

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, September 13, 2004
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Councilmember Gustafson

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, with the exception of Councilmember Gustafson.

Upon motion by Councilmember Grace, seconded by Councilmember Chang and unanimously carried, Councilmember Gustafson was excused.

3. **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

Steve Burkett, City Manager, commented that bids were opened today for the 3rd Avenue NW Project and the Gateway Project at N 175th Street. Thirteen bids were received for the former, and the apparent low bid was below the engineer's estimate. There was only one responsive bid for the latter, which is being evaluated for responsiveness and potential award.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen announced a number of upcoming events.

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

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, expressed opposition to the new location of the podium, noting that it blocks views and does not allow citizens to form a line. She then commented on the economic development discussion from last week's meeting, noting that every decision the Council makes has an economic impact. She felt the City Council has more impact on economic development than any full-time staff position could ever

have. She suggested that Council's decision on the North City/15th Avenue Project "sabotaged" efforts to bring economic development to the City.

(b) Gretchen Atkinson, Shoreline, asked the Council to find a way to approve the North City Project before the City accrues additional costs. She said the project is well coordinated with the phone/cable companies, the Water District, and Seattle City Light. If the project is cancelled, the City will spend more to upgrade these utilities later. She said if the City does not accomplish the subarea plan for North City by doing the necessary utility undergrounding/upgrades, its potential non-compliance with the Growth Management Act could result in fines and penalties. She said most dissenters were misinformed by a group who opposes apartments and other higher-density development. She said the group hopes to get a zoning change to make North City a light industrial area. She felt this group has not considered the betterment of fellow businesses that have invested heavily on the promise of increased growth.

(c) Patty Crawford, Shoreline, also opposed the relocation of the podium. She referred to a 2001 e-mail correspondence between the King County Economic Development Council president and former Councilmember Grossman regarding the Aegis development. She indicated that Deputy Mayor Jepsen was also involved in the discussion at that time. She said individual Councilmembers should not be involving themselves in such development groups when they try to circumvent the legal and legislative process "behind closed doors." She said the entire Council should be involved in such decisions, and that the City should abide by the rulings made in Superior Court. She said the City has provided legal defense, planning, and infrastructure (fire station) to the Aegis development, the costs of which cannot be quantified because the City has not tracked such information.

(d) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, urged the Council to carefully consider the Planning Commission report on the Midvale Avenue Closure so it can fully understand how the Commission reached its conclusions.

(e) Anna Kallis, Seattle, and Sara Deutsch, Shoreline, thanked the Council for its support of the Teen Link Crisis Clinic and requested that it consider reinstating the full amount requested for the 2005-2006 biennium budget. They said the additional funding would allow them to hire additional part-time staff to supervise the crisis hotline, ultimately to provide more timely response to requests for help. They described the many programs Teen Link provides, including education on suicide prevention. Ms. Deutsch said that many of her fellow Shorewood High School students are aware of Teen Link and consider it a valuable resource. She noted that the youth suicide prevention program is used in the school's health classes. She said Teen Link has a good presence in the community and the funds used to support it are used effectively.

Responding to Ms. Crawford's comments, Deputy Mayor Jepsen clarified that although he was mentioned in the e-mail, he had no involvement in the matters discussed therein.

DRAFT

Councilmember Fimia inquired about the relocation of the podium. Mr. Burkett said one of the goals is to position the podium so that people can speak directly to the Council. He said staff is also experimenting with the configuration of the Council table. He asked for Council's thoughts and suggestions on the new set-up.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, seconded by Councilmember Grace and unanimously carried, the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved approval of the consent calendar, pulling the Minutes of August 23, 2004 for review of Councilmember Ransom's proposed changes. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried 6-0, and the following consent calendar items were approved:

**Minutes of Workshop of August 16, 2004
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of August 23, 2004**

**Approval of expenses and payroll as of
September 3, 2004 in the amount of \$1,460,421.98**

**Motion to approve \$5,000 in neighborhood
Mini-Grant funds for the Richmond Beach
Community Association to purchase materials
and items for its community Halloween carnival**

**Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute
the School Resource Officer Interlocal Agreement
with the Shoreline School District**

**Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a
construction contract with Paul Brothers, Inc. for the
Interurban Trail North Section B (N 200th Street to N 205th
Street) and the South Central Section (N 155th Street to N 175th
Street) improvements and execute changes orders up to 10%
of the contract amount**

**Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a
construction administration contract with Otak, Inc.
in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for the South
Central and North B Segments of the Interurban Trail**

**Resolution No. 223 authorizing parking restrictions
on portions of NW 159th Street, 1st Avenue NW,**

DRAFT

Palatine Avenue N and N 160th in the vicinity of Shoreline Community College, and establishing a Residential Parking Permit Zone

8. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARING

- (a) Public hearing to consider citizens' comments regarding the proposed use of 2005-2006 Community Development Block Grant and General Funds to support human services

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute the contracts to implement the approved programs and projects

Rob Beem, Human Services Manager, reviewed the recommendations of the ad-hoc Human Services Allocations Committee regarding how the CDBG and City funding should be allocated. He said the Committee identified the need to increase support to Shoreline's core locally-based agencies and to add a new service in response to community need. To accomplish this goal without additional funding, the Committee provided for a four percent increase to the Center for Human Services (CHS), because it is a Shoreline-based agency. Three other projects, Meals on Wheels, Crisis Clinic Telephone Line and the Senior Center were funded either at the requested or the currently funded amount. All other currently funded projects were reduced by approximately ten percent of their current allocations. These changes freed up \$2,250 to provide funding to the Wonderland Development Center, the one new public services program added. An addition this year is a minor home repair program administered by Senior Services of King County. Capital funding is \$90,000 higher than usual because of the large amount of loan paybacks received from the home repair program. Capital funds were allocated between the Home Repair Program (both major and minor programs) and the City of Shoreline. It is proposed that Shoreline's capital funding (approximately \$150,000) be used to construct curb ramps, sidewalk improvements and wheelchair pads at bus stops to increase accessibility for persons with disabilities. Mr. Beem estimated that human services funding would serve approximately 10,000 residents. He recommended that if Council wishes to provide additional human services funding, it adopt the proposed plan as a base, after which staff could explore funding increases during the budget process.

Mayor Hansen opened the public hearing.

- (a) Chris Johnson, Seattle, thanked the City for its past support of the King County Sexual Assault Resource Center (KCSARC), which provides 24-hour response, advocacy, therapy and support services to sexual assault victims. He said the program helped 32 Shoreline residents, half of whom were children and teens. He said KCSARC experienced a 14 percent increase in requests from Shoreline in 2004, and it must leverage two dollars for every dollar contributed by Shoreline. He said if the City reduces its funding by 10 percent, KCSARC will have to leverage even more or reduce services. He felt that responding to new needs at the expense of other organizations

weakens the existing service delivery system. He requested increasing funding so new programs could be built on the solid foundation of existing services.

(b) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, expressed strong support for human services funding, noting that if it could be achieved, she would like to see it doubled over the proposed amount. She questioned why the committee recommended full funding for large programs like Parkview Homes, but chose to cut small programs such as Teen Link. She suggested that Teen Link's funding be reinstated and that the City fund those projects that have the greatest impact on the community. She felt that CHS has proven itself as a worthy recipient of City funding and urged Council to ensure they can adequately continue their "good works."

(c) Tara McCaffrey, Senior Services Minor Home Repair Program, thanked the Council for its support of her program, which helps elderly and low-income residents maintain safe occupancy in their homes.

(d) Matthew Fairfax, Shoreline, CHS board president, thanked the City for all the support it has given over the years. He pointed out that CHS provided services for 167 clients from Shoreline for the first quarter of 2004 (126 in family counseling and 41 in substance abuse), and billed out 822 hours of contracted services with the City. It had to find additional funding for the 2800+ hours of services it provided at a value of \$196,000. He said the challenge is to continue to provide services amid increasing costs.

(e) Taeson Lee, Asian-American Chemical Dependent Services, urged the Council to consider funding his agency, which was established in 2003 to address chemical dependency and related problems in the Asian community. He said funding is needed because there is no real focus on these problems in King County, and training and counseling funding is in short supply. He explained that his agency is trying to establish a culturally-oriented substance abuse treatment program in the region.

Councilmember Fimia asked if the agency has a physical location or if it trains counselors for practicing at existing human service facilities. Mr. Lee responded that his agency is still in its infancy, but ideally it would eventually be centrally located.

Councilmember Ransom questioned Mr. Lee's statement that there is no real focus on human services for the Asian community. He named the Korean Counseling Center as a resource for Asians in the King County area.

(f) David Schiber, Shoreline, representing Parkview Services, supported the recommendation to allocate CDBG funding to Parkview Homes. He said the funding would allow the agency to acquire more affordable housing for the developmentally disabled community. Although Parkview Services is based in King County, it has administrative offices and 20 homes located in Shoreline.

(g) Mark Brown, Seattle, representing HopeLink, thanked the City for its ongoing support of the program, noting that it could not provide food, shelter, and

DRAFT

emergency financial assistance to the needy without Shoreline's assistance. He commented on the difficulty of delivering effective services when the cost of such services continues to rise. He said an average of 230 families (450 people) per month received food from the food bank, and 205 families (444 people) received emergency financial assistance. Twenty-eight families were housed in emergency shelters in the 2003-2004 biennium (10 more than the previous), and 36 residents received case management services through the family development program in the last fiscal year. He requested that the Council reconsider the recommendation for a 10 percent cut; otherwise, HopeLink will not be able to offer a wide array of services.

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

Councilmember Ransom asked if services were being reduced by 10 percent in order to use CDBG funds on curb ramp and sidewalk improvements.

Mr. Beem clarified that the capital money was allocated and budgeted separately from public service funding. He said the 10 percent reduction results from shifting money within the public service contracting group of agencies.

Mr. Burkett pointed out that CDBG funds require that the City spend a certain proportion on capital projects. He said there is more demand for services than for capital at this time.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Beem clarified that there is currently a balance in the home repair fund.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to adopt the Human Services Allocation Committee's Recommended 2005-2006 Plan in accordance with Attachments A and B in the Council packet and to authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements to implement the funded projects. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen explained that the City leverages block grant funds with General Fund money to provide additional services. He felt it might alleviate confusion to divide the discussion into a conversation about capital and services. He asked for further clarification of the 10 percent reduction in some services.

Mr. Beem said the recommendation includes a slight increase in funding for CHS, level funding for some programs, and a 10 percent cut for a third group. He said the recommendation was based on a budget exercise, similar to what Council does when it considers shifting priorities within a fixed budget.

Councilmember Grace commented favorably on the work of the citizen advisory committee, the evaluation criteria, and coordination with other jurisdictions. He suggested that during the budget discussions he would support additional funding

DRAFT

(\$32,000) to allow agencies recommended by the committee to receive full funding for two years.

Mayor Hansen concurred, noting that the budget process would be an appropriate time to consider modifications.

Councilmember Fimia wished to see a list of the agencies not recommended for funding. She concurred that during the budget process additional funding should be considered for human service agencies and that the Council should know what the unmet needs are in the community. She also suggested pooling some of the capital funding to focus on long-term endeavors, such as developing affordable housing and a health clinic in Shoreline.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Mr. Beem explained that Appendix B in the Council packet outlines the funding shifts the City would make, should the actual block grant amount be higher or lower than estimated.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that the City and School District adopted shared funding for the School Resource Officer. He was curious to know what other services on the list have become essential within the school system. He said it would be helpful to understand how the costs are being shared amongst the different entities.

Councilmember Chang asked if Councilmember Fimia was thinking of setting aside \$150,000 for long-term human service needs. Councilmember Fimia said the amount would probably be more, although it would be important to determine the unmet need. Councilmember Chang concurred with Councilmember Grace in that he would like to see all requests fully funded.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously; and the Human Services Committee's recommended plan was adopted and the City Manager was authorized to enter into agreements for implementing the funded projects.

Councilmember Fimia asked staff to do some research on the Home Waters Project (formerly the Thornton Creek Project) for the budget discussion. She described the program as an environmental partnership between cities, businesses, school districts, and community colleges.

9. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) Ordinance No. 358 vacating Midvale Avenue N approximately 170 feet south of N 185th Street

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director and Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, described the proposal to vacate a portion of Midvale Avenue N, approximately 170 feet south of N 185th Street as part of the redevelopment of the former QFC site. Mr. Stewart updated the Council on minor changes to the Planning Commission minutes and an additional letter received from Forward Shoreline. He also noted that staff has drafted

DRAFT

a substitute ordinance, which the City Attorney will discuss later. He said Council must deliberate based on the information presented at the Planning Commission and on the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Mr. Cohen described the proposal, noting that the Planning Commission had asked for more analysis regarding the application of Criteria #4, consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. This analysis was provided in the staff report. The Planning Commission amended the proposed conditions of approval to delete a condition on the location and approval of the closure of N 183rd Street and the proposed main entry off Aurora Ave. N. The Commission felt it was not relevant to the vacation/realignment of Midvale because site entry could be resolved during development review. In addition, the Commission amended Condition 4 so that Area 2 meets City street standards. The ordinance includes the substance of the Planning Commission conditions with some editing to remove redundancy and provide clarification.

Jill Marilley, City Engineer, described the anticipated effects of the vacation in the context of traffic circulation. She concluded that a realigned Midvale Avenue N should function as a normal City street and allow unimpeded traffic flow. She said staff would work with the developer to discuss any traffic mitigation that may be necessary to prevent diversion of traffic onto residential streets.

Mr. Cohen described the following criteria for street vacations and how this vacation meets them:

1. The vacation must benefit the public interest;
2. The vacation must not be detrimental to traffic circulation, access, emergency services, utility facilities, or other similar right-of-way purposes;
3. The street must not be a necessary part of the long-range circulation plan or pedestrian-bicycle plan; and
4. The vacation must be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and adopted street standards.

Mr. Cohen then described how the vacation is supported by various policies from the adopted Comprehensive Plan. He concluded that the vacation offers four benefits: 1) opportunity to improve traffic circulation onto Midvale and N 185th Street, and off N 185th Street; 2) allows adjustment to the Seattle City Light right-of-way and future Aurora improvements; 3) facilitates economic redevelopment; and 4) meets the four criteria for a street vacation. The Planning Commission and staff recommends that City Council adopt Ordinance No. 358, approving the vacation of Midvale Avenue N. Street subject to conditions.

Mr. Stewart noted that the substitute ordinance clarifies the legal issues and conditions so the vacation can be practically implemented within a reasonable amount of time.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, outlined the changes included in revised Ordinance No. 358. Section 1 finds the vacation is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and adopted street

DRAFT

standards. Section 3 clarifies the timing of conditions that must be met in order for the vacation to take effect. Condition #2 adds a critical option that allows the City to repurchase an interest in part of the vacated right-of-way to exchange with SCL if needed to realign Aurora Avenue during Aurora Avenue Project Phase 2. Condition #3 was revised to clarify that improvement to Area 2 must comply with City street standards. This condition has been attached to the site development and must be completed before occupancy.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Mr. Sievers said the Planning Commission has not seen the substitute ordinance.

Continuing, Mr. Sievers discussed the remaining conditions. Condition #4 grants the City vehicle and pedestrian easements in Area 3 and ensures that the City can make adjustments as part of the site development plan. Condition #5 was revised to allow approval of the entrance to the site from Aurora Avenue during the site plan process. Condition #7 clarifies the timing of the construction of the Interurban Trail portion of the project, and Condition #9 is rephrased to clarify that utility easements will include the owner's responsibility for all utility facility relocations. He concluded that Conditions 2,4,6, and 8 must be satisfied prior to recording the vacation ordinance.

Referring to the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding utilities, Councilmember Grace wondered why the substitute ordinance did not specify all utilities as contained in the Planning Commission recommendation. Mr. Sievers clarified the condition that all of the existing utilities must have easements to remain in place, and if the development requires relocation they must be relocated at the developer's expense.

**Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved approval of revised Ordinance No. 358.
Councilmember Grace seconded the motion.**

Deputy Mayor Jepsen felt the wording of the substitute ordinance might limit the City's ability to modify the plan to include amenities such as street trees.

Mr. Stewart said the intent of Condition #4 is to ensure the City obtains a public access pedestrian and vehicular easement through the site, the location of which may be decided in the future.

Mr. Burkett noted that many conditions, such as a requirement for street trees, will be negotiated during the site plan review process. The conditions in the ordinance are the minimum that will be required, but others can be imposed.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen wished to ensure that Condition #5, construction and use of the main entry to the site from Aurora Avenue N, is addressed as part of the site development permit.

Mr. Stewart said the Planning Commission concluded that this issue is connected to the site plan process, not the vacation.

DRAFT

Mr. Burkett said it is not the City's intent to allow additional access from Aurora Avenue if a new access easement is granted. He emphasized the need for SCL's involvement and approval.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern about whether the design is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He felt the "zigzag" route of Midvale Avenue through the parking lot would be a "disaster," noting that some drivers might use residential streets to bypass the property altogether. He recalled that the subarea plan envisioned this site with a multi-story mixed-use building, not a one-story strip mall. He felt the Planning Commission's alternative to have buildings on the frontage and build the parking lot to the east, with Midvale Avenue built in a straight line, would be a more feasible design. On the other hand, he noted that the developers have already invested a great deal of money in this plan to accommodate what staff has required. He felt the Council is being compelled to approve a "very inadequate plan."

Councilmember Ransom moved an amendment to strike the words "and further finds that the vacation is consistent with Criteria 4 and the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan." from Section 1, the Council findings. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion.

Mr. Burkett pointed out that since the Planning Commission's findings do not assert consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, the Council should do so in order to approve the vacation. If the Council does not find this consistency, the ordinance should not be passed.

Mr. Sievers concurred, noting that the Planning Commission recommendation was subject to the Council's finding that the vacation is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, so it would not be appropriate to pass the ordinance if all the key criteria are not met.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen pointed out that the Central Area Subarea Plan was never adopted. Therefore, the vacation can only be evaluated by the policies in the Comprehensive Plan, which it does meet. He noted that the Council had not supported moving forward with the North City Project, even though it is supported by an adopted subarea plan. He felt the Council should review the documents it has adopted to determine the goals and vision for development in Shoreline. He said whether you like the development or not, it "meets the test."

Responding to Councilmember Chang regarding the "zigzag" concept, Mr. Stewart explained that this "meander" route would have the least potential traffic impact on the adjacent neighborhood, and results in less right-of-way being vacated. The Planning Commission finally moved this design forward after much debate and discussion. He noted that adjacent property owners strongly support the vacation.

DRAFT

Councilmember Chang wondered how the developer would benefit by giving up nearly 1,700 square feet of property. Mr. Stewart replied that the developer obviously sees a benefit in giving up some land in order to gain additional land that is currently right-of-way.

Councilmember Chang also questioned the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, wondering if the “zigzag” concept would be the future for the downtown area.

Mr. Stewart reiterated that the Central Area Subarea Plan was never adopted, so it would not be appropriate for the City to enforce it on any development proposal.

Mr. Burkett noted that while this vacation is not the ultimate or perfect opportunity, the vacation would lead to substantial improvements in that area.

Councilmember Fimia wondered if the proposed vacation and street alignment was part of the subarea plan.

Mr. Stewart responded that the subarea plan was a 25-year concept that envisioned relocation of the road and more intensive mixed-use development. He said the street vacation resolves the primary traffic problem related to the current location of Midvale Avenue N, which is independent of the land use issues.

Councilmember Fimia wished to see more specificity about the standards to which the Interurban Trail will be developed. Mr. Stewart said this is another item that would be addressed as part of the site development permit.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Mr. Sievers clarified that although the Interurban Trail is a condition of the vacation, it is a frontage improvement that will be completed before an occupancy permit is issued. He said staff tried to include in the ordinance only those items tied to the vacation itself, not the design of the project.

Mr. Burkett noted that the developer would be required to fund the trail based upon the City’s design. If the design is not completed by the time the developer is ready to proceed, bonding would provide the funding to develop the trail.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Sievers reiterated that the vacation should not go forward if the Council does not find that the vacation is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Ransom moved a substitute amendment to strike only the last phrase (“and the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan”). Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which failed 3-3, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, and Ransom voting in the affirmative.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to amend condition #2 to read “An option for ten years” rather than five. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion.

DRAFT

Deputy Mayor Jepsen felt that allowing more time makes sense given the slow progress on the Aurora Corridor Project.

Councilmember Fimia wondered whether it is appropriate to make these changes without consulting with the developer. Mr. Sievers said staff reviewed the revised ordinance with the developer today. Mr. Stewart added that if the changes make the conditions too onerous for the developer, the developer could either request an amendment by Council or simply not fulfill them within the 90-day window. If the conditions are not fulfilled within 90 days, the ordinance will not be recorded or considered in effect.

Mayor Hansen wondered how likely it would be that the City would not be able to make a decision on the option within five years. He wondered if the City could still exercise its option to purchase right-of-way even if Aurora Avenue were not completed.

Mr. Burkett estimated that the City could exercise the option within five years, assuming Council adopted the design of that section of Aurora Avenue.

Mayor Hansen wondered who would benefit and who would be penalized by changing the purchase option to ten years.

Councilmember Ransom did not support a ten-year option. He noted that Council only needs to have an approved design, and that the Aurora Avenue project will progress faster as Phase 1 is built.

Mr. Sievers noted that the option, whether it be five or ten years, simplifies the transaction for both parties. He said extending it to a ten-year option might save the City some transaction costs. He was fairly confident the developer would not object to a ten-year option, noting that the parking scheme would likely be disrupted in five years rather than the outlying ten.

A vote was taken on the motion to amendment Condition #2 to provide for a ten-year option, which passed 4-2, with Councilmembers Fimia and Ransom dissenting.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 9:58 p.m. Councilmember Grace moved to extend the meeting to 10:15 p.m. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Councilmember Chang asked about the extent of the developer's investment in the design process for the property. Mr. Stewart said the developer has completed full building plans, and staff is currently reviewing site plans.

Councilmember Grace expressed his support of the amended ordinance, noting the Planning Commission did a good job of applying appropriate conditions to eliminate

unsafe traffic patterns. He said although he would like to see a multi-story building, the developers are economic realists, who know what will be successful at that site.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 6-0 and Ordinance No. 358 vacating 170 feet of Midvale Avenue N was passed.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.