONCRETE PUMPING SERVICE

New Business License Applications

11/02/2006

MEDIATION WORKS
950 12TH AVE SUITE 100
LONGVIEW WA 98632

CANDACE SANDERS
MEDIATION SERVICES

NORTHWEST TANK & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
17407 59TH AVE SE
SNOHOMISH WA 98296-6307

REMY CANO
ENVIRONMENTAL TESTING

NOVEDADES "IRIS"
4503 OCEAN BEACH HWY #102
LONGVIEW WA 98632

MAURO MURO
SELLING WOMENS ACCESSORIES

OASIS CONSULTING AND BOOKKEEPING
2728 FIR ST
LONGVIEW WA 98632

CHRISTINA SHELTON
OFFICE CONSULTING

P.T.E., INC.
1011 SE 11TH PL
NORTH BEND WA 98045

RICH CAMPBELL
ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR

SHERYL SIMPSON
1614 SLIDE CREEK RD
LONGVIEW WA 98632

SHERYL SIMPSON
RETAIL SALES OF SPA PRODUCTS
