

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, January 10, 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 Martin Luther King Jr. Day

Mayor Hansen presented the proclamation to teens from Shoreline and Shorecrest High School, members of the City's Teen Program, Empowering Youth Everywhere, and Rob Beem, Human Services Manager. Various teens spoke about the meaning and impact of Martin Luther King Jr.'s legacy. Waldo Nambo-Ojeda commented on the City's teen program and how it teaches teens to become leaders in their community.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Steve Burkett, City Manager, thanked the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services department for their efforts to develop community leaders. He then described the City's efforts to address the snowfall in areas of the City.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that Sound Transit would conduct a public hearing on January 13 regarding a supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: none

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

# DRAFT

January 10, 2005

(a) David Townsend, Shoreline, encouraged members of the audience to continue their efforts to bring important issues to the attention of the City Council. He asserted that he and his deceased daughter have been personally attacked by the City of Shoreline. He said his attempts to educate the City Council on various issues have “fallen on deaf ears,” but he has continued in his process of healing and training in the field of traffic engineering.

(b) Madison Batt, Lake Forest Park – testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

(c) Rick Stephens, Shoreline, provided background on his interactions with Mr. Burkett regarding collaboration on economic development strategies between the City and the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce Economic Development Committee. He said Mr. Burkett did not follow Council direction to continue working with the Chamber, but instead signed a contract with Forward Shoreline. He found this disturbing because Forward Shoreline is a new business group that has a board of directors but no official members. He felt it is clear that the Chamber of Commerce has been left out of the planning meetings. He said the Chamber simply opposes the City’s capital development plans and has asked for modifications. He said the City Manager has not been forthright with businesses and that he needs to learn to communicate.

(d) Robert Finney, Shoreline - testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

(e) Peter Thomsen, Shoreline - testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

(f) Pat Crawford, Shoreline - testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

(g) Tim Crawford, Shoreline - testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

(h) Brian Dimak, Lake Forest Park - testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

(i) George Walker, Shoreline - testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

(j) Fran Lilleness, Seattle - testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

(k) Doug Terrel, Lake Forest Park - testimony is described under Item 8(a), Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

# DRAFT

## 6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Gustafson moved to add item 9(b), Motion to adopt 2005 Legislative Priorities, to the consent calendar. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Councilmember Ransom asked that consent calendar item 7(e), City Manager's contract amendment, be made new Action Item 9(b). He then moved to approve the agenda as amended. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion and the amended agenda was unanimously approved.**

## 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved approval of the consent calendar as amended. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 7-0, and the following consent calendar items were approved:**

**Minutes of Dinner Meeting of December 13, 2004**

**Approval of expenses and payroll for the period ending December 27, 2004 in the amount of \$3,275,964.50**

**Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with the Shoreline Historical Museum in the amount of \$61,979 to provide educational and cultural services programs for Shoreline citizens**

**Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Arts Council in the amount of \$61,979 to provide educational and cultural opportunities for Shoreline citizens**

**Motion to approve the 2005 Legislative Priorities**

Responding to Mr. Crawford's comment recorded later in the minutes regarding Council e-mail, Councilmember Fimia clarified that there was no difference in how the Council was receiving e-mail, just a perceived difference in how it was happening. She said there are still some issues that need to be resolved regarding e-mail addressed to the entire Council. She suggested that comments regarding the parks master plan be included on Agenda Item 8(a).

## 8. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (a) Public hearing continued from December 13, 2004 to hear citizens' comments on the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update and the Transportation, Surface Water, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plans

January 10, 2005

Mayor Hansen opened the continued public hearing.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, briefly reviewed the background on this item.

(a) Madison Batt, Lake Forest Park, urged the Council to adopt the Parks Master Plan proposal to keep field maintenance a number one priority at Shoreline A and B fields and Twin Ponds Park. He pointed out that many soccer fields should be upgraded with new turf. He described the adverse impacts to both participants and equipment of playing soccer on dirt fields. He noted that the soccer program will be serving over 10,000 people over the next 20 years.

(b) Robert Finney, Shoreline, also urged the Council to keep field maintenance a priority at Shoreline Park and Twin Ponds Park. He said as a coach, referee and commissioner of the Hillwood Soccer Club, he understands the importance of good field conditions and how it relates to player safety, sportsmanship, and enjoyment of the game. He said field maintenance has been a concern for many players, noting that Twin Ponds Park is known in soccer circles as "Tri-Lakes Park." He said the field is flooded in the winter and too dry in the summer.

(c) Peter Thomsen, Shoreline, concurred with the previous speaker and described the many positive effects that organized sports have on youth, including friendship-building and bonding. He pointed out that field turf makes for a much safer field, which will result in fewer injuries and increased enjoyment of sports. He said tax dollars are an investment in safety.

(d) Pat Crawford, Shoreline, said that although sports can have positive outcomes on youth, Twin Ponds Park should not be used as a soccer field if conditions do not warrant it. (On another topic, she said the City has won on a technicality regarding development on the Aegis south site, and it is the City's fault that the building is being constructed even further into the stream buffer. She said there is no water detention on the project, that impervious surface is being added, and that things are being altered beyond what can reasonably be mitigated. She asserted that Pevely Pond has been drained, and it is the Council's responsibility to follow up on what it approved to ensure that the conditions of the special use permit are met. On a third topic, she urged people to read the book *Secrets and Lies*, noting that Forward Shoreline is an example of granting power to a hand-picked group in order to dismantle a citizens' campaign.)

(e) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, noted that the soccer field at Twin Ponds Park is partially located within a stream buffer. He noted that any upgrades made to the field would require a State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) process, and that he would legally challenge any attempt to install impervious surface in the buffer. (On another topic, he asked the Council to clarify whether e-mail correspondence was now being distributed to Councilmembers equally. He recalled that some Councilmembers mentioned they were not receiving City e-mail in a timely manner.)

# DRAFT

(f) Brian Dimak, Lake Forest Park, outlined his soccer coaching experience and urged the Council to maintain the goals for improving Shoreline sports fields. He said team sports are an important element in the positive development of youth, and upgrading fields will add to the safety and overall enjoyment of youth sports. He commented on the negative effects of substandard field conditions. He noted that some fields no longer drain in the winter, and that overly dry conditions in the summer months can cause respiratory problems among participants.

(g) George Walker, Shoreline, expressed concerned about the draft proposal to develop the Innis Arden Reserve M into a City Park. He provided background on several development proposals for this area, all of which were either rejected or withdrawn because of the area's environmental and ecological fragility. He said this completely undeveloped bluff area should be preserved as a greenbelt, and that developing here would endanger the entire area and undermine the principle of having a greenbelt. Developing this area would also expose the City to significant liability risk relating to the Burlington Northern Railroad and fire hazards, and would require increased law enforcement.

(h) Fran Lilleness, Seattle, expressed support for developing the Innis Arden Reserve M area into luxury estates in order to increase the City's revenue base. She said the revenues generated from such a development could be used to build more play areas for children living between Aurora Avenue and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW. She said Innis Arden has 54 acres of inert natural greenbelts and it does not need more natural parks.

(i) Doug Terrel, Lake Forest Park, described his lengthy soccer coaching experience and urged the Council to work with soccer groups on funding solutions for field maintenance. He said his group is willing to contribute funding to maintain soccer fields if the City develops an organized plan. He pointed out that Shoreline loses many players to other soccer programs because they have better fields.

(j) Janet Way, Shoreline, speaking on behalf of the Sno-King Environmental Council, Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, and Paramount Park Neighborhood Group, noted that the draft plan "waters down" many goals and policies by replacing the word "shall" with "encourage," "strive," "should," and "support." She also spoke against the use of the phrase "where practicable." She said the Comprehensive Plan is required to comply with countywide planning policies, the Growth Management Act (GMA), and the State Environmental Policies Act (SEPA), but the plan contains no analysis of this compliance. She said the City should be required to provide an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Comprehensive Plan. She believed that citizens find the documents comparing the proposed plan with the existing one to be misleading and cumbersome, noting that the original plan was reformatted so that it is not recognizable to citizens who worked on it originally. She urged the Council to spend more time refining the document, noting that it will not comply with state and federal requirements in its proposed form. She also said there is no analysis of compliance with the non-point discharge elimination system (NPDES) and policies regarding critical areas.

