DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, May 12, 2003
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Jepsen, Deputy Mayor Grossman, Councilmembers Chang, Hansen, Montgomery, and Ransom

ABSENT: Councilmember Gustafson

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exception of Councilmember Gustafson.

Upon motion by Councilmember Ransom, seconded by Councilmember Montgomery and unanimously carried, Councilmember Gustafson was excused due to illness.

(a) Proclamation of "Judge Robert Wacker Week"

Mayor Jepsen presented a proclamation commemorating the life of Judge Robert Wacker to his widow, LaNita Wacker and his son Doug and his family. Ms. Wacker provided some background on her husband's life and interests and made a donation in his memory to the Shoreline Youth Athletic programs.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Steve Burkett reported that the May 19 workshop has been cancelled.

Councilmember Ransom moved to suspend the Council's rules of procedure to extend the public comment period to accommodate the number of people wishing to speak on agenda item 9(a). Deputy Mayor Grossman seconded the motion. After brief discussion on procedures, **a vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously, and the public comment period was extended.**

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: none

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Clark Elster, Shoreline, asked if the Council had read the Sunday *Seattle Times* article regarding the destruction of Thornton Creek. He said the Council should be protecting the creek and not "selling out" Shoreline to private development.

(b) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, expressed disappointment with the City's failure to publicize the Council Retreat. He said notification is an extremely important function, and that he hopes the City learns from this tremendous oversight. On another topic, he said a senior Seattle City Light (SCL) official indicated that SCL does not intend to pay the costs to underground utilities on the Aurora Corridor Project. He suggested that the City reconsider its position and disclose the true costs to the taxpayers.

(c) Virginia Botham, Shoreline, opposed Council's decision to restrict public comment, asserting that public input is not a high priority to the City. She also opposed the Council's decision to restrict the type of comments Councilmembers can make when officially representing the City.

(d) Pam McElmeel, Shoreline, opposed the continued closure of N 183rd Street at Dayton and asked what the safety concerns were for closing the street. She questioned the process that resulted in the recommendation to permanently close the street, and asked if her street could qualify for closure.

(e) Laurie Maciel, Shoreline, opposed the street closure, noting that N 183rd Street has been a through-street since the 1970's. She felt that tax money should go toward keeping streets open, not closing them. She said the closure creates increased traffic near St. Luke's and Shorewood High School. She suggested that the Fremont side be closed so other people will understand the impact. She estimated that one-third or one-half of all vehicles traveling on that street are local residents.

(f) Cynthia Wills, Shoreline, said there needs to be a better resolution to the problem than street closure, which has resulted in the transfer of traffic, noise, and danger to other neighboring streets. She objected to the process, noting that it was decided by only 70 percent of those who responded, not 70 percent of the total residents of Happy Valley. She asserted that although Happy Valley has legitimate concerns, the closure does not properly address the effects of closure on the entire area.

(g) Naoma Hardy, Shoreline, submitted a petition with 200 signatures of people opposing the closure of N 183rd Street. She said only 41 of 83 eligible households requested permanent closure by the deadline, which is not even 50% of the total who could have voted. She said most people she talked to in the area oppose the closure. She said Area 2 on page 77 of the staff report is incorrect. She said there is a general decline in the livability of the area due to increased noise and traffic. She urged Council to find a solution that solves the problem rather than expands it.

(h) Carol Krantz, Shoreline, described the positive impact the street closure has had on her family life. She said the closure has resulted in less litter, more pedestrians, and greatly improved driver and pedestrian safety.

(i) Kristin Schwab, Shoreline, expressed support for the street closure, noting that her daughter can now cross the street safely, and neighbors can safely walk in their own neighborhood. She said sometimes the closure is inconvenient because she must drive a further distance, but it is well worth it from a safety perspective.

(j) Steve Bates, Shoreline, said the closure is inconvenient for him because he lives on the N 183rd Street side of the closure, but it has been a positive thing. He said the data indicated that 80 percent of traffic in Happy Valley was cut-through traffic, or people trying to save time by speeding or using a short cut. He said children can now safely play and ride bicycles on the street. He said the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program (NTSP) was not necessarily designed to close streets, but because of the unique features of the area, closure was the only viable alternative.

(k) Elizabeth Sheffield, Shoreline, said the closure has had many positive results, including decreased noise, children playing, an increased number of pedestrians, and the creating of a sense of community. She thanked the Council for the NTSP process, noting it has empowered people and impacted them in a positive way.

(l) Linda Nixon, Shoreline, said there are a variety of arguments she could use to support the street closure, but perhaps the most compelling are the Council goals, values, and critical success factors. These include "Safe Places to Live and Work" and "Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods." She said she realized that her values and those of her neighborhood are the same as those established by the City Council. She said people have a basic right to live in a safe neighborhood. She commended City staff for their work over the past two years on this issue, during which time they maintained a neutral position while collecting and analyzing the relevant data. She said their efforts will help Council make an informed decision. She said a majority of residents voted twice to support the closure. She thanked the neighbors and staff for their involvement and efforts in this cause.

(m) Fred Clingan, Shoreline, urged the Council to adopt Resolution No. 206, noting that it will resolve the safety problems created by cut-through traffic. He said the unique features of the road preclude the use of other calming methods. He said speeders and other traffic violators are responsible for damage to parked cars, mailboxes and yards, and they endanger the lives of pedestrians. He agreed that the closure will be inconvenient, but public safety is more important than personal inconvenience. He said an affirmative vote tonight will culminate a three-year effort to eliminate a significant safety problem and also return the neighborhood's quality of life. He said the process demonstrates that the NTSP will help other areas address their own traffic safety problems.

(n) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, explained the significance of the poster hanging on the wall behind the Council, which was created by 2nd graders at St. Mark's school for her late husband, Judge Robert Wacker, while he was in hospice care.

(o) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, expressed warm sentiments for the late Judge Wacker and his wife LaNita. Responding to remarks Councilmembers made at a previous meeting regarding people leaving the meeting early, he stated that the Council, not the general public, is required to be at meetings. He suggested that Councilmembers should resign if they find their jobs distasteful. He said Council is squelching public comment and ignoring the findings of agencies such as Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)and the National Marine Fisheries, who could offer real protections to the environment. He asserted that private citizens are doing the job of City staff, and that the City is destroying community conservation efforts.

(p) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, said the reduction of public comment is a perversion of the democratic processes. He said the Council is trying to pervert the Development Code as well by taking out protective standards in the name of increased development. He contended that Council's loyalties are not with Shoreline's citizens, but with private developers. He requested that the Council ask the cable company to provide a public access television station, which it is required to do under its franchise agreement. As a Richmond Beach resident, he is opposed to closure of N 183rd Street at Dayton, noting that traffic problems could be solved by widening N 185th Street.

Responding to Mr. Mann, Mayor Jepsen said that City Clerk Sharon Mattioli addressed the Council Retreat noticing issue at last week's meeting. He requested that Mr. Mann forward any relevant communications from Seattle City Light to the Shoreline Merchants Association so that Council can respond appropriately. He said tonight's meeting illustrates the fact that Council can make adjustments to the rules in order to accommodate public comment.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Ransom moved approval of the agenda. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Montgomery moved approval of the consent calendar. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 6-0, and the following items were approved:

Minutes of Workshop Meeting of April 21, 2003
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of April 28, 2003
Minutes of Regular Meeting of April 28, 2003

Approval of expenses and payroll as of May 2, 2003 in the amount of $854,568.68

8. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARING

(a) Public hearing to receive citizens' comments on amendments to the Development Code to further clarify and add administration and procedures for Critical Areas

Ordinance No. 324 amending the Development Code to further clarify and add administration and procedures for critical areas, including amending Shoreline Municipal Code Chapters 20.10, 20.20, 20.30 and 20.80

Anna Kolousek, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services, responded to comments and concerns raised by Councilmembers and the public at last week's workshop:

- Definition of qualified professional: To make an informed decision, the City needs to obtain reliable information that provides a basis for understanding consequences of permit decisions. Staff recommends the definition as proposed because it requires the minimum qualifications necessary to ensure the City obtains reasonable information. Certifications are not necessarily appropriate for the type of information the City seeks from qualified professionals.
- City Council versus a Hearing Examiner as the decision-maker for the Critical Area Reasonable Use Permit (CARUP): Staff concurs with the Planning Commission in recommending the Hearing Examiner because the decision-maker must be thoroughly knowledgeable about legal requirements and court decisions relating to land use planning. Decision-makers must also be unbiased and ensure fairness, consistency, and timeliness. It is vital that the decision-maker be not only free from impropriety, but from the appearance of impropriety. Having a Hearing Examiner make CARUP decisions also allows Council to focus on policy and other priority issues, which creates a desired separation between policy-making issues and quasi-judicial functions. Hearing Examiner expertise also leads to a reduction of land use liability exposure, and timeliness is easier to achieve with a Hearing Examiner rather than with City Council. Hearing Examiner decisions also provide the necessary updates on what is taking place in other jurisdictions. Disadvantages to using a Hearing Examiner include cost and lack of accountability to voters.
- Why is City Council recommended as the decision-making authority for the Special Use Permit, and a Hearing Examiner is recommended for the Critical Areas Reasonable Use Permit(CARUP)?: The purpose of the Special Use Permit is to allow regional land uses that would benefit the community, while these uses would be also be compatible with other uses in the community. This kind of discretionary judgement exercised by Council addresses issues relating to general community values and character. The CARUP is a technical process that involves

determinations of what is reasonable. For the most part, definitions of what is reasonable is left to the courts to decide. Hearing Examiners have more experience in case law and are more likely to make decisions based on a thorough knowledge of legal procedures, ordinances, and appellate court decisions.

- Procedural versus substantive issues: Substantive regulations are generally those that address specific standards, including buffer widths, height limitations, and setback distances. Procedural regulations are those that direct the City and the public process in applying those standards. The City is not proposing a reduction in buffer distances, as some members of the public have asserted, and no protective standards relating to Class 4 landslides have been removed. Procedures are being changed to consolidate two conflicting set of criteria into one chapter.
- The public notice for the procedural changes included an incorrect Washington Administrative Code (WAC) reference. The citation was corrected in the staff report provided to Council.
- Entitlement to permit if criteria are met: Permits are required to be granted if all criteria are met. This prevents arbitrary decisions and potential for appeal.
- Eligibility requirements for a Critical Areas Special Use Permit: Only a public agency or utility that is seeking to provide a public service would be able to apply for a CASUP.
- Building footprint issue: Council can choose to remove this definition in anticipation of Phase II, the development of substantive performance standards.
- Removal of Section 20.80.100: This item was removed because it is redundant; mitigation requirements remain in place for Critical Areas in Sections 20.80.250, 20.80.300, 20.80.350, and 20.80.500.
- The distinction between the Critical Area and Critical Area buffers: Buffers are included as part of the Critical Area district, so it is not necessary to include a requirement to directly protect buffers under the Growth Management Act because a buffer is a tool to protect the Critical Area.

Ms. Kolousek concluded that because of the comments raised in the discussion regarding the relationship between procedural changes and environmental protection, staff has decided to prepare an environmental checklist for this proposal. Staff recommends postponing action on this item until the checklist process and threshold determination has been completed. Finally, she pointed out that Paul Inghram, the City's consultant (who has been preparing the model ordinance for the State of Washington), also supports the City's approach.

Mr. Sievers added that issues have been raised about the criteria, and although staff believes the changes are categorically exempt from SEPA, there is an "in-between" area that will be looked at again through the environmental checklist.

Councilmember Ransom asked how the additional process would help Council make its decision and how the SEPA checklist would help distinguish between procedural and substantive changes.

Mr. Sievers responded that the decision is made by the SEPA official. The whole issue of substance versus procedure is avoided because the categorical exemption, exempting procedural regulations from SEPA review, is not being used.

Mayor Jepsen opened the public hearing.

(a) Janet Way, Shoreline, President of Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, requested an extension of the public hearing to give the WDFW adequate opportunity to comment on the proposed changes, stressing the importance of having state agencies comment. She said it is not clear if the public hearing process will continue after the SEPA checklist is completed. She also contended that it is unfair for the Council to take action without the full Council present. She said the proposed changes are not procedural but substantive, and she urged Council to read the recent *Seattle Times* article.

(b) Paul Kampmeier, representing the Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, commended the City for the revisions that make the proposed ordinance stronger, but supported the recommendation to do a SEPA checklist. He said this precautionary approach will give agencies an opportunity to comment and make for a better overall product. He said several ambiguities still need to be addressed in the revisions. He requested that the "building footprint" definition account for all possible impacts to Critical Areas. He also recommended that the word "only" be inserted into the section relating to CASUPs so that only utilities are eligible to apply. He expressed concern that under the proposed changes, a CASUP or CARUP must be issued if permit criteria are met. He felt the City should retain authority to deny a permit even if criteria are met in order to strengthen the protections.

(c) Pat Crawford, Shoreline, referred to the *Seattle Times* article and said the City is trying to make the Critical Areas ordinance a "non-salmonid ordinance." She said the correspondence the City received from the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development and consultants discuss the creation of a critical area overlay system to enhance protection beyond the establishment of maximum width buffers. She said that instead of enhancing protections, the buffers were reduced. She suggested that the Planning Department is only trying to protect the functions and values of these systems and not habitat. She said the City incorrectly characterized the stream adjacent to the Evergreen School as a "ditch," noting that Evergreen did not have legal challenges because it followed the code.

(d) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, asserted that Hearing Examiner Robert Burke does not work well for the citizens of Shoreline, noting that his CASUP decisions have been repealed. He said the City is trying to destroy the community's conservation efforts. He contended that Aegis, Aurora Corridor, Gaston, and the eagle scout bridge in Twin Ponds Park are prime examples of the Planning Director ignoring WDFW and National Marine Fisheries policy. He urged Council to read the *Seattle Times* article and not approve the changes to the Critical Areas.

(e) Ginger Botham, Shoreline, said the City is on the wrong track with the Critical Areas revisions, noting that the Planning Commission was uncomfortable with what the City is trying to do. She said the letter summaries included in the Council packet do not accurately represent the original letters. She suggested that the Council consider these revisions very carefully.

(f) Richard Tinsley, Shoreline, expressed disgust with the Critical Area revision process, explaining that Council's job is to listen to people and take comments into consideration. He said the Council has done everything to degrade environmental laws and accommodate Aegis and other developers.

(g) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, noted that the Planning Commission and Council disregarded public testimony in their deliberations on the Critical Areas revisions. He emphasized the need for public comment after each action item on the Council agenda, noting that Shoreline has a "hijacked government." He said the Planning Commission and the Council are not doing their jobs.

(h) Bob Vreeland, Seattle, said he speculated correctly WDFW did not have a chance to review the proposed amendments. He appreciated staff's intention to do an environmental assessment and provide further opportunity for comment, noting that perhaps WDFW will now be able to provide input.

(i) Walt Hagen, Shoreline, questioned the circumstance that WDFW was well-represented last year when the City proposed changes, but now it is not interested. He said WDFW always wants to be notified of proposed changes to Critical Areas. He asserted that staff is not telling the truth when it says that agencies were adequately notified.

(j) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, opposed moving clearing and grading permits from Type B to Type A actions, noting they would be exempt from public notice and neighborhood meeting requirements. He said there should always be meetings and notification for such permits, and that this represents a major change that will have significant impact on neighborhoods.

Upon motion by Councilmember Hansen, seconded by Deputy Mayor Grossman and unanimously carried, the public hearing was closed.

Responding to comments that the WDFW had not had time to comment on the proposal, Mr. Burkett produced an affidavit of mailing and a certificate of receipt from an individual in that department.

Mayor Jepsen said he left a message with Mr. Pentico at WDFW to hear his thoughts on the proposal and has not received a call back. He said opponents seem to contradict themselves when some assert that the procedures have been tightened while others suggest the opposite.

There was Council consensus to move forward with a SEPA environmental checklist.

Councilmember Ransom said he felt staff did not adequately respond to his suggestion that the definition of qualified professional be modified to make it more stringent in terms of experience and the use of a national certification. He explained that qualified professionals are those who give advice or provide expert witness or professional opinion to the City. He pointed out that the Daubert decision set new standards for professional qualifications, and these are compatible with state law. He said that in some cases a qualified professional would have a national professional certification rather than a state license. He felt such national certification should be accepted and incorporated into the definition of qualified professional. He suggested the definition include "if not licensed, they must have a national certification in their professional field that requires: A) specific education; B) experience in the field; and C) a qualifying examination." An example would be a Master's Degree in the field and three years experience, or a Bachelor's Degree and five years experience, plus a qualifying examination, in lieu of a state license if there is no state license in that field. He suggested that if no certification exists, a Bachelor's Degree and ten years related work experience be the minimum qualification. He said the definition proposed by staff would be inadequate in the courts, and it should be for a professional opinion in that field.

Based on last week's Council discussion, Councilmember Ransom thought there was consensus to direct staff to change the CARUP decision-making authority from the Hearing Examiner to City Council. He suggested that it be changed to reflect the same process that was used on the south parcel of the Aegis development, where the Hearing Examiner held the hearing and then clarified his recommendation to City Council.

Mayor Jepsen noted that the Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund prefers that the Hearing Examiner be the CARUP decision-making authority rather than Council. He asked for clarification of that preference in order to better understand Councilmember Ransom's recommendation.

Councilmember Ransom felt other areas of the proposal were not clear, but said he would defer additional questions until later.

Councilmember Hansen read an e-mail from the City's consultant, Paul Inghram, explaining how Shoreline's proposed revisions compare to the state model code recommendations he prepared for the Office of Community Development. The letter conveyed the opinion that the content of Shoreline's regulations is similar to the content of the model. Councilmember Hansen emphasized the importance of the letter, noting that it demonstrates that City staff's expertise on this issue is acknowledged by some.

Councilmember Chang inquired if there would be an additional public hearing after the SEPA checklist is completed. Mr. Burkett noted that people can comment on the SEPA determination, and the item will likely return to Council on June 23.

Mr. Sievers said there is no public hearing process as part of the SEPA checklist review, and therefore no need for a second public hearing.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Burkett confirmed that any comments received from WDFW will be forwarded to Council.

9. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

(a) Resolution No. 206 establishing continuing closure of N 183rd Street at Dayton Avenue N.

Jill Marilley, City Engineer, noted that all comments about traffic issues made in regard to this item will be considered as the City develops its long-range Transportation Master Plan. She provided some background on the development of the NTSP, noting that "Happy Valley" (the area requesting closure of N 183rd Street) was the first to apply to the program. She explained that after proceeding through Phases 1 and 2 of the NTSP, residents of Happy Valley concluded that street closure was the only viable alternative to their unique traffic problems. The two primary issues to be addressed by the closure were: 1) excessive speed, and 2) cut-through traffic.

She explained that a 90-day street closure was implemented on January 13, 2003, after which residents were polled to determine the level of support for its continuance and any negative impacts. Of the 82 petitions mailed to eligible residents, 61 responded, with 44 (72%) supporting the closure and 17 (18%) opposing it. The surrounding community expressed concern that closure may set a precedent for consistent closure of other residential streets in the future. Other concerns included issues related to safe pedestrian access, turning movements, traffic patterns/volumes, and the fact that only Happy Valley residents were allowed to vote for closure.

Ms. Marilley commented that many of the concerns expressed by the surrounding community are City-wide issues that will be addressed by the Transportation Master Plan, noting that some problems can be addressed through traffic engineering. In addition, street closures are considered on an individual basis and cannot have an overall negative impact on surrounding areas. Based on these limitations, she was confident there would not be a sudden demand for street closures as some have suggested. She said the City received approximately half of the total number of comments after May 2, noting that 76 percent of the comments were received from the neighborhood to the west of the closure.

