

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, April 4, 2005  
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Councilmember Grace

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

Deputy Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Mayor Hansen and Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, and Grace. Mayor Hansen and Councilmembers Chang and Fimia arrived shortly thereafter.

(a) Proclamation of Library Week

Deputy Mayor Jepsen recognized April as National Library Month and acknowledged the Richmond Beach and Shoreline Libraries for the services and programs they provide the public.

Joe Phillips, Chair of the Library Board, Mary Lynn Potter, Vice Chair, Judy Weathers and Anina Sill, Managing Librarians from the Shoreline and Richmond Beach Libraries, and Library Board members Jamie Holter and Yoshiko Saheki accepted the proclamation.

**Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Deputy Mayor Jepsen and carried 6-0, Councilmember Grace was excused.**

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Steve Burkett, City Manager, reported on the following items:

- advertisement of the request for bids for the Aurora Corridor and Interurban Trail projects

# DRAFT

- Washington State Department of Transportation construction project on Interstate 5 beginning at NE 175<sup>th</sup> Street
- City gateway project on NE 175<sup>th</sup> Street
- progress on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE drainage project
- new banners to be displayed for Shoreline's Tenth Anniversary

#### 4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Fimia submitted an item for consideration regarding City support for the Shoreline Solar Project's 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Renewable Energy Fair.

#### 5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Dale Wright, Shoreline, commented that a new group called Progress Shoreline has been organized to help achieve the original vision established by the community. This group is dedicated to building on what has been accomplished and helping the City move forward. He noted there is a small group in Shoreline whose apparent purpose is to prevent progress in Shoreline. Rather than expressing their vision for the City, they have focused on "obstructing the City Council's efforts to move forward" through "misuse of public comment privileges, delay tactics, distortions, misrepresentations, intimidation, and litigation." He said Progress Shoreline will be supporting candidates who will work toward continued improvement and who will represent all segments of the community. He urged all citizens to join in electing a "forward-thinking" City Council.

(b) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, pointed out that the "17 acre" South Woods property, which is jointly owned by the Shoreline Water District and Shoreline School District, is actually 15.69 acres and has an assessed value of \$5.77 million. She noted that the current market appraisal for such property is likely to be higher than the assessed valuation. She said she is organizing a task force to explore the possibility of preserving the property for City and school district use. A joint meeting with the Cascade Land Conservancy will be held at the Shorecrest Library on April 12 to discuss the feasibility of such an acquisition. She urged the City Council to adopt a resolution requesting that the school board maintain their interest in the property. She felt the City's elected representatives should consider acquiring at least half of this property for City and school district use because this is what taxpayers want.

(c) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, expressed support for Ms. Wacker's idea, urging the Council to also consider purchasing the land at Echo Lake for a City park. She said this would be consistent with Councilmember Ransom's vision of a community center at Echo Lake, and it would ensure that the environment at Echo Lake is not compromised. Since Echo Lake is the headwater of McAleer Creek, she said this would also be consistent with the City's goal of enhancing, preserving, protecting and restoring Lyons and McAleer creeks for salmon habitat. She felt acquiring this property as well as the South Woods would be a good use of City funds and provide opportunities for many Shoreline citizens.

(d) Janet Way, Shoreline, concurred with the previous speakers, noting that she supports progress in improving water quality on Echo Lake and protecting the environment. Her organization, Sno-King Environmental Council, as well as the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce and the City will sponsor a tree-planting event on April 23 in recognition of Earth Day. She pointed out that the City could also acquire property next to Paramount Park. She noted her intention to bring up the issue of tree cutting in critical areas next to Paramount Park at the Code Enforcement workshop on April 6. She said property owners need to understand that tree cutting and other environmental damage is not appropriate. She urged the City to work with her group to require mitigation and restore some of the qualities and lost habitat at Paramount Park.

(e) Bill Ptacek, Executive Director of the King County Library System, thanked the City for recognizing Library Week. He commented on the quality of library personnel, resources, and services in the area, noting that KCLS is the second busiest library district in the United States. It generates \$4.50 of direct benefit to the community for every dollar it receives. He concluded by commenting on the status of planned improvements to the Shoreline Library.

Councilmember Gustafson commented that employees of both libraries have been particularly helpful to him in his research efforts, and Councilmember Ransom noted that the Library board has been an effective liaison between the public and the King County Library Board of Trustees in relaying citizen's concerns.

Robert Olander, Deputy City Manager, noted that the City's code enforcement department is investigating Ms. Way's complaint. He pointed out that there are some remaining funds from a prior land acquisition grant that could potentially be used for further land acquisition.

Responding to Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Burkett explained that the City received a letter from the school and water district over a month ago offering to sell the property to the City. Subsequently, City staff met with representatives of those groups, the Cascade Conservancy, and King County Councilmember Carolyn Edmonds to identify potential funding sources for the preservation of some or all of the property. He said staff will continue to monitor this item.

## 6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

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

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, distributed a list of the items in Category G to be discussed this evening.

Mayor Hansen called for public comment.

# DRAFT

(a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, reiterated the importance of urging the school board to retain the school district's portion of the South Woods for potential purchase by the City. She also asked that the City purchase the water district portion so that it can be developed into a neighborhood park for Briarcrest. She said it is appropriate when considering the Comprehensive Plan and parks expenditures that the Council refer to this specific property, which was not available three months ago.

(b) Brian Derdowski, Bellevue, speaking on behalf of the Sno-King Environmental Council, Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, and Public Interest Associates, said he now represents the Shoreline Neighborhood Alliance, a new group dedicated to protecting Shoreline's excellent neighborhoods from incompatible and unreasonable development. He urged the Council to resolve the cottage housing controversy as soon as possible, noting that at least seven amendments proposed by staff and the Planning Commission would "gravely weaken" existing standards. He said he initiated a pilot project for such projects and developed good performance standards while serving on the King County Council. He urged the City to require a conditional use permit (CUP) for cottage housing to ensure that the City retains discretionary authority over design standards. He also noted that the City might have a SEPA problem if it increases densities in zoned areas that exceed the underlying zoning.

(c) Paul Tychsen, Shoreline, concurred with the previous speaker, noting there is something fundamentally flawed with the concept of allowing double densities in low-density, established neighborhoods. He said the term "bonus density" is a misnomer for people who make the largest single investment of their lives in their homes. He urged the City to adhere to the underlying zoning density, and to follow the established procedures if it is to be changed. He said despite what traffic statistics might indicate, there is eight to ten times more traffic on 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW than a few years ago.

(d) Janet Way, Shoreline, offered Comprehensive Plan amendments relating to utilities and capital facilities. She noted her concern about the impact on taxpayers of collocating utilities in capital facilities, offering the following amendments:

- Goal U II: Facilitate the efficient and economical provision of appropriate, reliable utility services whether through City-owned and operated, or other independent providers.
- Goal U2: Investigate whether alternative provision options may or may not be more effective at providing services to our residents.
- CF29: Review and adopt updated plans for non-city capital facilities and services and ascertain the demand for: co-location of facilities by comparing with existing City-owned services: service enhancements and coordination with city facilities and services. Investigate the actual costs to the public of co-location of facilities with the City.

She concluded that Thornton Creek is not adequately defined in relation to Cromwell Park in the Surface Water Master Plan.

# DRAFT

(e) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, proposed the following amendment for Comprehensive Plan policy EN68: “Utilize and require zero impact development strategies in all new public and private developments, including use of permeable road surface materials, solar energy designs, and green roofs in order to protect wetlands, minimize groundwater runoff, and enhance the natural environment, including natural drainage systems.” She said many new technologies have emerged in the past few years that protect, enhance, and in some cases, restore the natural environment. She felt Shoreline could be a model city in this regard and urged the City to consider zero-impact strategies.

Council then began its review of the items on the “G” list.

**#7 (LU 6) and #10 (LU8)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendations. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion.**

Councilmembers Fimia and Ransom supported retaining the language of the existing policies rather than the Planning Commission recommendation to delete them. They contended that although these policies are referenced elsewhere, they should also be included in the Comprehensive Plan for clarity and ease of use. After further discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

**Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to retain the existing language for both items. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#26 (LU11)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion.**

**Councilmember Ransom moved an amendment to change the word “encourage” to “provide.” Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion.**

Mr. Stewart noted that the City’s role is to encourage and regulate a variety of housing opportunities and appropriate infrastructure, not necessarily to provide such housing and infrastructure.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which failed 3 – 3, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia and Ransom voting in the affirmative.**

**There was Council consensus to add any items that failed on a tie vote to a list of items for later discussion.**

**#27 (LU23)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#38 (LU34)— Councilmember Ransom moved that the language be changed to the following: “Clustering shall have densities consistent with the underlying zone**

# DRAFT

**unless impacts to surrounding uses can be fully mitigated and substantial public benefits can be achieved. Cluster densities shall not exceed the underlying zone densities by over 25%.” Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion.**

There was brief discussion and some Councilmembers concluded that policies related to clustering are already included in LU33.

Mr. Stewart clarified that this policy is not related to cottage housing density bonuses. Councilmember Ransom agreed to withdraw the motion, noting his intent to propose amendments to that policy at a later time.

**Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#84 (EPF2)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 1, with Deputy Mayor Jepsen dissenting.**

**#88 (EPF6)—Councilmember Fimia moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation with the additional bullet “design of facility to have as small a footprint as feasible.” Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia contended that if the City wants to move in the direction of minimal impact or zero impact development, the size of a building footprint is a major consideration.

Mr. Stewart felt it could be overly burdensome to operate under the constraint of designing a facility for the smallest possible footprint. He felt it could have other negative impacts in the community in terms of view preservation and other related issues. He said minimizing the footprint should be one of many considerations, but it should not be the dominant policy.

Mr. Burkett emphasized the importance of maintaining balance and flexibility in the policy. He pointed out that the ideal layout for City Hall is a two-story structure encompassing approximately 53,000 square feet. He said although it could be constructed as a five-story structure with a very small footprint, this design would not be as efficient or convenient for customers.

After further discussion, Deputy Mayor Jepsen suggested adding the word “footprints” to bullet number four. **Councilmember Fimia reworded her motion to that effect. A vote was taken on the wording in bullet four “Improvements to limit impacts to environmental health (e.g., footprints, noise quality...)”, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#91 (EPF9), #92 (EPF10), and #101 (EPF19)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendations. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion.** Mr. Stewart clarified for Council that although EPF9 and EPF10 are

# DRAFT

April 4, 2005

recommended for deletion, they are included in LU67 and LU68. **A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 6 - 0.**

**#120 (EN14)—Councilmember Ransom moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion.**

Mayor Hansen expressed mixed feelings about retaining this policy. He felt that the phrase relating to slope elevation changes of 20 feet or less could be problematic for some developments.

Councilmember Fimia asked about the difference between the terms “elevation change of 20 feet or less” and “40 degree slope.”

Mr. Stewart said the problem with “elevation change of 20 feet or less” is that it only applies one coordinate for measurement. Therefore, if applied literally, virtually everything would be covered by this definition. He said this policy is redundant and covered in policy EN15.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which failed 1 – 5, with Councilmember Ransom voting in the affirmative.**

**Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

Councilmember Fimia wished to discuss #110, which had been acted upon previously and the Planning Commission recommendation adopted. Mayor Hansen received concurrence on a general policy that each Councilmember would have the prerogative of bringing back no more than five items already acted upon for further discussion. Councilmember Gustafson said staff should be given an opportunity to consider these items before the discussion.

**#127 (EN68)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#196 (H8)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that this item was already acted upon when it was merged with H7 and previously adopted. He moved to accept the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#211 (LU27)—Councilmember Ransom moved to add language so the policy reads: “Allow cottage housing in medium density R-8 to R-12 residential areas” and delete “six dwelling units per acre and up.” Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.**

There was considerable discussion of the cottage housing moratorium and whether any policies should be changed at this time.

# DRAFT

Councilmember Gustafson felt it would be premature to make a decision on cottage housing during the moratorium and before the Planning Commission, Council, and the public have had a chance to weigh in.

Mr. Stewart said staff is doing additional research and the Planning Commission intends to conduct a workshop to discuss specific issues that have been identified for further review. He said if the Planning Commission and Council choose to reduce or eliminate the density bonus for cottage housing in one or more residential zones, it would essentially eliminate the incentive for developing cottage housing.

Mayor Hansen wondered if simplifying the wording to state "allow cottage housing in medium density areas of eight dwelling units per acre and up..." would satisfy Councilmember Ransom's intent.

Councilmember Ransom said he proposed the specific wording because the definition for medium density is R-8 to R-12. He felt it is important to be consistent with the definition for medium density.

Councilmember Gustafson reiterated the importance of hearing what the community and the Planning Commission have to say on the subject before taking any action.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen concurred. He noted the possibility that the Planning Commission and the public could recommend that cottage housing remain in low-density zones but with significant design review process. He asked what the current cottage housing allowance is now.

Mr. Stewart said in R-4 or R-6 zones a conditional use permit is required for cottage housing, which includes neighborhood notification and opportunity for appeal. In R-8 zones and above, it is permitted as matter of right if development conditions are met. Depending on the size of the unit, current regulations allow up to double the density. Over 90 percent of the single family area in Shoreline is designated R-4 and R-6, or low density.

Councilmember Fimia wondered how the City has permitted cottage housing in R-4 zones when the current Comprehensive Plan only allows it in areas zoned for six dwelling units per acre and up.

Mr. Stewart said the first set of regulations developed through an extensive community process resulted in allowing cottage housing under a CUP in R-4 and R-6 zones.

Councilmember Fimia pointed out that the Council might not have the opportunity to change the cottage housing policy for another year. In the meantime, the moratorium will expire and there might not be a mechanism for making a change to the policy.



# DRAFT

Deputy Mayor Jepsen felt the Comprehensive Plan policy should not reference a zoning designation because these are included in the Development Code.

Councilmember Fimia felt it should include a zoning designation because the Comprehensive Plan provides predictability to the public and policy direction to the Development Code. She felt to be safe, the policy should state medium-density zoning, and the Council could make additional changes next year in response to the public process if necessary.

Mayor Hansen noted that the Comprehensive Plan is policy direction, not a regulation. He said nothing in the current policy prohibits cottage housing in R-4 zones.

Councilmember Ransom noted that many neighbors have been requesting this change, and Council's action would be a good response to show it is sensitive to their concerns. He said the Shoreline Village is a good example of what can be accomplished in terms of medium density housing in Shoreline. He urged the Council to be sensitive to neighbors' concerns and not postpone this action.

Responding to Councilmember Chang, Mr. Stewart said if the cottage housing issues are not resolved before August (the time that the current moratorium expires), staff would recommend an extension of the moratorium to complete the process.

Mayor Hansen felt the cottage housing issues would be addressed more effectively through the moratorium rather than the Comprehensive Plan update.

Councilmember Gustafson emphasized that the purpose of the moratorium was to allow for a public input process before the Council makes a final decision. He maintained that the Council should allow that process to proceed before it makes a decision.

Councilmember Fimia suggested that compromise language could be added to the policy to acknowledge the current public process to avoid the impression that the Council has made a final decision.

Mayor Hansen felt that people generally understand that there is a public process and that the Council has not made a decision.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which failed 3 – 3, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia and Ransom voting in the affirmative. This item was placed on the list of items for further discussion.**

**#252 (T7)—Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Deputy Mayor Jepsen and carried 6 – 0, the Planning Commission recommendation was adopted.**

**#263 (T21)—After Councilmember Gustafson withdrew his motion to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation, he moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 4 – 1, with Mayor**

# DRAFT

**Hansen dissenting. (Deputy Mayor Jepsen stepped away from the Council table for a minute at 8:53 p.m. but returned for the next vote)**

**#264 (T22)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 0. (Councilmember Gustafson stepped away from the Council table for a minute at 8:54 p.m. but returned for the next vote).**

**#277 (T30)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.**

Mr. Stewart wanted assurance that this does not preclude the “payment in lieu of” option for the sidewalk requirement.

Mayor Hansen noted that these requirements are already included in the development regulations. Mr. Stewart affirmed that frontage improvements are required as part of the GMA and Shoreline’s Development Code.

**Upon Deputy Mayor Jepsen’s suggestion, Councilmember Fimia accepted the friendly amendment to add “or payment in lieu of.” A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 5 – 1, with Mayor Hansen dissenting.**

**#315 (T55)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to retain the existing language, adding at the end “and where feasible use SEPA to provide traffic mitigation for systemwide impacts.” Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia had questions regarding whether impact fees and SEPA mitigation can both be imposed and whether it is accurate to talk about SEPA “where feasible.”

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, explained the differences in the use of impact fees and SEPA mitigation. He agreed that a reference to “where feasible” is not preferred legal language in the context of SEPA.

Councilmember Fimia wondered how both impact fees and SEPA mitigation would affect developers. She wondered how the policy could be written to ensure it is reasonable and not overly burdensome.

Mr. Burkett noted that impact fees would not be imposed unless they are identified as part of the City’s financial policies.

Mayor Hansen felt that the feasibility condition provides the necessary protection to the City and developers.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which failed 1 – 5, with Mayor Hansen voting in the affirmative.**

# DRAFT

**Councilmember Ransom moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which was then withdrawn. This item was placed on the list of items for further discussion to allow staff time to research Councilmember Fimia's questions.**

**#332 (Tx), #333 (T69), #334 (T70), #335 (T71) and #336 (T72)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain existing language for these items. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion, which passed 5 – 1, with Mayor Hansen dissenting.**

**#337 (T73)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#359 (U13) and #361 (U14)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved the Planning Commission recommendations. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#366 (U20)—Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Councilmember Ransom and carried 6 – 0, the existing language was retained.**

**#367 (U21)—Councilmember Ransom moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 1, with Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.**

**#368 (U22)—Upon motion by Councilmember Fimia, seconded by Councilmember Gustafson and unanimously carried, the existing language was retained.**

**#369 (U23)—Councilmember Ransom moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Ransom felt the existing policy should be retained for long-range planning purposes. He felt the City might have a need to consider alternative solid waste facilities in the next 20 years.

Mr. Stewart noted that this policy is addressed in the Essential Public Facilities section of the Land Use Element. He also noted that the solid waste transfer station would not likely go through additional upgrades in the planning period.

**The motion failed on a vote of 3 – 3, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia and Ransom voting in the affirmative. The item was placed on the list of items needing further discussion.**

**#373 (Ue)—Councilmember Fimia moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation changing the word “encourage” to “require” in each policy. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion. Councilmember Fimia felt the word “encourage” does not effectively enforce the actions of utility providers regarding tree preservation.**

# DRAFT

Mr. Stewart commented on the potential legal dilemma of changing the policy in this way.

Mr. Olander noted that City requirements of utility providers are usually addressed through franchise agreements.

Councilmember Ransom asked for a legal opinion from the City Attorney.

Mr. Sievers commented that “require” might be too excessive. He recommended the wording “negotiate and condition where feasible” instead of either “encourage” or “require.” **Councilmembers Fimia and Chang agreed to this suggestion. A vote was taken on the motion as amended, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#374 (U27)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia pointed out that the policy does not address financial feasibility. She commented on the high expense of underground utilities.

Mayor Hansen noted that undergrounding utilities in Shoreline has been a Council goal from the beginning of the City.

**Councilmember Ransom moved to substitute the language “negotiate and condition where feasible” for “promote.” Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which failed on a 3 – 3 vote, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia and Ransom voting in the affirmative. Deputy Mayor Jepsen suggested adding the words “and financially” after physically so that the policy reads: “Promote the undergrounding of existing electric distribution lines where physically and financially feasible.” The motion carried 6 – 0.**

**#381 (U34, 35)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#456 (CF12)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Fimia spoke against deleting this policy, as the Planning Commission recommends. She pointed out that the existing policy provides further priority direction for capital facilities improvements.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 5 – 1, with Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.**

**#457 (CF13)—Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

# DRAFT

**#450 (CF4), #451 (CF8), #452 (CF9), #453 (CF10), #454 (CF10.1), and #455 (CF11)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which failed 3 – 3, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia and Ransom voting in the affirmative. These items were added to the list of items for further consideration.**

**#458 (CF14), #459 (CF15), #460 (CF15.1), and #461 (CF16)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendations. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion, which carried 4 – 2, with Councilmembers Fimia and Ransom dissenting.**

**#466 (CF17), #467 (CF18), #468 (CF19), #469 (CF20) and #470 (CF21)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendations. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion.** Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Stewart noted that these items are recommended for deletion because they are already addressed in Items 461, 462, 463, 464, which are new policies that Council already adopted. **A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

**#480 (CF30)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion, which carried 6 – 0.**

Councilmember Fimia asked that policy CFA be added to the list of items for further review.

**#481 (CF32)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 4 – 2, with Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.**

## MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to extend the meeting to 10:10 p.m. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**#482 (CF33)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 1, with Councilmember Ransom dissenting.**

**#483 (CF34)—Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 1, with Councilmember Ransom dissenting.**

**#485 (CF)—Councilmember Fimia moved to retain the existing language. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.**

# DRAFT

Councilmember Fimia felt the City should retain the recommended level of service standards for the police in the Comprehensive Plan, noting that it has served the City well up to now and it helps direct the City's contracts and funding.

Mr. Burkett felt this issue is more appropriately addressed as part of the annual budget. He noted that the number of police officers is probably the most significant issue for the annual budget.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen felt the emphasis should be on overall level of service rather than specifying a recommended number of police officers per thousand residents.

Mr. Stewart said the Planning Commission recommends deletion of this policy because it is a contracted service for which the City can negotiate on a service/performance basis. He noted that level of police service is not a requirement of the GMA.

Councilmember Ransom noted that although these recommended indices are included in the police contract, having them in the Comprehensive Plan helps provide guidance to the contract. He said the data in the annual budget has not always been consistent, so including it here will help maintain the general guidelines.

Mayor Hansen said he is more interested in the overall quality of service than in specifying the number of police officers per thousand residents. He felt that actual service levels and public input should determine the recommended level of service rather than the Comprehensive Plan.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 4 – 2, with Mayor Hansen and Deputy Mayor Jepsen dissenting.**

## MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:10 p.m. Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting to 10:20 p.m. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**#487 (CFI)—Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, seconded by Councilmember Gustafson and carried 6 – 0, the Planning Commission recommendation was adopted.**

**#514 (ED15)—Upon motion by Councilmember Fimia, seconded by Councilmember Chang and unanimously carried, the existing language was retained.**

## 7. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:13 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk