

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, May 3, 2004
6:30 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 6:30 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 AND FUTURE AGENDAS: none

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Ransom commented on his daughter's recent wedding and on another daughter's life-threatening experiences as a member of the armed forces in Iraq.

Mayor Hansen reported on the northend Mayor's meeting, which included discussion about whether the northend group wants to form a human services roundtable, as other jurisdictions have done.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that the sister cities delegation from Boryeong, South Korea will be visiting Shoreline next week.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Beverly Smilanich, Shoreline, described the excessive student parking in her neighborhood (Palatine Avenue N) due to the lack of parking at the community college. She said this is causing increased traffic and safety hazards for children and elementary school students in her neighborhood. She felt if the college reduced the cost of parking, it would help alleviate the problem. She also requested that her neighborhood be used for a zone parking pilot project, and that it be implemented this fall.

DRAFT

(b) Jeff Lewis, representing Forward Shoreline, thanked the City for its support of the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park showmobile, noting that it is scheduled for completion by the end of May. He then described the mission and objectives of the organization Forward Shoreline, which is to “promote and enhance the residential and business community we turn over to our children and grandchildren.” He said promoting pride and investment in Shoreline is complementary to the City’s economic development objectives. He thanked the City for its initial support and invited participation from others in the community.

(c) Dale Wright, Shoreline, noted that the Aurora Corridor is just as important to the overall community as it is to the businesses along it. He said the City’s plan is designed to specifically achieve the community goal of improved traffic safety for vehicles and pedestrians. Two elements essential to achieving this goal are raised medians and limited access. He then explained the conclusions of a Georgia study which indicate that raised medians, as opposed to two-way left turn lanes, significantly reduce accident rates. He also said the claim that raised medians will have adverse economic impacts on adjacent businesses is not supported by the experience of other states. He said the major factors that determine where people shop include customer service, quality of product, and competitive pricing, not ease of access. He urged the Council to maintain the plan’s integrity so it can achieve the community’s goals for the Aurora Corridor.

RECESS

At 6:50 p.m. Mayor Hansen declared a recess so that members of the Civic Light Opera, rehearsing next door, could retrieve their costumes from the closet in the Mt. Rainier Room. At 7:00 p.m. the meeting reconvened.

(d) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, explained that the retention of Fircrest School in Shoreline directly relates to the Council goal of promoting economic vitality. She emphasized that Fircrest employs 760 people and is the second largest employer in Shoreline. She urged the Council to help protect these union-wage jobs. She said Fircrest receives substantial federal funding each year, and this should be taken into account when considering overall economic vitality in the City. She asked that staff track the current litigation regarding the closure of Fircrest, and that the Council lobby state legislators on behalf of the City. She noted that the City of Buckley is lobbying the legislature, and Shoreline should do the same.

(e) Vance McElmurry, Shoreline, requested that the Council intervene in the zoning regulation issue at his home. In his opinion, the City’s development regulations were not intended to prevent him from making certain minor remodeling changes to his home. He said the concrete slab on his property was built in 1942 and leaks through to the garage below, making it practically unusable. He said the current development regulations prevent him from building a roof above the concrete slab because of the ten-foot setback requirement, even though his design is only deficient by 11 inches. He said the application of the rules in this case is for no other purpose than the application of the

rules. He asked the Council to help him resolve this conflict so he can complete his project.

(f) Russ McCurdy, Arlington, Vice President of the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, provided a brief history of the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, noting that it was established in 1977 and now represents over 211 small, medium and large businesses. He said despite its problems over the years, the Chamber remains a strong organization that strives to enhance business and the overall community. He felt the Chamber could work with the City in implementing the goals of Forward Shoreline, emphasizing that the business community needs to be stronger than ever before. He said the Chamber's focus is on creating the strongest business community possible, which will enhance the overall community.

(g) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, past president of the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, said the Chamber played a strong role in the development of the City and has tried to cooperate with the City. However, many businesses believe that "things are not working" and they cannot thrive under current circumstances. He said that the City's actions would not be perceived as friendly if the Council avoids honest dialogue with businesses. He said the vast majority of comments he receives are that Shoreline is not a friendly place to do business. He asked the Council to reflect on how it instructs staff to interact with constituents. He said staff often become advocates for positions that have been developed behind closed doors rather than soliciting honest input on how to make this a more viable, thriving business community.

(h) Pat Murray, Shoreline, asked why the recycling contract with Waste Management was revised when Shoreline incorporated. The revision eliminated the feature of paying citizens a token amount to recycle. He suggested this feature be restored and that City government itself engage in recycling. He concluded by saying that he would rather comment at Council meetings after people have spoken than before he hears what they have to say.

(i) Patty Crawford, Shoreline, referred to a letter she received from Tim Stewart explaining the extent of construction work going on at the Aegis development. She contended that a variety of construction work is happening within the critical areas buffer, in direct violation of the Critical Areas Special Use Permit approved by the Council. She asserted that construction is happening 15 feet from the "edge of water," far beyond the designated 75-foot buffer. She said based on comments from staff, she always suspected that Peverly Pond would be drained. She said Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife never recommended lowering the water level to make fish passage more successful, or restoring a stream channel through the Aegis site. She said Mr. Stewart claims that Peverly Pond was drained "because Aegis has done such a good job with their mitigation, it's turning back to nature." She concluded by explaining the difference between pond habitat and stream habitat.

Mayor Hansen asked Ms. Crawford to keep her comments respectful. Ms. Crawford said the Mayor has not been respecting the City and has never attended a single Aegis hearing in four years.

(j) Bob Barta, Shoreline, suggested that the Council goal of “healthy, vibrant neighborhoods” would not be achieved if unrestricted parking were allowed to occur in neighborhoods adjacent to Shoreline Community College. He agreed that the college is an asset to the community, but said the parking problem must be addressed soon. He pointed out that the college and other areas of the City do not tolerate unrestricted parking, and neither should the neighborhoods. He asked that the City fulfill its commitment to putting together a zone permit parking code to be implemented this fall. He concluded by describing the negative impact of the “parking lot atmosphere” in the neighborhood.

Responding to Mr. Burkett, Paul Haines, Public Works Director, briefly explained the status of the overflow parking issue around the college. He said that in response to the enormous number of requests received by the City, staff would introduce an ordinance this summer for zone parking. He noted his participation at the SCC master planning meetings and his familiarity with the concerns of the neighbors. He confirmed that parking would be addressed in the master plan. He also commented on proposed changes to the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program (NTSP) to allow for quicker action on certain types of problems.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Mr. Haines noted that the City has received over one hundred requests for different types of traffic-related remedies. He said he could provide a map to show the distribution of requestors in the community.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia’s comment that the need for traffic calming devices and other remedies should be addressed in the Transportation Master Plan, Mr. Haines said there is an entire chapter devoted to safe and friendly streets. It contains a series of traffic solutions as a necessary investment of the transportation system.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, explained the situation at Mr. McElmurry’s home and why it has been difficult to resolve. He said the problem with pursuing a building permit is that it could not be legally issued if the 10-foot setback requirement is encroached upon. Staff wants to find an acceptable outcome, but Mr. McElmurry does not qualify for a variance under the code because he had already constructed a wall, a “self-created hardship.”

Responding to Councilmember Ransom about whether the Aegis development has adhered to the 75-foot buffer requirement, Mr. Stewart stated that the south site was originally developed under a legally authorized permit that was later withdrawn as a result of various court actions. He said mitigation of the disturbed area of the site will occur as part of the construction in accordance with the Critical Area Special Use Permit, which must be completed prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy.

Mayor Hansen commented that substantial replanting of native vegetation has already occurred in that area.

Reading from a recent court order, Councilmember Fimia said that the building permit is presently suspended, and that the amended building permit for the north site was not issued validly under SEPA. She wondered if the permit for the south site is likewise not in compliance since it was issued under the same SEPA process as the north site.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, clarified that that review was used for a different project on the south site, and the north site did not have the same procedural defects (the same SEPA issues that were remanded by the court). He added that the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS) was not invalidated at the time the building permit was issued.

Councilmember Fimia asked for a tour of the entire site so she can compare what is occurring with what was approved by the Critical Areas Special Use Permit. She also asked for clarification of the status of the Aegis project.

6. ACTION ITEM

- (a) Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute the Brightwater Mitigation Agreement

Robert Olander, Deputy City Manager, explained that the City appealed the Final Environmental Impact Statement for King County's Brightwater project because it believed that the FEIS did not specifically identify the impacts to Shoreline residents or offer enough protection from them. Subsequently, staff has been negotiating the terms of mitigation and now feels that the concerns have been addressed. Tonight Council is being asked to authorize execution of the mitigation agreement and withdrawal of the appeal.

Mr. Olander noted that Brightwater mitigation was discussed in executive session last week, and since then he has discussed the changes suggested by Council with Brightwater staff. He said King County agreed to all the major conditions Shoreline proposed except one—the County was not able to provide a guarantee there would be permanent access to Pt. Wells once the project is finished. The property owner, Chevron, is very opposed to public access in close proximity to its plant.

Mr. Olander then outlined the minor changes proposed to the agreement in the staff report:

- Page 4, Section 5: “Based on the concerns expressed by the City, King County commits to evaluate the rail and barge transportation alternatives as described in Option 2 and 3 in Table 2.2 of Addendum 2 in the FEIS as the primary and preferred alternatives to the use of trucks . . .”

- Last sentence of Section 5, also add a reference to Table 2.2 of Addendum 2.
- Page 6, King County will be responsible for odor control detection and will promptly investigate City or public complaints of odor. (King County is responsible for odor detection and has agreed to a zero odor level. So it is responsible for the testing to comply with this requirement.)

Mayor Hansen said Brightwater was discussed at the Northend Mayors' meeting, and the City of Woodinville has come to agreement with the County on its Brightwater appeal.

Mr. Olander added that Councilmember Gustafson was successful in the Regional Water Quality Committee in getting language inserted into the policies regarding zero odor control. From that policy and this agreement, Mr. Olander was comfortable that the City is well protected.

- Page 7. Mediation costs shall be borne one-half by each party. This agreement may only be modified by an amendment in writing by each party. This agreement, unless terminated earlier through mutual agreement or consent of the parties, will terminate upon completion of all the tasks described herein.

Mr. Olander said these were minor amendments, and King County agreed to all the other changes proposed by the City. He also noted that the Richmond Beach Community Association had received a copy of the agreement on Friday and had not expressed any concerns about it today. The Community Association would still prefer that the rail or barge option be construed not as mitigation but as part of construction costs. Mr. Olander said as a practical matter, it does not matter how it is classified as long as it is in the agreement.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to approve the Memorandum of Agreement between King County and the City of Shoreline regarding mitigation of the Brightwater project. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion.

Councilmember Fimia was still concerned about odor control. She suggested the following wording for Section 8: "King County will be responsible for odor control and testing and will promptly investigate and remedy City or public complaints about odor." She feared that under the language proposed by Mr. Olander, the County could investigate a complaint and find there was no problem. Then the City would have to pay for the testing.

Mr. Olander said he thought her proposal would meet the County's concerns. He said that if the motion was to approve the MOA in substantially the form attached, there is authority to insert the language proposed by Councilmember Fimia. Both the maker and seconder concurred.

Councilmember Gustafson said he felt the County is fully committed to not having any odor. He supported the agreement.

DRAFT

Deputy Mayor Jepsen asked whether the Brightwater mitigation budget is defined. Mr. Olander said this is a global amount of \$88 million. There is no portion of this budget specifically allocated to Shoreline.

Councilmember Ransom wondered whether the concern about rail and barge removal being part of construction versus mitigation relates to King County's 1% for art from the construction budget.

Mr. Olander said art will be a part of the treatment plant but he said most of what is constructed in Shoreline would be underground. He was not familiar with how the County applies its policy.

Councilmember Fimia commented that the portals would be partly above ground. She recommended that staff look at the portal designs and ask that some of the art money be used to enhance the way those look. The art funding must be spent in conjunction with the projects and not elsewhere.

Mr. Olander did not think there would be a distinction about whether the funding came from the construction or mitigation budgets.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen suggested a change to the agreement to allow the hourly rate charge for Shoreline permitting review to stay current in coming years.

A vote was taken on the motion to authorize the City Manager to enter into the Memorandum of Agreement regarding the Brightwater mitigation substantially in the form presented, which carried unanimously.

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, seconded by Councilmember Gustafson and unanimously carried, the City Attorney was authorized to withdraw Shoreline's appeal of the FEIS.

7. WORKSHOP ITEMS

- (a) Status of the Comprehensive Plan and Master Plan updates

Mr. Stewart and Paul Inghram, consultant to the project, provided background on the Comprehensive Plan review and the development of the draft master plans for Transportation, Surface Water, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space.

Mr. Stewart explained that the state-mandated deadline for submitting the update is December 1, 2004. As part of the 2004 update to the Comprehensive Plan and development of the Transportation Master Plan, Surface Water Master Plan and Parks Recreation & Open Space Plan, the City is developing a 20-year Capital Facilities

DRAFT

Program. City staff and consultants began the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan and developing the master plans last fall. This process began with public open houses held on September 24th and 25th. Subsequently, the Planning Commission divided into three workgroups and reviewed public comments, existing policies and policy options during a series of informal work sessions. Between October and December of last year, 19 workgroup meetings were held, each open to the public. The City has received several comment letters during the update process. The themes that seem to repeat themselves in many of the comment letters include:

- Business access on Aurora
- Street Classification and Speed Limits
- Basin-wide improvements to Thornton Creek
- Enhance environmental protection

Mr. Stewart noted that the draft plans will be available on May 6, with an open house to be held May 13 to advertise the availability of the draft. He said people would be instructed on how to read the draft and how to submit additional input. He then briefly outlined the projected schedule for review and adoption of the update, noting that several more hearings would be held in both the Planning Commission and City Council. He noted that the major issue of the master planning process is the establishment of criteria for City priorities.

Mr. Inghram described the funding constraints that will be involved in prioritizing the projects in the master plans. He said the City anticipates about \$124.7 million in revenue for capital projects in the 20-year timeframe of the plans. The potential capital projects identified so far would cost over \$400 million. Mr. Inghram then asked for the Council's input on the prioritization criteria listed in the Council packet on pages 76-79.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Stewart acknowledged the value of using the survey results in developing prioritization criteria. He also explained how the feedback has been listed in the report, noting that an attempt was made to incorporate all comments. He said staff then used its knowledge of the community to develop recommendations that would serve as a good starting point for debate.

Mr. Burkett noted that additional open houses and opportunities for debate, discussion, and additional input would follow in both the Planning Commission and City Council. However, in the end, Council would make the final decision.

Councilmember Grace wished to ensure that the public be educated about the plans in a meaningful way in order to solicit the best possible feedback. He suggested that a portion of the open house be televised and the criteria be placed on the web page. He wanted to be sure the information was disseminated as widely as possible.

DRAFT

There was considerable discussion about how the public input would be weighed and tracked. Mr. Stewart noted that it is basically a process of balancing the competing needs and interests of the community. He said as long as the issues are clearly articulated, it will ultimately be up to the Council to evaluate and judge the projects.

Councilmember Fimia commented that it would have been helpful to have a prioritization list prior to drafting the master plans. She also felt that a topic-related matrix of the type and number of public comments would help the Council as it moves along in the prioritization process.

Mr. Stewart said the attempt is to focus the comments on a particular policy, and then catalogue/inventory the number of people for or against the particular issue. He emphasized the need to keep the process flexible as the plan becomes more refined.

Councilmember Fimia said she would need more specificity in order to know if the comments are being reflected in the document. She said although the four bulleted items are the most common concerns, it would be helpful to see if people are saying the same thing in different ways. She then emphasized the importance of ensuring there is a proper feedback process, as suggested by Councilmember Grace, so that people do not claim they "didn't have enough time to comment." She also suggested taking public comment at each Planning Commission meeting.

Councilmember Fimia felt that the Council should prioritize the projects so the public and the Planning Commission have something to react to, and so there is a "feedback loop." She suggested adding "level of community support" as a criteria on all the lists, as well as "degree of existing work on the project," and a "cost/benefit ratio" for the project.

Mr. Stewart explained that the proposed process is to establish criteria for 20-year planning, which then get narrowed down to the six-year CIP and then to the annual budget.

Mr. Inghram added that detailed project definitions usually occur at the six-year CIP process. Therefore, a precise cost/benefit analysis at the 20-year level is difficult to accomplish.

Mayor Hansen emphasized the importance of "getting through this process." He said the 20-year plan would likely be revised numerous times, and that the details are refined at the six-year level.

Councilmember Grace commented that a number of the criteria seem to be overlapping, and he wanted to make sure the criteria are distinct and commonly understood. He used "green streets" and "multi-modal" as examples of items that might mean different things to different people. He also supported including "number of accidents" as Councilmember Ransom suggested.

May 3, 2004

Deputy Mayor Jepsen suggested deleting these criteria, as well as deleting “improve traffic flow.” He suggested adding “ability to maintain in the future” and “potential for additional funding.”

Councilmember Ransom emphasized the importance of knowing how the community survey results would be weighed and factoring this in for all lists. He also suggested adding “maintenance costs, and “accidents at or near the project” for the street projects as additional criteria. He also added:

- To #4 “landscape retention project”
- To #5 “recreation activity requests”
- To #7 “fees”

He emphasized the need to analyze community needs, recreational activity requests (demand for particular projects), and fee-based programs for adults. He explained that revenue from fee-based adult programs could help fund other programs. He noted that surface water should be an “enterprise fund,” so that fees can balance the costs.

Mr. Burkett noted that the separate survey for the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan would be useful in determining markets and priorities.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Stewart explained the status of the stream inventory, noting that the final draft would be submitted to the Planning Commission next month. He noted that the Commission directed staff to remove the distinction between open-water courses and artificial open-water courses, since additional scientific work was needed to establish the base data for artificial open-water courses.

Councilmember Gustafson emphasized the important of the stream inventory within the framework of the master planning project.

There was Council consensus to take public comment next.

8. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, said the City could pursue abatement as a remedy to the fire hazard created by the vacant, asbestos-laden buildings at Fircrest. She then invited the Council to take an official tour of the residential habilitation center (RHC) to assess its facilities. She differentiated between the disability levels of residents living in the skilled nursing facility (SNF) versus those living in the intensive care facility (ICF). She pointed out that Fircrest’s SNF is the only facility in the western part of the state, and is ranked among the top ten in the nation. She urged the Council to visit Fircrest to “see what’s there.”

(b) Vance McElmurry, Shoreline, invited the Council to visit his home and observe the situation there. H explained the City code that prevents him from improving his home, but said that Council could use its discretion to permit him to make a

reasonable modification. He asked the Council to think about his proposal logically and consider changing the wording of the code to allow his development to move forward.

Responding to Mayor Hansen, Mr. Stewart said staff did not recommend that Mr. McElmurry apply for a variance because it probably would not be granted due to the self-created hardship rule.

(c) Street Lighting Program Funding Options

Mr. Olander explained that the City pays for street lights in the Briarcrest and Innis Arden neighborhoods, whereas individual customers pay for street lights in other parts of the City. He explained that a recent Supreme Court decision deemed it illegal for electric utilities such as Seattle City Light to add to their rate base for street lighting. Therefore, the staff recommendation is to partner with a utility district to adopt a street light utility fee in the City.

Mr. Olander then introduced Bernard Seeger, Management Analyst, who provided statistics on the deficiencies in the current street light system, including inconsistent standards for various street classes and inequitable funding of operations and maintenance costs. He presented four funding options, rating them on impacts to the General Fund, level of service (number of lights funded), ease of implementation, equity, and annual direct cost to property owners (residential and commercial). The funding options include:

- Option 1: General Fund and Residential/Commercial Property Owners (Status Quo)
- Option 2: General Fund and Residential/Commercial Property Owners (City devolves responsibility for all residential lights)
- Option 3: General Fund (City assumes responsibility for all street lights in the public right-of-way)
- Option 4: Utility Fee Collection Model with Wastewater/Water Utility (Partner with a Utility District to Adopt a Street Light Utility Fee)

Mr. Seeger concluded by recommending that Council pursue Option #4.

Mayor Hansen noted that the Ronald Wastewater District would be the logical utility because it covers the entire City. After discussion, Councilmembers expressed the following views:

Councilmember Ransom: agreed with #4 if it is feasible; otherwise #3;

Councilmember Fimia: support for #3 and asked that staff bring back a list of non-essential budget items to potentially fund it; she also wanted to be sure there was an offset for low-income citizens and seniors;

Councilmember Grace: #4; if not feasible, then consider #3;

Deputy Mayor Jepsen: explore #4 but find out how many lights are currently above standard and develop a policy related to that;

Councilmember Chang: #4 with low-income offset;
Councilmember Gustafson: a combination of #3 and #4; and
Mayor Hansen: #4.

Council and staff concluded that lighting standards is an important element in the overall analysis of street lighting needs. Mr. Olander summarized that the majority of the Council wishes staff to explore Option #4 but not preclude Option #3.

(d) Forward Shoreline

Councilmember Ransom said he still has many unanswered questions about the relationship of the City and Forward Shoreline. He expressed concern that the Council and the Chamber of Commerce had not seen the proposed contract for economic development services that the City is pursuing with Forward Shoreline.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting for fifteen minutes. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 4-3, with Mayor Hansen, Deputy Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen left the meeting at 10:01 p.m.

Mr. Burkett said staff is proposing that the City contract with Forward Shoreline to provide services related to the City's goal of economic development. He explained that one of the City's strategic plans is to partner with others in the community to accomplish this goal.

Councilmember Ransom questioned why this proposal has been going on for the past ten months without Council knowledge. He was also concerned about the attempt to develop a group similar to the Chamber of Commerce without the Chamber's knowledge.

Mayor Hansen said Mr. Lewis had approached the Chamber to fulfill the function of Forward Shoreline several months ago and nothing occurred, so Forward Shoreline was formed.

Mr. Burkett added that there is overlap between the Chamber membership and Forward Shoreline. He said Mr. Lewis had been discussing this for over a year. He said it is common for cities to have a Chamber of Commerce and a separate organization focused on economic development.

Councilmember Gustafson said he had been aware of the activities of Forward Shoreline and he supports the direction being taken.

Councilmember Chang asked for the draft contract with Forward Shoreline and wondered where the funding will come from. Mr. Burkett noted that there is funding in the

DRAFT

economic development budget for this purpose. He reiterated that the strategic plan recommends using partnerships in a variety of areas to accomplish City goals. He pointed out that members of Forward Shoreline have the ability to use their networks and specialized knowledge to encourage development in Shoreline.

Councilmember Chang questioned the motivation of trying to establish a group with similar goals and objectives. He emphasized the importance of process, fairness, equity, and inclusion. He was particularly concerned about the use of City money and staff time on this issue.

There was discussion of the City's past relationship with the Chamber.

Councilmember Grace felt it would not be appropriate to continue this discussion without the involvement of representatives of Forward Shoreline. **He moved to table further discussion of this item. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.**

- (e) Potential Revisions to the approved Aurora Corridor Design

Councilmember Ransom emphasized the importance of having key members of Washington State Department of Transportation's (WSDOT) executive staff at a Council meeting on camera to answer questions regarding WSDOT's position on access issues.

Councilmember Grace said Council needs to give some direction about the purpose of WSDOT coming to a meeting. He said Council should provide specific questions about access to which WSDOT could respond in a decision-making mode.

Councilmember Gustafson commented that he is not willing to discuss the issue of raised medians, although he would be willing to discuss left-turn access options in specific cases. Mayor Hansen concurred with Councilmember Gustafson, although he was willing to hear what other Councilmembers have to say. He said there are no concrete proposals for projects on the sections of Aurora under discussion.

Mr. Burkett said WSDOT is not willing to discuss continuous left-turn lanes, but if the City Council had other specific issues, WSDOT would consider them. He mentioned two specific issues:

- Left-turn access into the property Mr. Choi wants to buy (while keeping the separate left-turn into the Seattle Restaurant Store).
- Mr. Dally's question about the feasibility of a double-stacked left-turn lane into his property

MEETING EXTENSION

May 3, 2004

At 10:15 p.m. Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried 5-1, with Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.

Mayor Hansen had serious concerns about a double-stacked left-turn lane because of the potential to install a signalized intersection at N 149th Street. He felt a short, two-way left turn lane would decrease reaction times and create a significant safety hazard.

Councilmember Ransom commented on Goldie's problem of lack of official access from 152nd Street. Mr. Burkett said it is impossible to provide left-turn access because of the proposed traffic signal near 152nd to serve this property.

Councilmember Ransom said he had a fourth property that he was considering bringing forward for discussion. He suggested that WSDOT be invited to respond to the Council on television about what it will approve.

Councilmember Fimia commented on the need for economic development and business viability and the different solutions to access management that may be acceptable to WSDOT. She said the City should say its goal is "maximum access and maximum safety," and WSDOT should be asked "how to get us there."

Councilmember Chang commented on the loss of left-turn access to his business in the plan. He said his business does not compromise traffic safety and has more traffic coming in than does the Seattle Restaurant Store across the street.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting for 5 minutes. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 5-1, with Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.

Mayor Hansen summarized that the four properties mentioned would be submitted for consideration. Councilmember Fimia said Councilmember Chang's property should be added to the list.

Mr. Burkett asked Council to provide direction for staff to evaluate these sites before contacting WSDOT. He did not wish to send proposals to WSDOT that are not feasible from a technical or safety standpoint. Then, Council could review the evaluation and decide which proposals to send to WSDOT.

Councilmember Fimia objected to this approach, so Mayor Hansen said the Council "would operate in the dark and go with whatever the proposals are."

Councilmember Gustafson described the lengthy process of studies, input, and design that have culminated in the approved Aurora Corridor project. He said he is willing to look at these three or four properties, but he feared that other businesses would also come

May 3, 2004

forward to ask for consideration. He reiterated that the City should move forward and make decisions based on staff's recommendations.

Seeing that it was 10:35 p.m., Mayor Hansen said this discussion would have to be continued at a later date.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:35 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.