

**DRAFT**

**CITY OF SHORELINE**

**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL  
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, March 28, 2005  
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.

(a) Proclamation of Girls Basketball Week

This item was postponed to April 25.

(b) Shoreline Star—Keith McGlashan

Mayor Hansen presented the second Shoreline Star to Keith McGlashan and outlined his many contributions to the sense of community in Shoreline through his business and his interest in education.

Mr. McGlashan accepted the award and thanked the City for this recognition.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Steve Burkett, City Manager, reported that an ad hoc committee researching off-leash dog parks spent Saturday visiting several Puget Sound parks. The group will make a recommendation to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Board regarding such a park for Shoreline. Mr. Burkett also reported that 15 people attended the community finance meeting held last Tuesday. He noted that all the groups participating in this priority setting exercise show a fair amount of consistency. The results of these community meetings will be presented to Council as part of its Annual Retreat. Mr.

# DRAFT

Burkett concluded by noting that City Clerk Sharon Mattioli was selected as Washington Municipal Clerks Association Clerk of the Year at the WMCA conference last week.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: none

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) David Fagerstrom, Shoreline, asked the Council to consider changing the construction hours from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. for the project at 19141 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW per City code. This would accommodate some residents who retire at 8:00 p.m. He then explained that the developer of this project has been allowed by code interpretation to use public domain area to satisfy sight triangle requirements, which is an illegal gift of public property to a private citizen. He said the property owner must use his own property to satisfy the physical placement of this safety triangle. He felt this should be corrected in the code so it does not set an undesired precedent throughout the City.

(b) Tom Dunnihoo, Shoreline, thanked the Council for deciding not to pursue the Echo Lake site for the City Hall project. He felt people who express grievances should also express thanks for the good things the Council does.

(c) Larry Owens, Shoreline, and Maryn Wynn, Shoreline, described the activities of the Shoreline Solar Project, a non-profit organization dedicated to bringing renewable energy projects and responsible energy practices to the community. They commented on the success of its first annual renewable energy fair last year, which included the installation of Shoreline's first solar power electric system in a public building. The second annual fair will be held Saturday, June 4, and it is expanded to include more exhibits, educational workshops, and related activities. They asked for City support and sponsorship of this year's renewable energy fair, since the goals of the Solar Project are closely matched to goals and policies of Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan and Parks mission statement.

Mr. Burkett noted that staff would investigate the sight triangle issue and follow up with the Shoreline Solar Project.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Gustafson moved to approve the agenda. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried unanimously and the agenda was approved.**

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion. Councilmember Fimia asked that the Minutes of Regular Meeting of February 28, 2005 and Item 7(g), Resolution No. 229, be pulled**

# DRAFT

**from the Consent Calendar. A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 7-0, and the following Consent Calendar items were approved:**

**Minutes of Regular Meeting of February 14, 2005  
Minutes of Workshop Meeting of February 22, 2005  
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of February 28, 2005  
Minutes of Special Meeting of March 7, 2005**

**Approval of expenses and payroll as of March 3, 2005 in the amount of \$1,348,638.75 and approval of expenses and payroll as of March 17, 2005 in the amount of \$1,189,270.37**

**Ordinance No. 374 approving the continuation of a special use permit for the purpose of intensifying a nonconforming gambling use by adding satellite off track wagering at 16708 Aurora Avenue N.; and amending Ordinance No. 347**

**Motion to approve \$5,000 in mini-grant funds for the Parkwood Neighborhood Association projects for the reader board at Parkwood Elementary School and the plantings in Twin Pond Parks**

**Motion to approve \$5,000 in mini-grant funds for the Ridgcrest Neighborhood Association project to pay the artist to replace the existing mural located at NE 165<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> NE**

**Ordinance No. 378 reclassifying two project inspector II positions in the Planning and Development Services Department to a new classification entitled Combination Inspector; and amending Ordinance No. 373 by amending the 2005 Non-exempt Salary Table to add this classification**

**Ordinance No. 379 reclassifying a computer/network specialist position in the Finance Department to a new classification entitled Web Developer; and amending Ordinance No. 378, by amending the 2005 Non-exempt Salary Table to add this classification**

**Ordinance No. 377, amending Ordinance No. 355 by increasing the appropriation in the General Fund, Street Fund, Surface Water Management Fund, Public Arts**

# DRAFT

## **Fund, General Capital Fund, Roads Capital Fund and Surface Water Capital Fund**

### **Ordinance No. 380, amending Ordinance No. 114, increasing the dollar amount of the Petty Cash and Change Fund for the City of Shoreline**

### **Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute an interlocal agreement with the City of Lake Forest Park for the operation of the Teen Program**

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

- (a) Appointments of five regular and one alternate member to the Shoreline Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Board

Councilmember Ransom reported that the Council subcommittee, consisting of himself and Councilmembers Chang and Gusfason interviewed the two new applicants for the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Board. He said they recommend reappointment to four-year terms of Carolyn Ballo, Herb Bryce, William Clements and Bill Martin. They recommend that Dwight Stevens be reappointed to fill the unexpired two-year term of Michael Broili and that Kevin McAllife be appointed as the alternate for a two-year term. They also recommend establishment of a two-year eligibility list for appointment as an alternate and that William Blalock be placed on that list.

Councilmember Gustafson commented on the high quality of the two new applicants.

**Councilmember Ransom moved the subcommittee's recommendations. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously and the Mayor confirmed the appointments.**

- (b) (7g) Resolution No. 229 adopting a combined schedule for the 2003-2004 major Comprehensive Plan update and the 2004-2005 Annual Review of the Comprehensive Plan

There was Council consensus to take this item next.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, explained that the timing of the 2003-2004 major update of the Comprehensive Plan and the 2004-2005 Comprehensive Plan review that is currently moving through the Planning Commission raised some issues related to taking two separate actions in one year to amend the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Stewart consulted with staff at the Washington State Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (CTED), who suggested that the City might want to consider combining the two reviews into one consolidated

action. City staff concurs with this advice and therefore recommends combining the two actions.

**Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved approval of Resolution No. 229. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**

Responding to Councilmember Grace, Mr. Stewart explained that anyone can submit amendments to the Comprehensive Plan each year for consideration. They are compiled and reviewed by the Planning Commission on an annual basis. This year one amendment has been appealed, so a joint Planning Commission/Hearing Examiner public hearing will be conducted to hear the appeal. Following resolution of that issue, the Planning Commission will deliberate the various proposals and forward recommendations to the Council. He said the intent is to combine them with the 2003-2004 Comprehensive Plan update so one consolidated review can be accomplished in April or May.

Councilmember Grace wondered if this would jeopardize the City's filing requirements under the Growth Management Act.

Mr. Stewart said the City is not currently in compliance with the GMA since it has not completed its 2003-2004 update, but the City was encouraged to establish a timeline for adoption, which it did. However, the City was instructed that if its major 2003-2004 update occurs too closely to the annual update in the same year, there could be a concern about having two separate actions occur. Therefore, it is recommended that the City merge the two actions.

Mayor Hansen asked if there had been any discussion of an extension of the deadline by the State. Mr. Stewart responded negatively, but clarified that there has been significant debate about whether the smaller counties/cities could get the deadline extended in the coming years. He said staff has carefully considered how non-compliant status could affect the City's ability to acquire grant funding, but it should not present a problem until May or June. Beyond that, Shoreline could face serious financial disincentives for not being in compliance with the GMA.

Mayor Hansen wondered if adopting the 2003-2004 update in the next few weeks would still present a problem for the City.

Mr. Stewart said some people speculate that taking two actions in one year might serve as a basis for appeal to the Growth Management Hearings Board. While this risk is low, he felt the risk would be virtually eliminated by combining the two actions.

Councilmember Fimia asked if there was an exact deadline in May for accomplishing the plan updates. Mr. Stewart clarified that the May date was the result of internal discussions among City staff relating to the issue of ineligibility for grant funding. He noted that the City does not intend to apply for any IAC grants or Public Works Trust Fund loans before May or June. It would not be eligible to do so without adoption of the 2004 update.

# DRAFT

Councilmember Fimia asked when the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) review will happen in the process. Mr. Stewart responded that the SEPA process is happening for both updates concurrently.

Councilmember Fimia raised concerns about the SEPA process if the two actions are combined. She said she spoke to CTED today and her understanding was that the combined plan needs to have its own SEPA review. She felt that SEPA should not occur on two separate tracks if these actions are combined to form one document. She asked for a legal opinion from staff.

Mr. Stewart said that none of the land use changes proposed for the 2004-2005 update will have significant impacts over the plans under discussion now, so he does not foresee a problem with the update from a SEPA standpoint.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen wondered if the SEPA appeal would have to be resubmitted if the SEPA review is combined for the two plans.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, said if Mr. Stewart, as the SEPA responsible official, does not foresee impacts greater than the sum of the two parts, then the two SEPA determinations can be combined and adopted as one action. Since the SEPA is effective upon issuance, there is no appeal since that SEPA is attached to Council action (Comprehensive Plan), and therefore no delay by reissuing a single SEPA determination. The appeal would not be affected because that SEPA determination also has been applied to a contract rezone project, otherwise there would not be an administrative appeal at all.

Councilmember Fimia said she researched the City's process for Comprehensive Plan amendments and discovered that staff puts any proposed amendments through a series of tests, one of which is neighborhood notification. She asked if the neighborhoods had been notified of the rezone projects. Mr. Stewart answered affirmatively. Councilmember Fimia said she would support Resolution No. 229 as long as the SEPA review is completed for the whole document.

There was discussion of how Land Use Policy 7 (LU7) has been applied in this process. Councilmember Ransom emphasized the need to go through the SEPA checklist for the major 2003-2004 update and ensure that LU7 is being followed. He felt the process should be complete, noting that the checklist is an integral part of the process.

Mr. Stewart stated that the SEPA checklists have been completed on each of the elements and are part of the public record for all the actions. Regarding LU7, he said staff prepared two memos to Council regarding this issue, and he would be happy to review them if Council wishes.

Councilmember Ransom said that staff had previously stated that it does not have to follow LU7 for the major 2003-2004 update. However, since this is a major review that only occurs every seven years, he felt the update should have a complete review and that LU7 should not be "bypassed."

# DRAFT

Councilmember Fimia noted that the SEPA checklist is different than LU7, although there is probably some overlap. She felt the Council's review process has probably accomplished LU7, although a more condensed list of amendments should have been reviewed by staff and the Planning Commission. She said the 2004-2005 update should follow LU7 and include a complete analysis of any proposed amendments.

**Councilmember Chang left the Council table at 8:30 p.m. A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Resolution No. 229, which carried 5 – 1, with Councilmember Ransom dissenting.**

Councilmember Chang returned to the table at 8:35 p.m.

## AGENDA INTERRUPTION

King County Councilmember Carolyn Edmonds invited the Councilmembers to a lunch to be held on April 5 on the University of Washington Bothell Campus. The luncheon invitation is offered to the Councils of the northend cities—Shoreline, Bothell, Woodinville, Kenmore and Lake Forest Park. The program will be a discussion of a recent economic development survey done of northend businesses. The goal of these discussions is to encourage businesses to come to the northend and to educate the cities on regional business needs. She pointed out that north county businesses generated \$6.2 billion in revenue. While the north county is rich in higher education institutions, only 20% of north county businesses use them for workforce training. She stressed the importance of an ongoing dialogue between government, business, and education institutions.

- (c) Continued deliberations on the 2004 Update of the Comprehensive Plan and the master plans for Transportation, Surface Water, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space

Mayor Hansen called for public comment.

(a) Brian Derdowski, Bellevue, representing Public Interest Associates, Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, and Sno-King Environmental Council, noted that the Council still has considerable work to do on its master plans, which are considered part of the Comprehensive Plan. He said a number of deficiencies in the City's transportation concurrency plan have been identified and noted that the City's land use plans and transportation concurrency plan have to be consistent under GMA regulations. He noted that several key factors in the City's plans are missing, including revenue sources, peak hours, trip distribution, trip assignment, and trip generation. He suggested that Council hold a special session on this issue in order to ensure a complete plan. He said Shoreline residents are counting on the City's six-year plan and 20-year plan to be balanced between its revenue sources and land use assumptions. He urged the Council to seriously consider these objections and work with him to resolve these issues.

The Council reviewed the remaining items in Category F on the staff matrix (“amendments that would change the intent of the Planning Commission recommendations”).

**Regarding Item #208 (H18), Councilmember Fimia moved the following wording: “Develop policies, practices, and programs which will provide good management, preservation, maintenance and improvement to existing affordable housing.”**

**Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.** The Council discussed any potential budget implications this policy might have as well as what constitutes affordable housing. Upon suggestion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Councilmember Fimia rephrased the wording to read: **“Develop policies and practices which will provide good management, preservation, maintenance and improvement to existing affordable housing.”**

Councilmember Fimia spoke in favor of the motion, noting that the emphasis should be on protecting the affordability component for the long term.

Councilmember Ransom supported the motion, noting that most of the “affordable” housing in Shoreline does not really meet the definition of affordable, which is 80% of median income. Most cottage housing ranges from \$240,000 to \$300,000 for a 1,000 square foot unit. He noted that Shoreline Village is a remodeled condominium development that offers comparable units for only \$118,000. He felt Shoreline needs more housing that fits within the definition of affordable.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 7-0.**

**#254 (Goal TII)--Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion. Deputy Mayor Jepsen suggested rewording the motion to say: “Support increased transit coverage and service that connects local and regional destinations to improve mobility options for all Shoreline citizens.”**

Councilmember Fimia commented that Shoreline needs more transit service to more places, not necessarily more options. She felt that more emphasis should be placed on service rather than mobility options.

Paul Inghram, Berryman and Henigar consulting firm, said the Planning Commission’s recommendation reflects its view that the existing policy was somewhat vague. He said they tried to improve it by adding “connecting local destinations with regional destinations.”

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 7 – 0.**

**#255 (T13)—Councilmember Fimia moved to amend the Planning Commission recommendation to add “and students” and remove the last sentence so the policy reads: “Develop a detailed transit plan in coordination with transit providers to identify level of service targets, facilities and implementation measures to increase**

# DRAFT

**Shoreline residents' and students' transit ridership." Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia noted that some in King County wanted METRO to replace some of the school bus service, but this was a significant capital expenditure for transit. She recommended refining the bus routes so schools and other institutions are considered, but not dedicate service specifically for schools.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**#292 (T42)—Upon motion by Councilmember Fimia, seconded by Councilmember Gustafson and unanimously carried, the Planning Commission recommendation was adopted with the addition of "education" so the first sentence reads "Work with neighborhood residents to reduce speeds and cut-through traffic on non-arterial streets with education, enforcement, traffic calming, signing or other techniques."**

**#346 (U1)—Councilmember Grace moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation reworded to say "Coordinate with utility providers to ensure that utility services are provided at reasonable rates citywide and that those services meet service levels in the Capital Facilities Element." This eliminates the words "identified/recommended." Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**#372 (U26)—After Councilmember Fimia discussed and then retracted her motion that the word "encourage" be replaced by "require," Councilmember Gustafson moved approval of the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia felt the term "encourage" tends to weaken the requirements.

Councilmember Grace noted that the existing policy does not specify who should provide the mitigation.

Councilmember Ransom felt it would be unreasonable to require mitigation for electrical utilities because of the height of transmission power lines. He supported the Planning Commission recommendation because it specifies that the City's role is to encourage electric utilities to do the mitigation.

Mr. Burkett said the only way to mitigate electrical transmission lines is to put them underground, which is prohibitively expensive.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**#386 (PR4)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted a typo in the Planning Commission recommendation. With this correction, he moved the recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion. He accepted a friendly**

# DRAFT

**amendment by Councilmember Fimia to start the policy with “Where feasible . . .” A vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**#401 (New PRB)—Councilmember Grace moved the Planning Commission recommendation, omitting the words “attempt to.” Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion. Councilmember Fimia moved to start the policy with the words “When upgrading . . .” Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried 7 – 0. A vote was taken on the motion as amended, which also carried 7 – 0.**

**#427 (PR37)—Councilmember Ransom moved to retain the existing policy. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion. Councilmember Ransom said he would like to see this policy remain because recreational programs need to accommodate the schedules of working parents. Councilmember Grace noted that this policy is addressed in policy PR36. A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 4 – 3, with Mayor Hansen, Deputy Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.**

**#430 (PR40)—Councilmember Ransom moved to retain the existing policy. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which failed 3 – 4, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia and Ransom voting in the affirmative. Mayor Hansen noted that failure to keep the existing language affirms the Planning Commission recommendation to delete this policy.**

**#443 (CF6)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing policy. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 4 – 3, with Mayor Hansen and Councilmembers Grace and Gustafson dissenting.**

**#477 (CF27)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion. After considerable discussion of what constitutes a non-city service provider, the vote on the motion was unanimous.**

**#479 (CF29)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.**

Councilmember Grace felt the Planning Commission recommendation was more specific and clear.

Councilmember Fimia wondered if City facilities would be exempt from the standards that non-city entities must comply with under the Planning Commission recommendation.

Mr. Stewart said the intent of the policy is to strengthen the coordination between the City’s capital facilities plan and non-city service providers to ensure there is a consistent delivery system.

Mr. Burkett said the City is not exempt from such standards. He said a key requirement of the capital facilities element is that the City complete master plans and identify all the needs and funding for those that are unfunded.

**#496 (Goal EDa)—Councilmember Ransom moved the Planning Commission recommendation with the addition of the words “and office” after “retail.” Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried unanimously**

**#497 (policy EDe)—Councilmember Ransom again moved the Planning Commission recommendation with the addition of the words “and office” after “retail.” Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**#498 (policy Edf)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia felt that if the policy implies public sector spending, it could have major revenue impacts on the City. She felt the policy should specify private sector spending.

Councilmember Grace felt that specifying the private sector in this policy would require revision of the previous goals to maintain consistency; however, he did not support this.

After continued discussion, Mr. Stewart said that while he originally thought the policy referred to private sector spending, he now believes it includes both public and private sector investment. He noted that some public sector projects have a very positive impact in terms of construction spending, jobs, and economic activity.

Councilmember Fimia expressed continued concern that this policy could serve as the justification for significant public expenditures in the future.

Mayor Hansen pointed out that any future revitalization or construction project will require four Council votes. Councilmember Grace concurred, adding that any major project will require considerable discussion and economic analysis. He said whether it is a public or private sector project will depend on the facts of the time.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 6 – 1, with Councilmember Fimia dissenting.**

**#522 (ED22)—Councilmember Gustafson moved the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia proposed deleting “Direct capital improvements to key areas...,” inserting “Use local improvement districts to make,” and replacing the word “attract” with “grow.”

# DRAFT

Mr. Burkett noted that a key function of City government is to make capital improvements and attract both businesses and residents to the City. He said a Local Improvement District (LID) is a completely different issue.

Councilmember Grace felt that this is not the appropriate section of the Comprehensive Plan to address LIDs. He supported the Planning Commission recommendation.

Councilmember Chang wondered if the Comprehensive Plan includes a policy related to LIDs. Mr. Burkett said there is no specific policy, but the lack of a policy does not preclude the City from using an LID.

Councilmember Fimia did not consider this a responsible policy because it has the potential to put a considerable burden on the City. She cited the Aurora Corridor as an example of a major capital project that is aimed at improving the City's image. She felt if local businesses benefit by capital improvements, they should be required to contribute to capital investments through LIDs. She also felt the policy should address existing businesses. She considered the policy to be deficient because it lacks consideration of costs and benefits.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen said the Aurora Corridor Project has several objectives, including enhanced safety. He did not want to leave the impression that the Council is mostly concerned about the City's image.

**Councilmember Ransom moved an amendment to add the words "grow and" before attract. Councilmember Grace seconded the amendment, which carried unanimously. A vote was taken on the motion as amended, which carried 6 – 1, with Councilmember Fimia dissenting.**

## MEETING EXTENSION

**At 10:00 p.m. Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to extend the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 1, with Councilmember Fimia dissenting.**

**#559 (CD11)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing policy. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia felt the term "encourage" weakens the requirement for building/site design, landscaping and shielded lighting.

Councilmember Grace noted that the Planning Commission recommendation clarifies that this policy is for the City to apply to new development.

Mr. Burkett did not feel using the word "encourage" would make a significant difference, since the Development Code is the operating document that regulates development.

# DRAFT

After further discussion, **Councilmember Fimia moved a substitute motion to accept the Planning Commission recommendation, changing the word “encouraging” to “requiring.” Councilmember Chang seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 1, with Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.**

**#590 (CD 53)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing policy. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**#607 (CD57)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing policy. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which failed 1 – 6, with Councilmember Fimia voting in the affirmative.**

Councilmembers said it was difficult to determine the intent of this policy, therefore they agree with the Planning Commission recommendation to delete it. It was noted that zero lot line single family development is allowed under the current code.

Councilmember Fimia felt that the existing policy should be retained to provide guidance to the Development Code.

**Councilmember Grace moved the Planning Commission recommendation to delete this policy. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 1, with Councilmember Fimia dissenting.**

**#611 (CD 61)—Councilmember Fimia moved to add the language “especially mature trees” after “vegetation” in the existing policy. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion. After a comparison with policy CD24, a vote was taken on the motion, which carried 7 – 0.**

Mr. Stewart said staff is working on additional language for item #154.

Councilmember Fimia said #164 will require additional discussion. She noted that when the items were originally pulled, she specifically noted she might wish to add a few more. She asked to discuss Item #179 (EN62).

**Regarding Item #179 (EN62), Councilmember Fimia noted the Planning Commission recommendation speaks to “surface water quality” and she moved to add “ground water and” before “surface.” Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.**

Responding to Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Inghram noted that the Planning Commission wanted the emphasis to be placed on stream and wetland corridors, so they recommended adding “surface” water.

Councilmember Fimia noted that surface water and ground water are intimately connected. She said specifying surface water gives the impression that ground water is not important.

# DRAFT

Mr. Stewart pointed out that a number of policies in the section address both surface water and ground water issues. This policy happens to emphasize surface water.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**Turning to item #265 (T23), Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing policy. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion. In order to give staff time to research this item, Councilmember Gustafson moved to postpone the motion until next week. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 2, with Councilmembers Fimia and Ransom dissenting.**

Councilmember Ransom said he would like to go back and consider items #31 (related to #211), 28, 30 and 38.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:30 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk