

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, June 9, 2003  
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

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

**ABSENT:** Councilmember Montgomery

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 Montgomery.

**Upon motion by Councilmember Hansen, seconded by Deputy Mayor Grossman and unanimously carried, Councilmember Montgomery was excused.**

3. **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

City Manager Steve Burkett pointed out that the City's Finance Department received the Government Finance Officer's Association distinguished budget presentation award for the current fiscal year. He also noted that the City received its first building permit application relating to the North City Subarea Plan. The application is for an 88-unit apartment building in the North City Business District.

4. **REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS:** none

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(a) David Townsend, Shoreline, asserted that the City Council and staff are guilty of malfeasance and that they disregard citizen's concerns on many issues. He said the Council is not fulfilling its responsibility to question and challenge the data provided by City staff and that the people who provide public comment at Council meetings represent the people who elected the Council. He asked Council to install a needed traffic stoplight at NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Finally, he said he is conducting

# DRAFT

an investigation into the moral and professional ethics of City of Shoreline Council and staff.

(b) Cheryl Lee, Shoreline, thanked the Council for the time and service it dedicates to its citizens. She also thanked the Council for supporting Resolution No. 207, designating Boryeong, Korea as a Shoreline sister city, noting that Boryeong officials also passed their resolution naming Shoreline as a sister city. She said the Shoreline Sister Cities Association (SCA) stands as an ambassador for the City and is a tremendous opportunity to bring people together from different parts of the community. She noted that the SCA is planning community outreach activities for the Shoreline Arts Festival as well as Celebrate Shoreline.

(c) Patty Crawford, Shoreline, thanked David Townsend for his comments, noting that many Shoreline residents have become experts in the process of following City government. She asserted that the City attorney is providing support for the Gaston project in the appeal before Superior Court, noting that he has written two briefs on behalf of Gaston. She questioned the use of taxpayer funds to assist Gaston in this way.

(d) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, expressed satisfaction that the City decided to do a State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) process for the Aurora Corridor, and that state and federal governments are now involved in several City issues. He regretted that the Aegis project did not have the benefit of including state and federal entities. He pointed out there is a lawsuit pending for the south parcel and that he expected that Aegis will be required to tear down its north building. He said he will be questioning the City's actions relating to property takings at future meetings.

(e) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, urged the Council to restore the Shoreline Hearing Examiner's right to subpoena, noting that bad decisions will result without subpoena authority because the Hearing Examiner will be uninformed. He also encouraged Council to restore public comment periods after each agenda item at Council meetings, noting that the new procedures do not create a sense of community. He asserted there would be many changes in the City Council as a result of the coming election, and he urged fellow citizens to get involved in government.

(f) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, said that the City's cost estimates on the Aurora Corridor Project keep changing, which makes it difficult to have a meaningful dialogue with Shoreline's citizens. He said the numbers should be accurate and based on reality, noting that Council cannot possibly make reasonable decisions based on changing figures. He said many of the features planned for the Aurora Corridor Project will chase merchants out of Shoreline.

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, City Attorney Ian Sievers said there were no additional expenses for filing a joint appeal, as Ms. Crawford asserted. He said Gaston made slight improvements to the City's opening brief, after which the City petitioned to have its first brief removed from the court files. He said the City's intent has always been that Gaston should bear its full share of the costs, noting that multiple parties to an appeal are entitled

to join in a single brief. in an effort to reduce costs. He said the issues and costs will be consolidated from this point forward.

Mayor Jepsen clarified that the SEPA determination for the Aurora Corridor was already completed, so perhaps Mr. Crawford was referring to the National Environmental Protection Act process, which is still pending. He noted that the SEPA determination is the item currently under appeal. He said Mr. Mann's concerns about project costs will likely be addressed in the next several weeks when Council considers adoption of the Capital Improvement Plan.

Councilmember Ransom reminded Council that he supported the installation of a pedestrian light at NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and that he still supports it. He felt that there could have been more ceremony in designating Boryeong, Korea as Shoreline's first sister city rather than approving it on the Consent Calendar. He also expressed concern that the subpoena power was removed from the Shoreline Hearing Examiner when Shoreline revised its procedures. He said Council should consider reinstating that power.

Mr. Sievers responded that subpoena power is a general Hearing Examiner rule of procedure that is not necessarily linked to any other issue, so Council can address it at any time. He said new rules were adopted to reflect the changes in the Development Code, which eliminated the closed appeal hearing process. He said the subpoena issue arose from a citizen proposal for a referendum to restore subpoena power to the Hearing Examiner. He explained that the City requested clarification of the citizen's proposal, noting that the rules cover both quasi-judicial, open record appeal hearings and open record pre-decision hearings, which are also held by the Planning Commission.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Hansen moved approval of the agenda. Deputy Mayor Grossman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the agenda was approved.**

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

**Minutes of Regular Meeting of May 12, 2003  
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of May 27, 2003  
Minutes of Regular Meeting of May 27, 2003**

**Approval of expenses and payroll as of May 23, 2003  
in the amount of \$2,541,487.93**

**Resolution No. 207 designating Boryeong, Republic of Korea  
as a sister city under the Shoreline Sister City Policy**

# DRAFT

## **Motion to authorize the Mayor to execute the Second Amended Employment Agreement between the City of Shoreline, Washington and Steven C. Burkett**

### 8. PUBLIC HEARING

- (a) Public hearing to receive citizens comments on the addition of a map figure to the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element (new Figure T-8) and amendment of the text of Land Use Policy LU 48

Ordinance No. 326 amending the Land Use and Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan; and amending Ordinance No. 178 for the purpose of defining the future right-of-way needs for Aurora Avenue North in the Central Shoreline Area (177<sup>th</sup> Street to 192<sup>nd</sup> Street)

Mr. Burkett explained that this item came out of the Central Shoreline Subarea process, which had a great deal of public involvement. The goal is to provide some certainty to property owners about future right-of-way (ROW) needs and to take the uncertainty out of public and private projects along the Aurora Corridor in this area. He noted that the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the proposal and discussed it at two meetings.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, discussed the background and development of Ordinance No. 326, which defines the maximum future width of Aurora and identifies the eastern and western Aurora right-of-way (ROW) boundaries in the Central Shoreline Subarea. He said the purpose of the hearing is to get public input on the proposed addition of the map figure and Comprehensive Plan amendment to adopt the identified ROW needs into the Transportation Element. His presentation included the following points:

- The majority of ROW needs in the Central Shoreline Subarea (172<sup>nd</sup> to 192<sup>nd</sup>) occur on the east side of Aurora Avenue N due to the existing public ROW owned by Seattle City Light (SCL). Staff feels that rather than using additional private property, it is more appropriate to work with another public entity to maximize that publicly owned property for the benefit of the public.
- Several issues must be resolved before individual projects can occur in the corridor. The amendment contains several qualifications that identify some of the limitations on what this plan is, and what it is not.
- Staff hand-delivered and mailed potentially affected property and business owners in the Central Subarea copies of the proposed ROW changes. One of the purposes of defining the future ROW needs for the Central Subarea is to provide

property and business owners with some certainty about the future of their property.

- Two major concerns arose as a result of the public process: 1) existing distortions in the underlying aerial photographs; and 2) SCLs requirement that it retain 100 feet of ROW. In response to these two concerns, the City obtained and distributed rectified aerial photographs which included a new map note confirming SCL's 100-foot ROW requirement.
- The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan on May 15, 2003. On May 22, 2003, it unanimously recommended adoption of Ordinance No. 326 with four additional changes. The changes are summarized as follows:
  1. Clarification that the established ROW is the *maximum* future width, so that future projects would be encouraged to use less than the maximum width.
  2. Clarification that this effort should occur early on in the design phase, and that staff should be working with other public entities in this phase.
  3. Map Note No. 9, agreement on the possibility of vacating Ronald Place N if land use issues, circulation, and pedestrian needs of private and public entities are resolved.
- According to the State's Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development, the plan will provide certainty about the location of future public investment and assist owners and potential owners of adjacent property in deciding when and where to make their own redevelopment investments. The plan removes some of the uncertainty that may occur on east side area known as the "wedge," and also resolves issues regarding ROW needs on the west side.
- This is not a project, but a plan for future ROW needs. Therefore, any future project would be required to come forward as a stand-alone entity and be subject to an environmental assessment process. Furthermore, the proposal does not prohibit the use of private property, and does not take any private property (The U.S. Constitution requires that just and fair compensation be paid if a public entity takes private property)
- The plan clearly identifies the area within which future projects would need to be located. Note No. 3 states that "private property needs for streets, sidewalks, trails and utilities should be coordinated, consolidated and designed to the maximum extent feasible to minimize the acquisition of private property." This is a clear direction to staff and public entities to find ways to minimize impacts on private property.
- If a proposed project falls within the defined ROW, it would be considered in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. If a project is proposed outside the designated ROW, it would not be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. An additional amendment and public process would be required to allow for projects proposed outside the designated ROW.

Mr. Stewart concluded his presentation and stated that he and the Planning Commission Chair are available to answer any questions.

Mayor Jepsen opened the public hearing.

# DRAFT

(a) Maggie Fimia, Shoreline, urged the Council to defer this ordinance because there are other alternatives that have not been considered, and because it can effectively condemn private property. As a former member of the King County Council, she said amending a Comprehensive Plan is a tremendous responsibility which can involve manipulating property in such a way that negatively impacts property owners. Such amendments should come only after extensive public process and review. She said the Planning Department has issued contradictory statements saying Ordinance No. 326 implements both temporary changes and permanent changes. Due to impacts on property owners, and the lack of design, funding, and a proposed schedule, she urged Council to defer the vote on the proposed action.

(b) Randy Ferrell, co-owner of Farrell-Penning General Contractors on Aurora Avenue N, urged the Council to send the proposal back to the Planning Department in order to complete a thorough, fair, and legal process that would include the public. He said the plan originally envisioned developing the "wedge" into a special mixed use district, but the amendment bears no resemblance to the recommendations of the charrette process. He asserted that the new ROW lines will reduce the buildable area in the wedge by one-third, reduce property values on the east side, limit opportunities to sell or lease properties, and devalue properties before condemning them. He said a cost/benefit analysis of various alternative alignments should be completed before recommendations are submitted to Council.

(c) Roberta Farris, legal counsel for the Shoreline Merchants Association, provided a brief background on her experience in the areas of urban planning and transportation. She emphasized the fact that community planning decisions made now will have a lasting impact on future generations. She expressed the opinion that Aurora Avenue cannot be transformed into the kind of highway the Council envisions. She further stated that the Aurora Corridor design will not solve existing transportation problems. She said the Council is doing "backwards" planning by establishing general design parameters first, which will substantively take away the rights of business and property owners. She said Council has received bad advice from its staff, and its decision will likely be challenged before the Growth Management Board and in state court. She advised the Council against adopting the ordinance at this time.

(d) Rick Stephens, Shoreline, suggested that the City should work first with existing businesses on mitigation issues rather than drawing lines defining the ROW. He said businesses and owners feel left out of the process, and that the ROW lines will hurt key businesses in the community. He said adoption of the ordinance will preclude the community from substantially commenting and participating in the Aurora Corridor design, which will result in inverse condemnation for the affected owners in violation of SEPA, NEPA, and the Growth Management Act. He said the City has not completed an adequate analysis of potential economic impacts to businesses and the City that may result from adoption of this measure. He said this action limits the ability of citizens to do business in Shoreline.

# DRAFT

(e) Diana Stephens, Shoreline, reiterated the City Manager's earlier comment that the narrower the ROW is made, the greater the impact will be to businesses. She said the Aurora Corridor design should have included all three miles of the project and should impart the least impact to the business community. She asserted that the ordinance will preclude design modifications in Phase 2, and that staff has not been truthful about its intentions and designs. She urged the Council not to adopt the ordinance, noting that enhancement of economic viability of the City starts by supporting existing businesses, not destroying them.

(f) Pat Crawford, Shoreline, said Council should be mindful of the large amount of opposition to Phase 1 of the Aurora Corridor project, which will set the standard for the entire corridor. She said Council should defer this item because NEPA standards should drive the decision-making process, so there is no reason to make a decision that may need to be changed later. She said changes to the Comprehensive Plan and City code are not derived from public desires, but from the Planning Department, and updates are not being completed on schedule. She suggested that the City do an environmental checklist first and then build accordingly.

(g) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, expressed opposition to the ordinance, asserting that the City has been moving its predetermined agenda forward in a mean-spirited and uncompromising way. He said the City's plans for Aurora do not address storm runoff issues or other environmental impacts that affect the community. He said the City's plans will be thwarted and that rational minds will prevail.

(h) Larry Steele, Shoreline, owner of Aurora Rents, said he supports the amendment to possibly vacate Ronald Place N because it will give his business a chance to survive. He clarified that the amendment would allow him to rebuild his business on the existing site instead of moving it to another location. He said he does not generally support the widening of Aurora, but he would like to see the eventual realignment of Ronald Place N and Midvale Avenue N in order to minimize takings on Aurora Avenue. He also favored the idea of rerouting buses down Midvale Avenue N to eliminate bus lanes in that short section of Aurora Avenue.

(i) Walter Crow, Shoreline, asked that the letter from the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce outlining its concerns about the public process on this item be considered as part of the public record.

(j) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, asked Council to defer adoption of the ordinance, noting that while the Planning Commission insists it is not a project, it does affect the overall Aurora project design. She said the plan does not address several important concerns, including property takings and how fair property valuations would be determined. She said the Planning Department has not adequately answered several concerns, including funding of the Aurora Corridor Project itself, and how it would be funded. She expressed hope that the future City Council would be brave enough to admit that Shoreline citizens would be paying for Aurora improvements instead of disguising it as a benign public benefit.

# DRAFT

(k) Russ McCurdy, Aurora business owner, said the proposed ordinance needs to be reevaluated and that Council needs to consider a meaningful solution to the area known as the "wedge." He asserted that the Aurora business owners were only recently made aware that the Planning Department had decided to eliminate the wedge through adoption of this ordinance. He said the City has not dealt with property owners in a truthful way, and that the business community was "blindsided" by the decision. He questioned whether the City was following SEPA and NEPA guidelines for all phases of the Aurora Corridor Project. He speculated that the entire Aurora Corridor project could cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

(l) Carol Doering, Shoreline Planning Commission, clarified that not only did she walk the Aurora Corridor and speak with business owners, but a Korean member of the Task Force assisted in communicating the proposed action to the Korean community, including residents and business owners. She emphasized that the Planning Commission did not take its job lightly in considering this proposal. She stressed the importance of satisfying the needs of all affected parties, including business owners, commuters, and pedestrians. She expressed optimism about the future of Aurora Avenue and felt the plan is making progress.

(m) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, expressed opposition to Ordinance No. 326, noting that the plan has not adequately addressed environmental considerations such as runoff and drainage. He said the City's Aurora Corridor video addressed the need for improved drainage, but it did not provide documentation to support its claims. He characterized the charrette process as a "charade" and a platform for the City to ignore people's comments. He said Council is not listening to citizen input, and as a result the City is not getting the results it wants. He suggested the public would be outraged if it knew how much the City spends on litigation.

(n) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, said merchants are not against progress along Aurora, but they are against violations of the public process and the public trust. He said the Planning Department surprised the merchants with this plan, which is not an extension of the discussion that was endorsed by the public process. He said the merchants endorsed the plan to remove buses from Aurora and save the "wedge," but none of this was incorporated into the City's ROW expansion plan. He noted that merchants were prohibited from discussing ROW expansion during the charrette process, and that there was clear recognition that the Interurban Trail would be adjacent to the wedge and serve as the primary means of pedestrian traffic. He urged Council to defer this item, noting that Council does not know what effect this will have on the community.

**Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Councilmember Hansen and unanimously carried, the public hearing was closed.**

**Councilmember Hansen moved adoption of Ordinance No. 326. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**



Councilmember Hansen commented that after discussion, he planned to move to postpone action on this item. There was some discussion on the future Council meeting schedule.

Councilmember Ransom commented that the proposal does not consider the charrette process or changes to the design to accommodate buses on Midvale Avenue and to save frontage in the wedge. He said although this is technically not a "taking," property owners will not be able to sell or improve their property, which makes it a taking in practical terms. He concluded that he supports postponement on the general principle that action should not be taken on the same evening as a public hearing.

Mr. Burkett discussed options for postponement, noting that the July 14 Council meeting might be the most appropriate time to reschedule this item.

Deputy Mayor Grossman agreed that action should not be taken immediately following a public hearing. He acknowledged that while this is technically a Comprehensive Plan revision, new ROW lines will create perception issues and establish long-term standards for future planning. Noting that he supported the Central Subarea Plan in order to eliminate ambiguity, he asked about the impacts of not moving forward with these ROW maps.

Mr. Stewart explained that without the maps, public and private projects could move forward at their own pace, but there will still be a requirement for a ten-foot setback for both sides of Aurora Avenue until the future ROW needs are established. He said businesses would effectively gain ten feet of developable land if the ROW maps are approved.

Deputy Mayor Grossman speculated that west side businesses would be happy with the proposal, but east side businesses will gain little to nothing.

Mr. Stewart concurred that the west side property owners stand to gain more than the east, but the proposal would at least provide some certainty about the future ROW needs to new businesses.

Deputy Mayor Grossman said it is unlikely that any significant redevelopment will occur until a greater level of certainty is established. He asked Mr. Stewart to describe the process used to communicate this proposal to the businesses and property owners.

Mr. Stewart explained that the initial need to define the ROW originated from the charrette process. He said detailed maps were mailed to owners twice and hand-delivered to business operators. Property owners on the west side of Aurora Avenue liked the plan, and east side businesses were primarily concerned with timing issues. He said he received a number of calls from property owners seeking clarification. He went on to describe the public process as it occurred in the Planning Commission.

# DRAFT

Mr. Burkett said although this amendment does not constitute a taking in the legal sense, there is no doubt it will have significant impacts on some property owners. He said this is an issue every city and state government has to deal with when doing transportation planning. In this case, capacity and safety improvements along Aurora Avenue are issues that cannot be avoided. While the results of this proposal may not be good for some, everyone will be better off because they will have the certainty of knowing the maximum future width of Aurora Avenue. He emphasized that this is not a new or unique issue in Shoreline.

Councilmember Chang asked Mr. Stewart how he interpreted the concerns about timing expressed by the east side property owners. Mr. Stewart felt they were interested in developing their own business plans and having certainty about the future use of their property. Councilmember Chang asserted that some fear losing their businesses altogether. He asked about the possibility of constructing a 96-foot ROW as was done in Edmonds and Lynnwood.

Mr. Stewart clarified that the proposal is not a project with specific details of construction, but a proposed maximum future public ROW need. He emphasized that the intent is to minimize the need to acquire the maximum width.

Councilmember Chang said it is difficult to change anything that has been adopted in the Comprehensive Plan, noting that it can only be amended once a year. Mr. Stewart said amendments to the Comprehensive Plan requires a similar process to the one tonight, including noticing, solicitation of public comments, and full consideration.

Councilmember Chang asked about the financial impacts if the City has to move all the businesses that will be severely impacted by ROW issues.

Mr. Burkett said any financial impacts will be part of the projects that are designed. He emphasized the fact that this proposal does not preclude other designs for the second phase of the Aurora project. He said the proposal does not disqualify any of the design alternatives that resulted from the charrette process.

Councilmember Chang commented that the City's main concern should be a consideration of the livelihoods of the small business owners. He said their comments must be taken seriously and it is mandatory to reach out to them and communicate with them. He expressed a preference to postpone this item indefinitely.

Councilmember Gustafson preferred to postpone this item to a later date. He agreed that businesses need clarity, but he did not want to lose the options regarding the wedge. He strongly felt that environmental issues need to be resolved before moving forward with this plan.

Mayor Jepsen felt the proposal is a direct response to the Subarea charrette process and the public's need for clarity. He also felt the Planning Commission's amendments to the

ordinance responded to the business community's need to know where the maximum future ROW will be.

Councilmember Hansen did not see how deferring action on this item would help property owners in their planning. He said a line on a map does not necessarily mean that property will be condemned, noting that some development alternatives for Aurora could actually reduce the ROW in some areas below 100 feet. He asked for comment about the concerns expressed at the Planning Commission hearings and the reason for the unanimous recommendation. He also emphasized the fact that the Comprehensive Plan can be revised in the future.

Brian Doennebrink, Planning Commission Chair, said that while he could not comment on the reasons why each commissioner voted for the proposal, he did hear many concerns about individual property owners and the ability of smaller businesses to relocate. He said the Commission wanted the City to make relocation of businesses in Shoreline a top priority. He noted that the amendments made to the proposal were in response to public comments.

Councilmember Hansen said that the proposed ordinance does not preclude the options for the wedge, or the option of using Midvale Avenue N as an alternate bus route. He did not believe action on Ordinance No. 326 prevents consideration of design options in Phase 2 of the Aurora project.

Councilmember Ransom suggested that it might be preferable to do a SEPA process before determining the ROW lines. Mr. Stewart noted that a SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-Significance was issued in April of this year.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom's request, Rick Stephens spoke again for the Shoreline Merchants Association. Mr. Stephens commented that all the citizens who testified at the Planning Commission hearing opposed this proposal. He said the main issues at stake are truth and process.

Councilmember Hansen directed staff to respond to the questions in the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce letter.

**Councilmember Hansen moved to postpone the motion to pass Ordinance No. 326 until the July 14 meeting. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.**

9. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) Motion to adopt City Council 2003-2004 Work Plan

Bob Olander, Deputy City Manager, explained that the Council's 2003-2004 Work Plan, as developed at the Council Retreat, is described in the packet on Attachment A. He said while most goals remain the same, a new goal entitled "Enhance our program for safe and

# DRAFT

friendly streets" has been added. He referred to the "Major Objectives" listed in page 134 of the Council packet for implementation of this goal.

**Deputy Mayor Grossman moved to adopt the Council's 2003-2004 Work Plan. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion. Upon staff's suggestion, the motion was amended to include adoption of both Attachment A and Attachment B.**

Councilmember Ransom asked if this goal included moving toward a street lighting utility. Mr. Olander said that staff will return with more information on the implementation of Goal #2.

## MEETING EXTENSION

**At 9:55 p.m. Councilmember Hansen moved to extend the meeting to conclude this item or for another 15 minutes. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.**

Mr. Burkett commented that Council had received a copy of the PowerPoint presentation on the Capital Improvement Plan and his introductory remarks could be part of next week's discussion.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 4-2, with Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.**

Councilmember Chang suggested that the timely replacement of street lights could be addressed by having the Chair of the Neighborhood Association and the police volunteers share the duty of checking their areas for burned out or broken lights.

Mr. Olander commented that Attachment B should be modified to show the "FONSI Approval" as occurring in July rather than May.

**A vote was taken on the motion to adopt the Council's Work Plan, including Attachment A and modified Attachment B, which carried 6-0.**

## 10. NEW BUSINESS

- (a) Presentation of the 2004-2009 Capital Improvement Plan

Due to the late hour, Council decided to defer this item until next week.

## 11. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:05 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli  
City Clerk