1) Call to Order and Roll Call
2) Approval of the Minutes – October 1, 2014
3) Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda
4) DISCUSSION: Comprehensive Plan Update
   a) Urban Growth Area Boundary
   b) Vision Statement
5) Project Updates
6) Other Board Member Items Not on the Agenda
7) Adjourn

Next Meeting: December 3, 2014
The meeting was called to order at 3:03PM

**Attendance:**
Members present: Roger Gage, Aaron Simpson, Gail Fleming, Sue Walsh
Members absent: Dominique Emerson, Paul Goldfinger
Staff present: Jeff Arango, Cheryl Knighton

**Approval of Minutes:** Motion by Aaron to approve September 10, 2014 Minutes. Second, Roger
Approved unanimously.

**Public Comment for items not on the agenda** – None

**Langley Lift View Assessment**

Jeff briefed the board and the audience on the View assessment. He gave the history and noted that it is online and he offered copies of other comments that he has received in writing. Currently it is in the process of public input. He displayed a slide show depicting the history as far back as 2004. He noted that the $500,000 grant moneys came from Island County for Economic Development. He said there is still opportunity it add more transparency to the bridge. He walked through the assessment along Cascade. The plan would be to get more public input, present it to DRB, get advise from the PAB, and then present the recommendation to council.

Concerns from the audience:

Many were concerned about the parking. Who will benefit from this project? Pam Schell noted that there is no timeline on the project, but regardless of the outcome, she wants an elevator to be installed.

Also a concern was maintenance of the lift. Who will pay for it, who will provide the maintenance? What hours will it be open?

Brian W said that before continuing there should be a cost analysis done, most everyone agreed. Warren B asked what will it really going to look like. Charlie P is concerned about the view, the parking the maintenance and the cost. Nell A. agrees with Charlie, she is a long time sailor and says that the people who are boaters will not use it. There is no need for it. The marina staff offers transportation to town for those who cannot walk the hill. Feels there should be a survey done from the boaters. Eric L. suggested an alternative idea he found in a Hill Hiker brochure. Charles S. feels there is an emotional hit when he drives along Cascade and sees the view.
It was asked what happened to the funicular idea, why was it scrapped. Jeff said there is no reason why a funicular couldn’t go in. Ann S. spoke about the aesthetics of the project. Thinks it could be shorter so that it wouldn’t block the view at all. Brian W. said there needs to be public vote that it is public money and they should have a right to vote on it and asked how the city could get it on a ballot. Jeff said he would research it. Sharon E. thinks it is ugly, agrees that it is useless as far as boaters are concerned. Said she walked the distance both routes, and feels it is actually longer. It makes more sense to develop more vehicle access. Ryan is concerned about the view and does not like the idea of ruining it.

Aaron S. said that the city has benefited in many ways with grants they have obtained. Pam S. says the Port feels it is worth doing. Others feel there needs to be a second exit from Wharf Street before an elevator is installed. There was some concern about cruise ships coming into Langley. Langley is a mall sleepy town and it would not be appropriate to have large ships coming here. Many feel the golf carts should stay. The money that the seasonal boaters bring does not make a major impact on the economic development of the city.

Aaron said the biggest problem with the golf carts is finding volunteers to run them. They have advertised for help, but at this time it is 60% of the employees of Main Street who operate them. Gail proposed an alternative to golf carts, why not a trolley? A moveable sidewalk, says that other alternatives should be looked at first. She read a memo from Parks and Open Space Commission, that will be presented to the council recommending that everyone should step back and take a breath. Look at the Shoreline Master Program that states “development, uses and activities on or near the shoreline should not impair or detract from the public’s visual access to the water”. Also asking the city to document the need for such access, including documentation of any measurable gain and research into why this is a priority, including whether it is still a priority. To be included in this would be collecting information from boaters about their preferred meth of moving to and from the marina.

Sue asked if there was a timeline, Jeff said he would like more input from the public and from the different boards, maybe a couple of months before any direction will be taken. He learned a lot today from the public comments. He wants to make sure all avenues are looked at before taking anything to the council. Aaron moved to end the discussion and the audience left.

Comprehensive Plan Updates:

Jeff took out the Vision statement from the Review Executive Summary. Roger feels it was well written. Gail would like to propose adding another goal and reordering the presentation. Jeff agrees and will make the changes. Move environmental Stewardship to #1 and there should be a preservation goal from land use added. There was some discussion about attracting Knowledge Based workers and the vision is about the island and protecting the economic development as much as possible. Aaron asked if there could be the revenue source for the city added to the next packet. Some discussion on how the city is always “teetering” back and forth, and that it needs to be protected so that it doesn’t “tip over” with large projects that could run over budget.

Some discussion on what do we really want verses what we have done. Preserve the plan more than making many changes, but to remain proactive. Charles P. mentioned that item #2 does not mention
preserving views, and it should be considered. The board agreed. It was mentioned that the Shoreline Management needs to coincide with the Vision Statement. Item #1 needs to not only include attracting people but to retain them.

Jeff said he would like to complete the Comp plan before moving forward with any other projects. Gail would like verbiage on the water statements in the future about the tree ordinance, Cheryl said she would get it info from Jeff and would include it in the January billing.

Motion to adjourn – Roger, 2nd Gail.

Meeting adjourned 5:00PM
Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Board (PAB)
From: Jeff Arango, AICP – Director of Community Planning
Date: October 29, 2014

Re: Comprehensive Plan Update – Urban Growth Boundary

Island County has finalized the buildable lands analysis for the 2016 comprehensive plan update including growth targets for the City of Langley for the next 20-year period (2036). The City of Langley is estimated to accommodate approximately 89 additional people over the next 20 years based primarily on population projections issued by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). Urban growth areas must be of sufficient size to accommodate 20-year growth targets and may include a market factor to account for land that is not available for development. The city limits of Langley can accommodate approximately 1667 persons (an addition of approximately 600 people over the existing population) based on existing zoning, which could be amended to create additional growth capacity. Urban growth area boundaries should not be oversized to focus growth to the most appropriate areas that are already served by existing infrastructure. RCW 36.70a.110 identifies the requirements for the sizing of urban growth area boundaries:

(2) Based upon the growth management population projection made for the county by the office of financial management, the county and each city within the county shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county or city for the succeeding twenty-year period, except for those urban growth areas contained totally within a national historical reserve. As part of this planning process, each city within the county must include areas sufficient to accommodate the broad range of needs and uses that will accompany the projected urban growth including, as appropriate, medical, governmental, institutional, commercial, service, retail, and other nonresidential uses.

Each urban growth area shall permit urban densities and shall include greenbelt and open space areas. In the case of urban growth areas contained totally within a national historical reserve, the city may restrict densities, intensities, and forms of urban growth as determined to be necessary and appropriate to protect the physical, cultural, or historic integrity of the reserve. An urban growth area determination may include a reasonable land market supply factor and shall permit a range of urban densities and uses. In determining this market factor, cities and counties may consider local circumstances. Cities and counties have discretion in their comprehensive plans to make many choices about accommodating growth.

Oak Harbor was recently challenged through the courts and for having a UGA that was oversized and was prevented from expanding their UGA. The city does have an obligation to ensure the UGA is not oversized or risk legal challenge. Based on the fact the city can accommodate 20 year growth within the city limits is justification to resize the UGA. The UGA may be expanded as necessary in the future to accommodate additional growth.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the PAB support the resizing of the city’s UGA to the existing City Limits.
October 21, 2014

Mr. Jeff Arango
City of Langley
PO Box 366
112 Second Street
Langley, WA 98260

Dear Mr. Arango:

Thank you for your ongoing participation in our collaborative efforts to ensure that the City of Langley and Island County have consistent Comprehensive Plans as required by the Washington State Growth Management Act. As you are aware, we have finalized the Buildable Lands Analysis and have developed draft revisions to the Countywide Planning Policies. We are approaching a stage in the planning process in which we are considering modifications to Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundaries.

Based on discussions at Island County Intergovernmental Working Group meetings, we understand that the City of Langley would like to reduce the UGA to the existing city limits. The results of the Buildable Lands Analysis indicate that the City of Langley would be able to accommodate projected population and employment growth within the city limits, and the analysis could therefore support a reduction of the UGA. If the City of Langley wants to continue working with Island County to reduce the UGA, please provide us with a written statement from Mayor McCarthy or the City Council indicating that preference.

Feel free to contact me at w.simpson@co.island.wa.us or 360-678-7807 if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

William Simpson,
Associate Planner
Langley’s Vision for the Future

The City of Langley maintains it’s small town historic charm and unique sense of place that is characterized by the convergence of beautiful and inspiring natural and built environments. The city continues to be vibrant, artistic, human-scaled, walkable and support social and cultural connections amongst locals and visitors. Due to these assets Langley continues to be the artistic, cultural, retail, service and entertainment center for South Whidbey attracting visitors, retirees, businesses and new families to the community.

Langley’s assets have been strengthened by new development and growth that fits with the strong sense of place and community identity of the city while preserving key cultural, historical and environmental assets including:

- The marina has been further expanded to support economic development and marine access to the city as well as greater access to the waterfront for locals and visitors.
- New mixed-use, multi-family and housing has been integrated seamlessly into the community in appropriate areas with high quality design that respects the local character and minimizes impacts on critical areas.
- The city continues to support a number of non-profit organizations that meet the needs of the local community.
- Knowledge workers, those that have the freedom to work anywhere, have increasingly chosen to locate in Langley with their families due to broadband access and the variety of artistic, natural resource and cultural amenities.
- The city has preserved land in and around the city for recreation and environmental benefits.
- Artisan manufacturing and associated light industrial uses have integrated into the city and are driving new investment the local economy.

The City has continued investing in public infrastructure with new street design and public space investments that provide placemaking opportunities to be capitalized on by the local community stakeholders as a means to increase the vibrancy, economic activity, social interaction and amusement in the downtown core.

To achieve the above vision the City of Langley has the following goals:
1. **Environmental Stewardship.** The City of Langley should provide an effective stewardship of the environment to protect critical areas and conserve land, air, water, energy resources as well as shoreline views.

2. **Downtown Vitality.** The City of Langley should maintain and enhance the downtown core as the economic, cultural, retail and social hub of the community to attract residents, businesses, organizations and businesses to the community.

3. **Community Design.** The City of Langley should encourage changes that promote livability, pedestrian orientation, and thoughtful design, and limit stress factors such as noise and air pollution and traffic congestion.

4. **Local Economy.** The City of Langley should use local resources whenever possible to encourage local involvement in community actions and to enhance community pride. This should include continued encouragement of public and private involvement in community traditions, as well as encouragement of volunteerism and activism.

5. **Diverse Economy.** The City of Langley should encourage the local economy by providing a timely review of projects and allowing a diversity in the range of goods and services, and recognize that as the economy changes, employment opportunities should be balanced with a range of diverse housing opportunities.

6. **Recreational Amenities.** The City of Langley should enhance the opportunities for enjoyment of recreational activities, providing a range of activities for all ages. The enjoyment and educational value of such activities is enhanced by diversity in the available choices.

7. **Arts + Culture.** The City of Langley should encourage and support cultural activities and the arts as an integral element of the community.

8. **Public Investment.** The City of Langley should identify the public improvements needed to properly serve existing and planned future growth and the means to finance these improvements so that they are implemented in a timely and equitable manner.
9. **Public Participation.** The City of Langley should encourage community involvement by ensuring effective communication, providing ample and diverse opportunities for input, and empowering people to be involved in the planning, design and development process.

10. **Partnerships.** The city is also committed to working with Island County, Port of South Whidbey, Island Transit, South Whidbey School District, and other relevant jurisdictions to coordinate and resolve regional issues.

11. **Preservation.** Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical or archaeological significance.

12. **Community Character.** Preserve and enhance the existing small town and historic character of Langley.

13. **Knowledge Workers.** The city should actively promote Langley as a hub for Knowledge Workers that have the freedom to work from anywhere.
GENERAL FUND REVENUES
“Where does the City get its money?”

The General Fund provides for the general operation of the municipality. Revenues in the General Fund are usually general purpose and with a few exceptions, are available for any public purpose. Taxes are the largest source of General Fund Revenue. Sales tax and property taxes are the largest general purpose revenue sources. The General Fund provides for the operation of administrative; financial and records services; staff training; general legal and legislative costs; police and emergency services; dispatch; library and city hall building maintenance; parks; public health and welfare, and land use.

The following is a brief summary of the sources of revenue which support this fund. The three major revenue sources are property taxes, sales taxes, and utility taxes.

TAXES - Real and Personal Property Taxes - Revenue derived from taxes on the assessed value of real property including land, buildings and improvements and the assessed value of personal property. Property tax is levied based on the full market value of property as determined by the Island County Assessor annually. The County Treasurer's office is responsible for billing and collecting the tax. In 2005 the citizens of Langley voted to lift the levy lid from the 2005 rate of $1.04 cents per $1,000 of property valuation to $1.83 for taxes collected in 2006. Because the overall amount of the property tax levy may be increased by no more than one percent, when assessed value rises, the levy rate per $1,000 of assessed value decreases. The 2007 levy rate was $1.51, the 2008 rate was $1.29. The rate for 2012 was $1.51 and $1.60 in 2013.

Local Sales Tax - Revenues distributed by the State for the City's share of taxes imposed upon the sale and consumption of goods and services within the city. When $100 worth of goods is purchased within the city limits, sales tax of $8.70 is charged. Of that 8.70, the City receives $0.85.

Utility taxes - This is a business and occupation tax assessed by the city equal to a percentage (6%) of the gross sales or income of utility business within the city. Utility taxes are collected on water, sewer and storm sewer, garbage service, phone services, cable television, and electrical power service.

LICENSES & PERMITS - License and permit fees are designed to cover the cost of administration, inspections and services for those occupations, trades and activities which are regulated by city ordinance. The following fees are collected:

Business Licenses – Fees charged to regulate and permit an individual or company to conduct business within the City. Licenses are renewed yearly.

Building Permits - Fees charged by the city for the issuance and regulation of building and the inspections necessary to make sure those buildings are up to the city's code standards.
Animal Licenses - All dogs residing in the city are required to be licensed by city ordinance. With proof of vaccinations and proof of spaying or neutering, if applicable, a fee is paid and a license issued. Records of licenses help to identify lost pets.

Temporary Vendors & Contractor's Licenses - Fees charged for permits to open a temporary business (one week or less) and to do construction work within the city.

Franchise Fees - Fees paid to the city by franchise holders. A percentage of gross profits made within the city.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES - Grants, entitlements, shared revenues and payments for goods and services provided by one governmental entity to another. The major sources of revenue in this category are:

DOE Shoreline Grant – A grant from the State Department of Ecology for completion of the Shoreline Comp Plan.

Conservation Futures Grant – A grant from the County Conservation Futures Fund to purchase conservation easements for the Noble Creek property.

Criminal Justice Funds - State distribution to cities from state sales taxes for criminal justice use only. Some funding is distributed in a lump sum by population level and the remainder allocated for the enhancement of certain ongoing criminal justice programs enacted by the city.

Liquor Excise Tax - Taxes collected by the state from the sales at State Liquor Stores and agencies and on other sales of beer and wine and distributed to cities. Allocations are based on population. Two percent of the total received by the city must be spent on alcoholism programs.

Liquor Profits - Distribution by the state from license and permit fees, penalties, forfeitures and other income by the State Liquor Control Board. These funds are allocated on a per capita basis and two percent of them must also be spent on alcoholism programs.

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Budget & Accounting Services – The fee paid to the city for its service as a Puget Sound Energy Pay Station.

Passport Services - The City became a US Passport Application office in February of 2005. For each application processed, the City earns $25.

Rents - Rental fees paid to the city for the use of city owned buildings such as the Fire Hall and Visitor Information Center.
Investment Interest – The amounts that the city earns on the investment of cash resources. Most of the city’s funds are kept in interest bearing liquid investments until needed to pay expenditures.

Operating Transfers – (Cost allocations) The amounts paid to the General fund by the enterprise funds to cover the costs of finance and record keeping, utility billing, postage, legal fees and other general services supplied to those departments. These amounts are based on a specific accounting formula.

Revenue sources at a glance
“Where does the City get its money?”

2013 General Fund Revenues

Langley City Hall
SALES AND PROPERTY TAX REVENUES

Sales Tax

The State of Washington collects the 8.7% sales tax paid to merchants and vendors who do business within the City of Langley and distributes the City’s portion back to the City on a monthly basis. All sales tax is accounted for in the General Fund and promotes general fund programs.

For every $100 of goods or services purchased in the City, a sales tax of $8.70 is paid. Of that amount the City of Langley receives $0.85. The tax is distributed as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Langley</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island County</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Sales Tax

Out of the 282 cities in this state, Langley ranks 36th in amount of sales tax per capita ($16,235). (2012)
Property Tax

The Island County Treasurer collects the property tax levied by the City of Langley and remits it to the City on a monthly basis as collected. The property tax is recorded in the General Fund. City Council set a policy in 2005 when the City's levy lid lift was approved by the voters that a portion of property tax would be transferred to the Street Fund to support street construction and maintenance. The remainder of the property tax supports General Fund programs. As with Sales taxes, the majority of the property tax paid by our residents does not go to the City. In 2013, Langley residents paid a tax of $8.22 per thousand dollars of assessed valuation. Of that amount, the City of Langley received $1.60. The following chart shows how property tax is distributed.

![Property Tax Distribution Chart]