

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL  
SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, May 16, 2005  
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Deputy Mayor Jepsen

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Hansen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Hansen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Deputy Mayor Jepsen.

**Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Councilmember Grace and unanimously carried 5-0 (Councilmember Ransom arrived shortly after the vote), Deputy Mayor Jepsen was excused.**

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Steve Burkett reported on the "Shoreline Live '05" show presented by the Creative Arts for Life program. He recognized the efforts of Jill Rogers, Bonnie McMahon, Aaron King, Bill Bettinger, and Megan McMahon in putting together this outstanding production. He also reported on: 1) the success of the Clean Sweep Recycling event; 2) the community forum on cottage housing; 3) the grand opening of the newly remodeled Spartan Gym Phase II; 4) the Tip-a-Cop event at Spiro's on Thursday; and 5) the groundbreaking ceremony for the North City project to be held on Saturday.

Mr. Burkett then responded in detail to the issues raised by Councilmember Fimia last week regarding what information was available to the City Council during the North City deliberations. He distributed a copy of the goals for the North City Subarea Plan, pointing out that they focus on slowing traffic and creating a safer pedestrian-oriented corridor. He noted that traffic calming may be required on adjacent residential streets if road narrowing may reduce volumes and potentially redirect traffic. He explained that all internal staff memos are not typically distributed to the Council, and that the documents Councilmember Fimia provided are not the only studies that were conducted. He said the

memo from the Interim Public Works Director contained a fairly significant traffic projection error, and that the Council approved the North City project after reviewing the specific details and weighing all the issues. He said recent traffic reports indicate that the streets are performing as projected, and there is funding to mitigate any future problems if conditions change.

Councilmembers Grace and Gustafson commented on the success of the Shorewood High School Jazz Band at the Essentially Ellington jazz competition in New York City.

Councilmember Ransom emphasized the need to provide the Councilmembers with all relevant information on City projects, including Aurora Avenue, so they can make informed decisions. He said he did not see the INCA report when the Council deliberated on the North City project.

Councilmember Gustafson felt it was appropriate for the City Manager to “weed out” the material that is appropriate for the Council to see, noting that the Council does not have the time to read voluminous materials. He noted that staff has to make decisions based on the accuracy of information received. He felt the Council made the correct decision on the three-lane configuration after reviewing all the facts and comments, noting that the vote on the North City project was unanimous. He was disappointed that Councilmember Fimia did not provide the Council with adequate notice of this issue.

Councilmember Chang agreed that the Council should be provided with all relevant information in order to make wise decisions. He said the Interim Public Works Director’s report was “suppressed,” and that voters and taxpayers deserve credible and accountable leadership. He suggested that the Interim Public Works Director’s employment was terminated because of his recommendation on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mayor Hansen said the Interim Director was a temporary employee and that his replacement had already been hired. He said he was aware of the INCA report and that initially he was the only major opponent of the three-lane configuration. However, the three-lane configurations on NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street have worked out very well. He said the Council debated this issue at length, made its decision, and now it is time to move on.

Mr. Burkett noted that Mr. Maronek, the Interim Public Works Director, was actually a contract employee who worked while Shoreline was recruiting for a permanent director. He said he asked Mr. Maronek to look at the City’s major projects with a critical eye, as he did with another consulting engineer he hired under contract. He said this illustrates that staff members do not have a monolithic point of view. He disagreed with Councilmember Chang’s characterization that the memo was “suppressed,” since there are a number of memos that Council does not receive. He said he has no doubt that the Councilmembers who voted on this over the past five years were fully informed when they made their decisions.

Councilmember Fimia recommended that Council put time on its agenda in order to resolve this issue, which is “putting a cloud over a lot of other projects and relationships and level of trust.” She said the INCA study, which suggests substantial negative impacts to the capacity of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, was a major study and a critical piece of information that should have been provided to the Council. She said the study concluded that a reduction from four travel lanes to two travel lanes would have substantial impacts to the capacity of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue by the year 2015, and that excess traffic volume will be diverted onto residential streets. She read from the Metro Transit letter, which recommended against the three-lane configuration because it may increase the risk of pedestrian-automobile collisions.

Mr. Burkett said the Metro and City of Seattle letters were shared with the Council. The conclusion was that there was more concern about Shoreline streets and neighborhoods than with the opinion of Metro or Seattle.

Councilmember Fimia said the letters relate to pedestrian safety, and they were not shared with her when the North City issue came up. She asked for answers to the following questions:

- 1) Which Councilmembers were given access to the INCA study?
- 2) Who approved the scope for the INCA study?
- 3) How much did the INCA study cost?
- 4) Who approved the scope for the second KPG study?
- 5) What was the cost of the second KPG study?
- 6) What happened to the plan to widen 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue to five lanes from NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street to NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street? Why did this plan change, and was the Council and public informed of the change?
- 7) If reducing to three lanes through the North City area was going to cause so much potential traffic projections by 2015, how does reducing to three lanes for the whole corridor not make it worse?
- 8) Why did the KPG study shown there would be less impact to neighborhoods?

Councilmember Ransom questioned whether the vote on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE was unanimous, noting that he recalled some dissention on it. He said his other concern is the fact that the whole Council does not seem to be getting the same meeting materials.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS: none

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Stuart Turner, Shoreline Water District Manager, clarified that SWD jointly purchased the South Woods property with the Shoreline School District in 1997. At that time the plan was to partition the parcel, but this has not happened. Both districts have deemed the property as surplus, and it was initially thought it would be easier to dispose of the property as a single parcel than as two separate parcels. He said there is no deadline for selling the property, and SWD must follow a very strict legal process to

May 16, 2005

dispose of it. He said the district can deal with local governments and agencies, but it must be careful to protect the interests of its customers, who live not only in Shoreline but also in Lake Forest Park. He said the SWD is willing to work with City, community, neighbors and customers to come up with a solution that meets everyone's needs.

(b) John Rohrback, speaking on behalf of the Student Action for the Environment (SAFE) club at Shorecrest High School, urged the Council to preserve the South Woods property as an environmental "lab" and educational resource. He described the property as a very rare, 80-year-old second growth forest that could be used to potentially recreate Shorecrest's environmental science class. He noted that other classes use the property, including the cross country team and the English department. He said his group has been circulating petitions and has collected well over 300 signatures in support of preserving the property. Several other students stood at the podium to support his comments.

(c) Gretchen Atkinson, Shoreline, stated that the 16,500 Shoreline property tax payers, along with Lake Forest Park property owners, have already paid for the South Woods through property taxes allocated to the water district and school district. If the property is given away, the districts will have to make up that funding with additional bond funds or increased water rates. She said the group asking to have the property donated has not considered who has already paid for that property. She said if the property is sold at a fair value, both the school district and the water district could use those funds to reduce rates or decrease the amount of a proposed school district levy.

(d) Alan Sharrah, speaking on behalf of Frank Lumber the Door Store, commented on the perception that not all the information came forward on the North City traffic lane issue. He said while City staff works hard and does a good job, they are not the decision-makers in the City. He said it troubling to citizens to find out that information is being screened by senior staff. He said citizens do not trust the City Council to make correct decisions if they are not given all the information. He said the process is broken and the community needs to work together to fix it. He suggested that staff bring forth all the information, regardless of whether or not staff can provide a positive recommendation on a given issue.

(e) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, spoke in support of preserving the South Woods property on behalf of the South Woods Preservation Group (SWPG). She noted that while there are conflicting aims and desires in the community, the South Woods property will be gone forever if it is sold for development. She said preserving the land not only enhances the watershed, but it provides needed oxygen and positively impacts the entire ecosystem. She commended the Parks Director for writing a grant request for the property and urged the Council to seriously consider purchasing "one of the last remaining open spaces."

(f) Todd Linton, speaking on behalf of the Hillwood Soccer Club and Shorelake Soccer Club, urged the Council to consider their proposal to provide soccer turf for Shoreline Athletic Fields A and B. He said his organizations are willing to

May 16, 2005

provide seed money to get the project started, and they have identified a source that will allow them to finance the remainder over a ten-year span. He said this project is a matter of pride for the community because Shoreline Fields A & B are the Seattle Youth Soccer Association's (SYSA) designated fields.

(g) Brian Bodenbach, Woodinville, said that while the South Woods property only represents a small portion of the 1,200 acres of the Thornton Creek Watershed, it is a very valuable part in terms of water capacity. He said as a landscape contractor, he has found that building large infrastructure elements to deal with surface water and other things are very costly in terms of construction and maintenance. Seattle has recently gone back to low impact development practices and natural solutions to surface water runoff, noting that Shoreline would be better off in the long run with a more natural approach to environmental problems. He said it is very expensive and sometimes impossible to reverse the effects when the total amount of impervious surface is exceeded in a given watershed. He urged the City to keep these factors in mind when considering the purchase of the South Woods property.

(h) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, pointed out that the South Woods property was not available when the City planners put together the priorities for the Parks Master Plan. She illustrated the fact that priorities must often shift in response to changing circumstances. She clarified that she brought forward the zoning designation of "urban forest" at the January 18 meeting and identified the importance of the South Woods property at that time. She said the property should be considered a priority because of its many environmental benefits. She said the Council must preserve this property if the City wants to preserve birds and wildlife habitat for the next 100 years.

(i) Janet Way, Shoreline, commended the Shorecrest SAFE club for their interest in advocating for the South Woods property. She said the City can "hit a home run" by following through on exploring ways to acquire this property in conjunction with the school and water districts. She noted that this issue is in stark contrast to other controversial issues such as North City. She clarified that the SWPG is not asking that the property be donated, but it is talking about finding ways for the City to acquire the property as part of a public-private partnership.

(j) Elaine Phelps, Shoreline, concurred with previous speakers in support of purchasing the South Woods, noting that as Shoreline's population increases, so will the need for open space. She said the goal should be to put density in areas that are already built, not to replace open space with density. She also commented on the importance of preserving the 80-year-old, second-growth forest. On another topic, she commented that the Mayor should not interrupt other Councilmembers or lose his temper, since he is responsible for setting the tone of the meeting.

Councilmember Gustafson emphasized the need for the school district to be involved in the South Woods issue if the property is to be maintained as an environmental classroom. He felt the students should discuss the proposal with the school board and science departments.

**6. WORKSHOP ITEMS****(a) First Quarter Financial Report**

Debbie Tarry, Finance provided the first quarter financial report for the City's main operating funds: General Fund; Street Fund; and Surface Water Fund. She said the other City funds do not have enough revenue or expenditure activity to warrant discussion at this time. Ms. Tarry's report included the following points:

- Actual first quarter expenditures were \$3,902,167, \$232,732 or 5.63% below projections of \$4,134,899. At this time 2005 projected expenditures have not been revised, so more actual expenditure data is needed before an accurate spending outlook can be developed.
- First quarter 2005 actual revenue collections were \$578,746, \$29,192 or 5.31% above projected first quarter revenue of \$549,554, due to better than expected right-of-way fee revenue, investment interest income and a small increase in fuel tax revenue.
- Actual first quarter expenditures were \$454,857, \$104,570 or 18.69% below projected expenditures of \$559,427. This is due to a delay in King County billing for street work and salary savings from vacant positions.
- First quarter 2005 actual revenue collections were \$136,561, \$13,489 or 11% above projected first quarter revenue of \$123,072. This increase is due to slightly higher than expected storm drainage collections.
- Actual first quarter expenditures were \$455,017, \$36,947 or 7.51% below projected expenditures of \$491,964.

Mayor Hansen thanked Ms. Tarry for the comprehensive report.

**(b) Motorized Scooter and Transportation Regulation**

Flannary Collins, Assistant City Attorney, reviewed briefly that Council discussed the issue of motorized scooter regulations last fall and had decided to wait and see whether the state legislature would address the matter. Since it did not, staff has returned to seek Council direction. She noted that there have been few complaints about scooters in the past six months. On a related issue, Ms. Collins pointed out that Shoreline does not have a helmet law for bicyclists, although the King County Public Health Code has a bicycle helmet law.

Bernard Seeger, Management Analyst, commented on the input from the Youth Council and the Empowering Youth Everywhere (EYE) group. He summarized that the youth groups wanted to differentiate between electric scooters and gas-powered scooters, and in general they wanted fewer restrictions on motor scooter use. He compared the six 911 calls received in the past six months with the 20 calls received in the months of June, July, and August.

Councilmember Fimia said while she is not in favor of banning scooters, because they are a viable mode of transportation, Shoreline needs regulations to ensure that people operate them safely and do not create a public nuisance. She felt that licensing of motor scooters would aid the enforcement effort. She wondered if jurisdictions have the authority to ban gas-powered scooters.

Ms. Collins said the City cannot require licenses because licensing of motor vehicles is a function of the State.

Councilmember Grace commented on the unsafe scooter use he witnessed in his neighborhood where two young people were riding together at high speed. He felt it would be preferable to have adopted regulations rather than waiting until there is an injury or death. He felt an ordinance addressing age, mufflers, and helmet use could be put together fairly easily using other jurisdiction's ordinances.

Councilmember Gustafson asked about the difference between motor scooters and "pocket bikes."

Mr. Seeger said that staff focused on motor scooters because pocket bikes fit the definition of a motorcycle, which are covered by state licensing regulations.

Councilmember Gustafson gave examples from several states around the country that have adopted a variety of motor scooter regulations. Some cities have banned them outright, whereas others have adopted regulations related to operator age, time of day, and helmet use. He said he agrees with restricting motor scooter use to daylight hours and to streets with posted speed limits of 30 miles per hour or less.

Councilmember Chang agreed with Councilmember Grace's sentiments and emphasized that scooter riders should not be able to take passengers. He also stressed that parents should ensure that their children wear helmets.

Councilmember Ransom expressed support for a municipal ordinance and said he would be willing to consider the electric versus gas-powered scooters arguments. He noted that motorcycles are licensed by the state because they have vehicle identification numbers and mini-motorcycles do not. He asked if it is possible for a mini-motorcycle to receive a motorcycle license.

Mr. Seeger responded affirmatively, noting that mini-motorcycle manufacturers are starting to produce vehicles with VINs. He said this is different from his initial research.

Councilmember Fimia emphasized that any regulations that are adopted should include reasonable and appropriate parameters. She felt it might be reasonable to allow scooter use on the Interurban Trail at night if vehicles are equipped with lights. She wondered about the feasibility of banning gas-powered scooters and whether or not the City could require mufflers or other noise reduction measures.

May 16, 2005

Ms. Collins noted that state law prohibits the use of motor scooters on trails built with federal funds.

Mr. Seeger noted that many communities have not succeeded in banning scooter use, but they have succeeded in regulating them.

Councilmember Gustafson felt that an ordinance should include an operator education aspect and possibly a parental education component. He also wished to get input from the Teen Council before an ordinance is adopted.

Mayor Hansen noted that the City of Lynnwood uses fines and confiscation to strictly enforce its motor scooter regulations. He felt that strict regulation practically amounts to a ban in many situations. He speculated that the situation Councilmember Grace described could have been addressed through local police enforcement.

There was Council consensus to direct staff to prepare a local ordinance to regulate certain aspects of scooter use. Mr. Burkett said staff will bring back an ordinance with various options.

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

Prior to beginning this item, Mayor Hansen received Council concurrence to reserve ten minutes at the end of the meeting to discuss Councilmember Ransom's memo and request regarding travel for himself and Councilmember Chang.

1. Motion to accept the transportation components of the draft Capital Facilities Element dated April 7, 2005

Noting that this is the eighteenth meeting on the Comprehensive Plan, Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, reminded Council that a motion was postponed from last week to accept the transportation components on the draft Capital Facilities Element dated April 7, 2005. He clarified that the Council could update the 20-year plan annually, although the state mandates a comprehensive update every 7 or 10 years.

Paul Haines, Public Works Director, and Jill Marilley, City Engineer, responded to Council questions. Mr. Haines clarified that accepting the transportation components of the Capital Facilities Element includes the entire list of project priorities, both pedestrian and non-pedestrian alike. However, the plan indicates that Priority Level 1A is the only component with a reasonable revenue source.

Councilmember Chang inquired about the projected expense of \$1.7 million for the 2011-2024 timeframe for 175<sup>th</sup> Street NE and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He wondered if this could be included in the current North City project.

Ms. Marilley said projections show the City would need to do an improvement at that intersection to accommodate traffic traveling to and from Interstate 5. She said the current North City project will more than accommodate moving traffic at the current volumes, but the \$1.7 million project is a study to determine an exact solution to accommodate future growth at this intersection.

Noting that the City plans to spend \$90 million of its total \$130 million in the first six years of the plan, Councilmember Chang asked if the early expenditure might jeopardize the City's ability to get grants for major projects in the last 14 years.

Mr. Haines did not feel it would jeopardize the City's ability to compete for grants because it reflects the fact that grant projections are fairly conservative.

Councilmember Chang speculated that underground utility costs for the Aurora Corridor Phase 2 and North City projects could reach \$30-40 million, and that Shoreline ratepayers would ultimately have to pay for them. He questioned whether the Aurora project would truly enhance the business atmosphere in light of the increased tax rates that everyone will be paying. He also noted that no other city is spending more than \$15 million per mile on the Highway 99 improvements. He felt the project could be done for much less and the savings could be used for other priorities such as field turf or open space acquisition.

Mr. Haines noted that the City will have a good idea about how much a mile of Aurora will cost after the bids come in. He noted that there are several components to track and that all Aurora corridor projects are not the same. Shoreline's project includes the sub-projects of the bridges and undergrounding.

Mr. Burkett concurred, noting that costs for Aurora Corridor Phase 2 is only an estimate. He said Council could decide to reduce the scope to save money, but the important issue is that grant funding is projected at 85-90% of the total project costs. The savings achieved from a reduced scope could not be used for field turf or open space acquisition because it is dedicated transportation funding.

Councilmember Ransom speculated on the high costs for underground utilities on Aurora Avenue based on cost projections for 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Ms. Marilley noted the difficulty of comparing Aurora Avenue to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. She said Aurora Avenue does not have the same issues and limitations that North City has.

Councilmember Fimia commented that the bulk of the money for 20 years is tied up in a few major road projects at the expense of many other priorities. She noted that \$82 million worth of pedestrian and safety improvements are not addressed in the proposed plan. She agreed with Councilmember Chang that the Aurora Corridor plan should be scaled down so there is adequate funding for sidewalks throughout the City. She said

although nothing precludes the City from proposing a bond issue, people would be far more likely to vote for a bond if they see the City spending money wisely.

Councilmember Gustafson asked about the rationale for dropping N 160<sup>th</sup> Street and Greenwood Avenue N down to Priority Level 1B. He felt that the congestion and traffic problems qualify this intersection as a high priority and wished to ensure that it stays one.

Mr. Haines said the community college has an obligation to mitigate the impacts of future development. He said the City anticipates that the school would fund any major improvements there when it redevelops.

Councilmember Grace noted that the short-term plan does not reflect the emphasis on safe streets/sidewalks that the Council had discussed at its retreat. He asked for staff assistance to trying to make this a higher priority in the next five years. He pointed out that City money is only a small proportion of the bulk of the funds for Aurora Corridor Phase 2.

Mr. Burkett said staff is working on a proposal for the current six-year CIP to address Councilmember Grace's concern about sidewalks. He said the ways to find funding include: 1) changing priorities and taking funding from another project; 2) acquiring or assuming grant funding in the 20-year plan; or 3) proposing a bond issue or some other kind of public funding.

Mr. Haines said the need for pedestrian/non-motorized projects has been captured in the plan, but it is really a matter of finding the revenue that meets the desired level of sidewalk/pathway construction.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern that the plan includes a very aggressive schedule for completion of the Aurora Corridor. He questioned the City's ability to acquire the necessary grant funding for Phase 2 and asked what would happen if sufficient grants are not acquired. He speculated that the project might be delayed for a number of years under such a scenario.

Mr. Stewart explained that if probable funding runs short of existing or future needs, the plan would require an update to balance projects with expected revenues. He said the City is obligated to reassess its plan every year as part of the Growth Management Act.

Mr. Haines noted that staff is cautiously optimistic about the available resources, and most agencies consider Highway 99 a high priority in the region. From a strategic standpoint, the City has a certain amount of federal funds that must be spent by a certain time or theoretically they will become unavailable. He said the City has enough federal money to build portions of the next two miles, but if continuing the project is in question, it could be completed in smaller segments.

# DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom was reluctant to approve a 20-year plan that does not address sidewalk needs near schools and neighborhoods. Mr. Burkett pointed out that the funded plan includes several million dollars for sidewalk improvements.

Mr. Haines emphasized that there is still much work to do, but the Capital Facilities Element provides a flexible framework for identifying and funding the various priorities. He said specific neighborhood priorities will be further refined through the Neighborhood Traffic Action Plan process. He felt the plan should be viewed as a list of priority interests, noting that this is the first time it has been created in a 20-year format.

Mr. Burkett noted that staff is operating on the assumption that Aurora Corridor Phase II will be built with 80-90% grant funding. Therefore, if funding falls short, the project would most likely be delayed. He clarified that staff is not going to recommend a bond issue or other local funding in order to rebuild a state highway.

Mr. Haines said the purpose tonight is to determine if Council is comfortable with the priorities and the amount projected for reasonable funding sources. He said Council could ask for a more aggressive plan in terms of outside resources, but the plan assumes all the City's resources in the numbers. He said the projects listed in the document, whether funded or not, are essentially a statement of the City's interest in building them over the next 20 years.

Mr. Burkett noted that sidewalk projects make up about 50% of the non-Aurora related projects in the 20-year plan (approximately \$20 million over 20 years). He said if the Council wishes to make sidewalks a higher priority, then it could increase funding amounts and assume the City will aggressively pursue a corresponding amount in grant funding.

Councilmember Fimia pointed out that the focus on the Aurora corridor probably precludes the City from acquiring grant funds for other arterials. She said the \$14 million for pedestrian projects does not occur until 2011-2024, and these projects might never occur due to cost overruns on projects slated to happen in the first six years. She felt the Council should direct staff to return with more options, since the biggest priorities for citizens are sidewalks, traffic reduction, and surface water. She also felt that money is being transferred from surface water in order to complete roads projects. She used the Dayton Avenue/Westminster intersection as an example of why the plan needs more work, since a City gateway might have to be torn out in order to reconfigure the intersection. She then asked for answers to the following questions:

- How many trips are being taken in Shoreline under one mile?
- Of the 26 miles of arterial streets that lack sidewalks, how many miles are constructed in the next 10 years if the plan passes as is?
- How many miles of sidewalk are in the school walkway program, and how many are constructed in the next 10 years if the plan passes as is?
- What is a reasonable amount of councilmanic bonds the Council could approve, as opposed to exploring a voter-approved bond?

# DRAFT

She noted that if the City can provide more pedestrian and bicycle access, it will reduce the number of trips in the City, which will ultimately relieve congestion and allow more growth. This means committing to more sidewalks throughout the City.

Councilmember Grace said he would appreciate it if Councilmember Fimia could have provided those questions to staff prior to the meeting so Council could have a more productive discussion.

Councilmember Fimia said the Council has expressed interest in making sidewalks a higher priority, but it keeps getting the same alternatives from staff.

Mayor Hansen said he suggested a street program patterned after the Auburn program. IT would dedicate a portion of the property tax to sidewalks. Councilmember Fimia noted the Mayor has not provided any kind of written proposal on this issue.

Mr. Burkett advised that Council could propose a revenue line for a property tax program or other proposal and then allocate it for sidewalks. He reiterated that the Council can reallocate funding by changing the priority levels or by exploring options for creating additional funding.

Mr. Haines estimated that it would take a significant amount of time to compile and analyze the data requested by Councilmember Fimia.

Councilmember Gustafson supported moving forward with the Planning Commission recommendation, noting that this is the City's first 20-year plan. He emphasized that the plan can be changed anytime, and there will always be time to consider sidewalks and pathways.

**Councilmember Ransom moved to amend the Capital Facilities Element to allocate an additional \$5 million for neighborhood sidewalks around elementary school areas and to subtract this amount from the Aurora Phase II funding. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 4-2, with Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.**

Responding to Mr. Burkett and Councilmember Gustafson, Councilmember Fimia clarified that the intent is to pursue all options, including additional grant funding, reducing the scope of existing projects, and councilmanic bonds.

**A vote was taken on the motion to accept the transportation components of the Capital Facilities Element dated April 7, 2005 as amended, which carried 4-2, with Councilmembers Chang and Fimia dissenting.**

2. Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan  
\*South Woods Property and field turf for Fields A and B

Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, reviewed the draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) plan. He described the extensive public involvement process of determining community needs and the work conducted by the various stakeholders involved. The process included interviews, focus groups, surveys, community open houses, and meetings of the Parks Board and the Planning Commission. Mr. Deal then outlined the following plan goals:

- Assess current and future needs
- Develop an inventory of facilities and programs
- Identify service gaps
- Prepare lifecycle costs to maintain existing facilities
- Identify existing levels of service
- Establish target levels of service
- Develop a 20-year list of facility improvements
- Ensure plan is consistent with other local, county, and state documents

Continuing, Mr. Deal described the “recreation program pyramid,” which prioritizes the various recreation programs in terms of the amount of community benefits and individual benefits they provide. He pointed out that the pool provides a high level of community benefit, whereas diving lessons provide a high level of individual benefit. He said the goal of the recreation program is to have majority of programs at the bottom of the pyramid. He concluded his presentation by highlighting the capital funding recommendations for the PROS plan.

Mr. Burkett summarized that the plan includes \$34 million in Priority 1A projects that are funded with projected revenues over the next 20 years. The amount of unfunded priorities total \$41 million.

**Councilmember Gustafson moved to accept the Parks and General Capital component of the draft Capital Facilities Element dated April 7, 2005. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Grace asked about the process for moving items such as the South Woods property or field turf to Priority level 1A. He also asked about the \$1.6 million for athletic field restoration and wondered if it could be used in conjunction with the funding proposed by the soccer clubs.

Mr. Burkett said the Council could simply move items to Priority 1A and then include additional projected revenue lines from grants and/or bonds. Using open space acquisition as an example, he noted that Echo Lake lakefront access and Hamlin Park are the only two items that have a reasonable revenue source.

Mr. Deal explained that the \$1.6 million for athletic fields is to replace the soil fields with synthetic infill material.

May 16, 2005

Councilmember Chang asked for clarification about the \$2 million estimated cost for the South Woods property as noted on the list of Suggested Property Purchases.

Mr. Burkett said the \$2 million estimate is derived from a larger amount that would be provided through partnerships and other funding sources such as grants and/or bonds.

After further discussion on the feasibility of changing priorities, **Councilmember Chang moved to change the revenue available line (page 36 of the Capital Facilities Element) to assume new grants and/or other sources, including debt, to \$3.6 million, in order to raise the South Woods property and field turf for Fields A and B to Priority Level 1A. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.**

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Deal provided additional information on three potential acquisition opportunities: 1) Hamlin Park (property at north end of Fircrest – parking); 2) Paramount Open Space (adjacent land); and 3) Richmond Beach Saltwater Park (property between park and conservancy).

There was Council consensus to continue this discussion next week.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 9:55 p.m. Councilmember Gustafson moved to extend the meeting to 10:10 p.m. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

NEW ITEM

- (a) Travel for Councilmembers Ransom and Chang

Councilmember Ransom reviewed his memo to the Council describing his request to the City Manger that he and Councilmember Chang be funded to attend a National League of Cities Conference on budgeting in Henderson, Nevada. He said that the City Manager denied his request and had not addressed Councilmember Chang's request. He asked the Council to provide direction to the City Manager to authorize this travel request.

Mr. Burkett clarified that he did not deny the request, but he was not comfortable approving a trip that was not budgeted. He said while there are surplus funds due to the fact that some Councilmembers have not attended certain conferences, the Council should adopt a policy addressing this issue.

Councilmember Ransom noted that this particular conference would take the place of the budgeted Association of Washington Cities conference that he and Councilmember Chang usually attend in August.

Councilmembers Grace and Fimia supported the request. Councilmember Grace felt that such travel requests should be approved as long as there is money in the budget.

May 16, 2005

Councilmember Fimia felt that budget issues should be referred immediately to the City Council rather than the City Manager.

Councilmember Gustafson questioned the necessity of this trip since similar workshops are often available through the Association of Washington Cities and National League of Cities.

Mayor Hansen felt the City Manager was correct in referring the matter to the Council instead of approving an unbudgeted item.

**Councilmember Ransom moved that Council approve the trip request made by himself and Councilmember Chang in an amount not to exceed \$1,600. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.**

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

---

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk