

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, January 26, 2004  
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Hansen, Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, Grace, Gustafson, and Ransom

ABSENT: none

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Hansen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Steve Burkett, City Manager, reminded Council of last week's consensus to delete Item 9(a) from the agenda. He also noted that a number of e-mails have been received regarding Resolution No. 212. He suggested that Council suspend its rules to allow public comment after the staff report for this item.

Councilmember Ransom reported that his appointment to the National League of Cities' Human Development Committee.

Mayor Hansen reported that he and Councilmember Ransom attended the Suburban Cities Association meeting and that Councilmember Gustafson was elected to the Regional Water Quality Committee; Councilmember Chang was elected to the Transit Committee; and that he had been elected to the Puget Sound Council Regional Executive Board.

4. REPORT OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: none

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Sally Granger, Shoreline, thanked the City and Council for completing the rechannelization of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

# DRAFT

(b) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, referred to the minutes of December 19 and asserted that the decision not to videotape the Council meeting of December 20 was not made by a majority of Councilmembers. She also questioned why this action was not specified on the special meeting notice received by the public.

(c) Patty Crawford, Shoreline, said she has never received a response from the City regarding the disappearance of the bicycle lane fronting Paramount Park. She has also not received an answer to her concern about overflow parking at the Aegis site. On a third topic, she noted that neither the Planning Commission nor the public reviewed the definition for "Reasonable Use" before it was included as an amendment in the Development Code. Finally, she asserted that the new playground equipment at Twin Ponds Park was installed within the creek buffer. She said Development Code Section 20.80.030(i) does not justify locating the playground in the buffer.

(d) Walt Hagen, Shoreline, expressed support for the comments of Ms. Ryu and Ms. Crawford and said the people simply want a forthright and honest government.

(e) Ginger Botham, Shoreline, asserted that staff is not implementing the wishes of the Planning Commission. She said Planning Commissioners often direct staff to make changes to proposed actions, but those changes are not being made and staff has to be reminded of those changes. She thanked Ms. Way and Ms. Crawford for attending Planning Commission meetings.

(f) Richard Johnsen, Shoreline, was not fully satisfied with the proposed changes to public dance regulations as contained in the Council packet. He suggested that the City do more research and discuss the issue with the Seattle Folklore Society and the Northwest Folklife Festival.

Mayor Hansen pointed out that the proposed dance regulations specifically exempt public dances sponsored by tax-exempt non-profit organizations and dances in which the number of participants is 150 or less.

Councilmember Ransom noted that he heard all other Councilmembers support the decision not to videotape the December 20 Council meeting.

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk, clarified that Deputy Mayor Jepsen asked her to review the Council meeting tape to determine if there was a majority. She said the tape confirms that Deputy Mayor Grossman concurred with the majority, although his statement was not included in the Council minutes. She said the minutes could be amended to reflect his support of the decision.

Councilmember Gustafson said although he supported the decision not to televise the meeting at the time, he would probably not make the same decision in the future.

# DRAFT

Upon consensus of the Council to suspend its rules, Ms. Crawford responded to questions and comments by Councilmember Fimia regarding the changes to the Development Code. Ms. Crawford suggested that the Council reconsider Ordinance No. 324, since certain changes were not provided to the Planning Commission before the ordinance was adopted.

Councilmember Fimia asked that staff provide more information regarding the Twin Ponds playground at a subsequent meeting.

## 6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Ransom moved approval of the agenda, deleting the Minutes of the Special Meeting of January 5, 2004, moving Item 7(c) to Item 8(b) and deleting Item 9(a). Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.**

## 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Councilmember Ransom and unanimously carried, the following consent calendar items were approved:**

**Minutes of Dinner Meeting of January 12, 2004  
Minutes of Regular Meeting of January 12, 2004**

**Approval of payroll and expenses as of January 16,  
2004 in the amount of \$1,644,552.09**

**Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute  
a construction management contract with Kirsten  
Betty & Associates for the North City Project in  
an amount not to exceed \$398,985.00**

## 8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) Resolution No. 212, amending Resolution No. 183 by amending Sections 5.5 and 5.7 of the Rules of Procedure for the City Council relating to Final Actions of the Council

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, explained the recommendation to amend the City Council's Rules of Procedure to clarify actions that may be taken by Council at Workshop and Special Meetings. His presentation included the following points:

- State law allows the City Council to take action at regularly scheduled workshops, but the Council's Rules of Procedure defining the scope of workshops limits final actions. There are occasions when it is necessary for Council to take action at a workshop meeting. As a result, special meeting notices are used to bring

workshops under the Special Meeting provisions of the Rules, which allow final action on items specified in the special notice. These notices would not be necessary with a more flexible description of the workshop format.

- Under State law, both “regular” and “workshop” meetings are “regular meetings,” since they are scheduled by resolution and rule of the Council. Therefore, under this proposal, final action may be taken at a workshop on any item including ordinances, resolutions, rules, orders, directives, proposals, contracts and motions. Special meeting notices are then unnecessary.
- In addition, Council discussion at workshops often concludes with a directive or consensus, which is a “final action” under the Open Meetings Act anyway since it is a “collective positive or negative decision.” Under the proposed rule change, the format of workshops will continue to emphasize informal discussion and planning for future actions, but will now include motions where appropriate and final action items added to the agenda under Council rules to allow timely actions and efficient use of all weekly meeting times.
- Staff also recommends eliminating an overly restrictive approach to the topics considered at true special meetings (those not routinely scheduled in the Rules of Procedure). The Open Meeting Act does not prohibit taking less than final action with respect to matters not identified in the notice, such as taking public comments, considering Council and staff reports or discussing any item. The proposed revisions will preserve this agenda flexibility for special meetings.
- Under current practice, a minority of Councilmembers may be frustrated due to the inability to use workshop meetings for raising action items unless they can convince the Mayor to hold a special meeting. The unavailability of one Councilmember 24-hours before the meeting could prevent use of that workshop meeting for a time-sensitive item.
- The proposed changes are an attempt to align the City’s rules with the Open Public Meetings Act.

Mr. Sievers concluded by responding to concerns raised in e-mails sent to the Council. He clarified that the amendments do not change the informal discussion format for workshops, and do not eliminate the seven-day waiting period between workshop discussion and Council action. He pointed out that most items do not go to a workshop before the Council considers them for action. He said the rules for agenda preparation and notice would remain the same.

There was Council consensus to suspend the rules and allow public comment on this item.

(a) Vicky Westberg, Shoreline, said the Council will be distancing itself from the public it serves if it passes this proposal. She said the proposal creates confusion about when the public can expect a vote to take place, and will create an unnecessary race to meet media deadlines for broadcasting information. She said the action would create a shorter turnaround time for adequate inclusion of public opinion in the decision-making process.

(b) Janet Way, Shoreline, said the proposed change makes no sense since the Council already makes decisions without having discussed them in workshop meetings. She speculated whether the Council should have workshops for every agenda item. She said there is a “perception of deception” because some staff and Councilmembers wish less public input. She felt the Council should consider changing the format of meetings to allow as much public comment on every topic.

(c) Ginger Botham, Shoreline, urged the Council to oppose the resolution, noting that it will reduce public scrutiny and create an “ends justify the means” approach. She said although it may increase attendance and make meetings shorter, it makes the public process subservient to the result.

(d) Patty Crawford, Shoreline, concurred with prior comments, noting that Council actions at workshop meetings will catch people off-guard and not allow adequate public participation. She pointed out that staff provided an impromptu presentation on a permit issue, which shows that workshop meetings are already flexible. She felt the proposed changes will create a disconnect between the Council and the public.

(e) Donn Charnley, Shoreline, also concurred with prior comments, noting that the proposed changes smack of dishonesty and haste. He pointed out that despite its flaws, democracy is still the best way for free people to rule themselves. He urged the Council to specifically reject line #3 related to taking final action.

(f) Walt Hagen, Shoreline, stressed the importance of forthrightness and honesty in government. He said the Council should be conscious of setting a good example for school students.

Mr. Burkett responded to public comments. He explained that under the proposed changes, the Council could conceivably take final action four times per month, although agenda preparation and noticing would continue as usual. Staff supports the change because it would facilitate the capital project bid/approval process as well as timing issues. He pointed out that tonight’s agenda included approval of a construction contract that was not previously discussed at a workshop. He said the intent is to continue to identify workshop items for discussion and direction but not final action.

Mr. Sievers pointed out that state law does not require much notice except for special appropriation ordinances or ordinances that must be preceded by public hearings. From a legal standpoint, he felt the current practice of taking final actions at workshops by using a special meeting notice is not a good procedure.

Mr. Burkett pointed out that the policy on public comment at special meetings is not clear, whereas there are two opportunities for public comment at workshop meetings.

**Councilmember Gustafson moved adoption of Resolution No. 212 as amended in the handout. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion.**

Mayor Hansen felt the changes provide clarification and consistency with both state law and current practice.

Councilmember Grace asked for clarification about whether Council direction to staff is considered a final decision.

Mr. Sievers noted that courts are interpreting positive or negative direction to staff as final actions, and that the City is probably taking many final actions without formal notice. He felt the changes would make the City's procedures more correct and consistent with practice.

Councilmember Gustafson asked if the Mayor's identification of a consensus on a particular workshop item is considered making a final decision. Mr. Sievers affirmed that it is, and that the current rules for workshops unnecessarily limits options.

Mr. Burkett pointed out that Council identified a consensus on the Aurora Avenue pedestrian bridge at a workshop meeting, and that staff is pursuing a particular option as a result. He said the Council could either 1) change its procedures to clarify that Council can take final actions by consensus, or 2) put consensus items on future agendas and vote on them at a regular meeting.

Mr. Sievers expressed concern that people might misinterpret the current practice as limiting workshops to the kind of informational presentations Ms. Crawford mentioned.

Mayor Hansen pointed out that the Council can change a workshop meeting into a special meeting just by providing notice, and this would preclude the need for that. He felt the proposal is simply an attempt to formalize the current Council practice.

Councilmember Fimia felt the primary issue is trying to balance the Council's need to move along with business with the public's need for predictability and adequate notice. She expressed concern that the agenda can get amended with just four votes, and that the public may not have adequate notice of what has been decided unless they attend every meeting. She suggested that the Council see how it can incorporate some of these changes into its scope of work for changing the public input process.

Responding to Mayor Hansen, Mr. Sievers pointed out that four members can add agenda items at the last minute, and two members can add items five days prior to a meeting. These items would not be included in the Council packet available to the public a week in advance. Also under the current procedure, special meeting notices and agendas can go out as little as 24 hours before meetings. He said the current process does not require a significant amount of notice.

Councilmember Gustafson felt the changes would provide more clarity for citizens and more consistency with state law. He said if items are placed on the agenda properly, people will know there could be potential action items at workshops. He agreed that

major workshop items should be clearly identified, and that this topic should be revisited at a workshop retreat in conjunction with a discussion on public comment.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern that the changes could give the appearance that action items will be added to agendas without adequate notice. He felt there is no reason to change policy because there have been no problems in the past. He felt the public has some trust in the current process, and any changes would not be received well.

Mayor Hansen noted that as accountant, he usually tries to take action before a potential problem becomes an actual problem. He agreed that although the current policy has not presented a problem, it is unclear and inconsistent.

Councilmember Chang said he does not see the need for the change, noting that workshop meetings are a chance for the Council to interact with the public and be educated about their concerns. He said changing workshops to decision-making meetings changes the spirit of those meetings. He said the Council already has the means to carry over items and adopt them on the next week's consent calendar if necessary. He felt workshops in the current format give the Council and public the necessary time to think about the issues that affect everyone. He agreed with Councilmember Ransom that there does not appear to be a problem.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen expressed agreement with the recommendation, noting that the City needs to be consistent with state law. He said the people he has talked to do not feel the changes would be problematic. He wondered if adding language to Section 5.5 would help emphasize the fact that the Council and the community do not want to get into the habit of adding action items at every workshop.

Councilmember Grace felt that adding action items to workshops changes the nature and purpose of such meetings. He wished to have more time to consider the proposal.

**Councilmember Fimia moved to postpone action on the motion to adopt Resolution No. 212 for two weeks (February 9). Councilmember Chang seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.**

After brief discussion of the process for proposing amendments, Councilmember Fimia suggested that this item be added to next week's agenda for review and discussion.

**Councilmember Grace moved to add this item to next week's workshop agenda. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 5-2, with Deputy Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.**

- (b) Ordinance No. 345 repealing Title 5.05 of the Shoreline Municipal Code and adopting a new section 5.07 regarding specialty business licenses; and motion to authorize the City Manager to execute an interlocal agreement with King County to

implement the licensing process for taxicabs  
and for-hire vehicles

Ms. Mattioli briefly outlined changes made to the proposed ordinance in response to Council discussion from the January 5 workshop. At that meeting it was suggested that only those businesses selling specific types of merchandise should be required to buy a license. It was also suggested that non-profit agencies selling used merchandise be exempted. After consideration by the Police Department, it was determined that it is not feasible to try to call out only certain types of merchandise for licensing, because secondhand stores often sell a variety of items. Therefore, staff recommends against making this change. However, after reviewing the records, the Police Department has no concern about exempting non-profit agencies from the secondhand dealer's license. Therefore, a new 5.07.505(A)4 has been added to achieve this exemption. To address a question about regulating garage sales, a new exemption 5.07.505(A)5 has been added. A new section 5.07.205 has been added to exempt dances sponsored by non-profit organizations and a second exemption has been added to clarify that this requirement only applies to very large dances of more than 150 participants.

Continuing, Ms. Mattioli addressed Councilmember Ransom's concern about the equity of taxicab distribution around the County and the service received in the City of Shoreline. She explained that she contacted the director of the King County Department of Licensing, Diana Toledo, for further information regarding these issues. When this information has been received, the Council can make a determination about further steps to take. At this time, staff recommends the adoption of King County's taxicab licensing regulations and the execution of the interlocal agreement to allow the County to continue providing the licensing service in Shoreline.

**Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to adopt Ordinance No. 345. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Ransom reiterated his concerns from January 5 regarding inadequate taxicab service in Shoreline. He felt the County would continue ignoring Shoreline's needs if Council simply passes the agreement.

Councilmember Grace commented that several of his acquaintances report fairly good taxi service from Seattle to Shoreline. He expressed concern about having unlicensed taxicabs operating in Shoreline if the agreement is not renewed. He felt that any data that may come forth later supporting Councilmember Ransom's assertion could be addressed with the County in the future.

Councilmember Ransom said the problem lies not in service from Seattle to Shoreline, but from Shoreline to other destinations in and around Shoreline. He said he personally knows people who wait up to an hour to get a cab for work.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen felt the issue could be analyzed from two different perspectives: 1) number of licenses issued in the northend; and 2) market demand in the northend. He



thought the level of taxicab service in Shoreline could be both license-driven and market-driven. He felt increasing the number of licenses in Shoreline would not necessarily equate to better service. He agreed that the Council should move forward and pass the agreement.

Councilmember Ransom noted that King County froze the number of licenses in 1994, and most are in Seattle.

Councilmember Gustafson supported approving the interlocal agreement, noting the importance of ensuring there are licensed taxicabs in Shoreline.

Councilmember Chang commented on his own personal experience of waiting up to 50 minutes to get a taxi. He pointed out that demand and response times vary widely depending on many factors, including weather. He agreed with Councilmember Ransom's point but wondered about the consequences of not renewing the agreement. Ms. Mattioli said without the agreement, unlicensed cabs could operate within the City.

Councilmember Chang said he would support the motion tonight if there is flexibility to renegotiate the interlocal agreement in the future. Ms. Mattioli confirmed that the interlocal agreement could be amended in the future. She added that it is the same agreement the County signs with several jurisdictions, and this is why the suggestion was made to possibly address these issues at the Suburban Cities Association.

Mr. Burkett confirmed that the City could negotiate the level of service in Shoreline while the agreement is in place.

Councilmember Fimia suggested that perhaps this issue could be put on an agenda six months from now to give time to do more in-depth research.

**Councilmember Grace suggested a friendly amendment to change the word "newsboys" in Section 5.07.630 to "persons who deliver daily or weekly newspapers," which was accepted.**

Mayor Hansen asked if the City has the capability to administer a taxicab licensing program. Ms. Mattioli said the Clerk's office does not have the capability due to the complicated and labor-intensive nature of such a program.

Councilmember Ransom said he would withdraw his objections if he can be assured that the City will get service data and have further discussions in the future.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 7-0 and Ordinance No. 345 was passed.**

9. NEW BUSINESS

- (a) Report on the Capital Improvement Program

Jill Marilley, City Engineer, provided a status report on completed and current CIP projects and summarized issues being addressed for smoother performing projects. She also provided a review of the 2004 CIP program. Her report included the following points:

- The following projects have been completed during 2003:
  - 1) NE 175<sup>th</sup> Sidewalks (15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to the YMCA and Corliss Avenue North to Meridian Avenue North)
  - 2) 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE Sidewalk (NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street to N 192<sup>nd</sup> Street)
  - 3) 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 165<sup>th</sup> Street Signal
  - 4) Shoreview Park Improvement
  - 5) Richmond Beach Saltwater Park Lot 6 & 8
  - 6) Richmond Highlands Community Center
  - 7) Swimming Pool Improvements
  - 8) Curb Ramps Program
  - 9) Annual Overlay Program
  - 10) Richmond Beach Road at 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW Option Study
  - 11) Paramount School Park (Phase I and II)
- The Aurora Corridor Project Right-of-Way acquisition process is proceeding according to plan. The majority (98%) of property owners have been visited and informed of impending right of way acquisitions, the need for temporary construction easements to complete property interfaces between the new level of the sidewalk and existing driveways, and to let them know what to expect during the construction process. Utility coordination is also underway, and design is progressing towards a 60% design submittal scheduled in February.
- Interurban Trail construction is nearing substantial completion on the South Section. Construction on the North Section was started in mid-December and is currently scheduled for substantial completion in April. South Central section construction plans, completed to the 60% level, were delivered to the City and Seattle City Light and are currently under review.
- The 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE rechannelization was completed in December. Curb ramps in the corridor were installed as part of the Curb Ramp program and an overlay was completed as part of the Annual Overlay Program. The mitigation projects on NE 177<sup>th</sup> and NE 168<sup>th</sup> Streets are on schedule for a March/April construction start. The signal at NE 150<sup>th</sup> Street will start construction in Spring 2004.
- The North City Business District is still on schedule for a March 1 award, and easements still remain the critical path of this project. Progress has been good and negotiations with property owners continue to meet the schedule. Mitigation in addition to the rechannelization of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE will happen prior to or simultaneously with construction.

# DRAFT

- Staff reviewed the 30% design plan for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW Drainage Improvement and design continues on schedule. An additional component was added to address flooding issues in the adjacent Dayton sub-basin. Coordination with the adjacent METRO project continues.
- The Richmond Beach Overcrossing type, size and location report was originally scheduled to be complete in December 2003 and is now tentatively scheduled for February 2004. The overall project schedule has not been delayed. This change in schedule is due to early discussions with Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF) regarding design for the third track and cost-sharing negotiations.
- The Serpentine project (part of the Ronald Bog Drainage Improvements) started construction in mid-December and is scheduled for substantial completion in April, weather dependent.
- Construction of the Gateway at the 175th West site (“The Ponies”) is 80% complete with substantial completion expected early February, weather permitting.
- Council was updated on the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan in July 2003. An update will be forthcoming this quarter in conjunction with the other Master Plans underway. The Transportation Master Plan and Surface Water Comprehensive Plan are part of the larger Comprehensive Plan update that was reviewed by Council December 1, 2003.
- Design is complete for Phase II of the Spartan Gym. School Board approval is expected this month. Once approved, the project will advertise for award and construction will take approximately 7 months.
- The Cromwell Park project was suspended pending completion of the Parks and Open Space Master Plan.
- Testing has been completed for the Dayton Avenue N and N 175<sup>th</sup> Street Retaining Wall. Decisions for proceeding and the design for improvements will be performed as part of the 2004 CIP.
- Design for the Richmond Beach Saltwater Beach Erosion project is complete and is pending Fisheries permit approval. The start of construction was delayed from December 2003 due to changes in the permitting agency staff. Construction will begin late January – early February upon permit approval.
- New projects for 2004 include: 1) Richmond Beach Saltwater Master Plan; and 2) Preliminary Study of Intersection at N 185<sup>th</sup> Street and Aurora Avenue.

- The City expects the North City Project to reach the construction phase in 2004, including mitigation on NE 168<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 177<sup>th</sup> Street. It also expects to begin construction on the NE 150<sup>th</sup> Street signal and Paramount Park picnic shelter, irrigation, and park entrance improvements.

Ms. Marilley concluded by emphasizing that 2004 is one of the most significant years in City history because construction contracts may total \$10 million.

Councilmember Fimia suggested that the Richmond Beach Overcrossing not be delayed due to the third track issue because it is unlikely to be resolved any time soon.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern that perhaps City funds could be better spent on additional staff rather than on consulting contracts since the construction pace is increasing. He felt the Council should seriously consider hiring another project engineer to oversee the many capital projects and to prevent errors from occurring.

Councilmember Chang wondered why the City hires consultants only for the duration of projects when there are capital projects scheduled back to back for several years. He said staff previously explained that consultants are only hired on short-term projects, but this policy is not sensible when there are several consecutive projects.

Ms. Marilley said staff would likely address that issue in the next budget cycle.

Paul Haines, Public Works Director, explained the reason for using consultants on major projects such as the North City Business District. He said the budget reflects the need to have on-hand expertise on these rapidly moving projects without experiencing the delays of a learning curve or continued recruitment of specialists. He reminded the Council that three new staff were hired in 2003 and two more are in the 2004 budget. He felt that under the high workload it is more effective to use outside expertise rather than additional staff. He also noted that the current facilities limit the amount of additional staff that can be hired. He said while he appreciates the Council's concern, he feels the Public Works department has the right balance of staff and contract employment.

Councilmember Grace pointed out the difference between a consultant and a contracting employee, noting that the contracted employee works for a specified duration. He suggested the City look into the possibility of using contract employment.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen asked about the status of all the Seattle City Light (SCL) power poles he sees lying in the public right-of-way. Ms. Marilley explained that SCL delivers the poles to the installation site as they become available instead of storing them.

Mayor Hansen asked staff to ensure that Seattle Public Utility is working under the proper permits for the work it is doing in Richmond Beach.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Ms. Marilley said the traffic lights along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE were synchronized when the rechannelization was completed. She said staff is analyzing the road weekly as drivers acclimate to the changes.

Councilmember Ransom asked how long it would take to conduct the traffic study at NE 170<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He reminded Council that he supported installation of a pedestrian stoplight at that intersection.

Ms. Marilley said discussion of that item is scheduled for a Council meeting in either March or April.

Councilmember Fimia suggested that the Council consider the unmet needs of sidewalks, overlay, and hazard mitigation as it considers capital projects as part of its April retreat. She suggested that reprioritization of projects may be necessary.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen said surface water is also an unmet need the City has not been able to fully address since it inherited its faulty system from King County.

Ms. Marilley said that the completed master plans will help Councilmembers with the prioritization process.

Councilmember Chang asked that staff follow up on Ms. Crawford's concern about the bike lane at Paramount Park. He also asked for follow up on a citizen request that a garbage can be installed at the NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street and Aurora Avenue bus stop.

Mr. Burkett said the City is planning to install and maintain a garbage can at that location.

Councilmember Fimia asked if the wood chipper previously made available to citizens at Hamlin Park could be made available on a regular basis. Mr. Burkett said staff would look into the request.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:50 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.