Continuing, Ms. Marilley reported that cut-through traffic was reduced by 45 percent, with no decrease in the level of service in the surrounding area. She said traffic counts indicate that traffic was evenly dispersed to other arterials. She said while traffic volume increased on N 172nd Street by 176 cars per day, this represents a three percent increase in overall daily traffic -- not a significant increase. She explained that even without the NTSP, the City would have eventually addressed traffic issues in Happy Valley because of its unique geographical features. She said the closure will significantly reduce cut-

through traffic, improve safety, and have no negative impacts on the overall transportation system.

Councilmember Ransom commented on the high degree of public input on this item, both from Happy Valley residents and those from the surrounding community. He said the high level of concern on both sides suggests there are legitimate traffic problems in the vicinity. He felt the City should keep its commitment to Happy Valley because it followed every NTSP procedure, although he was still concerned that other residential streets could be negatively impacted.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Councilmember Hansen moved to extend the meeting to 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Marilley suggested that the Transportation Master Plan and the recently-hired City Traffic Engineer will be able to address both short-term and long-term transportation issues in the City.

Councilmember Hansen commented that the temporary closure has resulted in significant safety improvements for the residents of Happy Valley. He said he would support permanent closure because it is a public safety issue.

Deputy Mayor Grossman moved adoption of Resolution No. 206. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Grossman wished to ensure that education and notification extend beyond the immediately affected parties in the future. He suggested that neighbors who use N 183rd Street as an arterial may have chosen to modify their driving habits had they known the City was considering drastic measures. He expressed concern that some approaches were disregarded without thorough testing, but felt comfortable that closure is the best solution to the problem.

Councilmember Chang agreed with Councilmember Hansen that safety is the first priority, although he was somewhat concerned this action may set an undesirable precedent for closure of other neighborhood streets. He suggested extending the closure without making it permanent.

Councilmember Montgomery raised the issue of whether the percentage of votes required for closure was derived from the total number of ballots sent or those returned. She presumed that permanent closure is recommended because N 183rd Street does not lend itself to any other solutions.

Ms. Marilley concurred, noting that the combination of speeding, cut-through traffic, and geography create a very unique situation.

Paul Haines, Public Works Director, clarified that the standard for street closure has always been based on the number of ballots returned.

Councilmember Ransom said in terms of voting statistics, 70 percent supporting closure and a 75 percent return rate of the ballots are very positive figures.

Mayor Jepsen concurred with other Councilmembers about the difficulty of this issue, but agreed that safety must come first. He suggested that several other streets, including N 171st Street and N 183rd Street at Dayton, have traffic issues that must also be addressed.

Councilmember Chang suggested that the closure be effective only until the Transportation Master Plan is completed. After brief discussion about the permanence of closure, it was noted that the resolution is written so that the closure will remain until the City Council takes further action.

A vote was taken on the motion and Resolution No. 206 was adopted by a vote of 6-0.

Councilmember Ransom said even though he voted for the resolution, he feels more time and money should go into solving the traffic problems on Dayton Avenue N.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Hansen moved to extend the meeting until 10:45 p.m. in order to hold executive session. Deputy Mayor Grossman seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

Mr. Burkett noted that Council should take action on Item 9(b) in order to stay on schedule with the Parks master plan.

(b) Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract for $82,225 between the City of Shoreline and GreenPlay LLC to complete the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan for the City of Shoreline

Councilmember Chang suggested that the survey envisioned as part of this work item be combined with the general City survey in order to save money.

Mr. Burkett pointed out that while the survey is only one small part of this contract, the City will make every attempt to maximize its funds.

Councilmember Chang moved to authorize the City Manager to execute the GreenPlay contract. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION

DRAFT

At 10:35 p.m., Mayor Jepsen announced that the Council would recess into executive session for fifteen minutes to discuss one item of potential litigation. At 10:55 p.m. the executive session concluded and the regular meeting reconvened.

11. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:55 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

_____

Sharon Mattioli
City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.