(k) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, pointed out that 57% of the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) budget is based on grant funding, which she felt was too high and speculative. She expressed alarm at the number, scope, and cost of projects outlined in the proposed Comprehensive Plan and master plans. She said grant funding is a very risky undertaking and is dependent upon many factors, including the amount of funds available, an agency's priorities, and the number of competitors. She asked if the City has previously received grant funding from the sources listed on pages 204-205 of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan, noting that this information should be part of the public record. She said the City is not financially responsible or fiscally restrained, and that taxpayer money is being spent recklessly.

(l) Alan Sharrah, Frank Lumber the Door Store director of operations and owner of USA Karate in Shoreline, asserted that the Comprehensive Plan is really a Shoreline "tax increase plan." He commented on the improbability of acquiring the grant funds to support all the projects outlined in the plan. He said the City will be committed to raising taxes to pay for the plan, since the CIP cannot be accomplished without additional funding and the GMA requires a fully-funded CIP for urban services. He pointed out that the surface water management fee for 2005 is 8.88%, and is scheduled to increase 32% in the next six years. He noted that people living on fixed incomes cannot afford such increases. He said the City is committed to tax increases at the federal and state level in an attempt to capture more money, so if the CIP cannot be funded, the Council must support additional taxes in Olympia. He urged the City to take advantage of existing facilities and services, and not to overtax citizens and business owners and put the City in debt.

(m) Kristin Ellison Oslin, Fircrest RHC chaplain, noted that the demographic analysis of the Parks Master Plan uses median household income (\$51,658) but it does not consider those who earn less than \$50,000. She questioned how the City could serve a population that is not even mentioned in the plan. She said those who do not contribute substantially to the tax base are "some of the most noble, spiritual, powerful personalities" she knows. She spoke favorably of the facilities and residents of Fircrest RHC, noting that it Fircrest RHC is worth preserving but is not even mentioned in the City's Comprehensive Plan.

(n) Vicky Westburg, Shoreline, pointed out that trees are the single most important factor in flood control and water quality, but the word "tree" does not appear in the official language of the surface Water Master Plan. She suspected that the forest management plans for Twin Ponds Park and Hamlin Park are actually "timber-cutting" plans. She explained that the 17-acre forest south of Shorecrest is the largest coniferous forest in the area and contributes enormously to water quality and flood control in the Thornton Creek watershed. On another topic, she noted that Fircrest RHC could function as a multi-use center for the City. She said rather than integrate Fircrest residents into the community, the community could be integrated into Fircrest. She felt this would create a superior multi-use facility for the entire community while maintaining vital services to the community's most vulnerable citizens.

# DRAFT

(o) Leah Matasich, Shoreline, questioned the proposal to replace the term “policies” with “requirements” in Item # 104 of the Comprehensive Plan Review Matrices. She noted that a requirement is a rule, whereas a policy is something you hope to do. She also questioned the changes to Item #130, Goal EN, III, which replaces “provide” with “sustain” and “sustain” with “maintain.” She also questioned the deletion of the word “conditional.” She also spoke against Item #148, EN 53, which suggests that off-site mitigation may be better for critical areas protection in some cases. She felt that one should not be allowed to damage a wetland and then provide mitigation in another area.

(p) Chris Eggen, Shoreline, noted that the executive board of the 32<sup>nd</sup> District Democrats recently evaluated the draft Comprehensive Plan and prepared several technical comments that will assist the City in creating a good policy. He felt the process of staff making preliminary changes and then allowing citizen comments to be included or not included inherently gives priority to technical concerns and bypasses citizen participation. He urged the Council to approach similar tasks in the future by creating a citizen advisory board that would make initial recommendations. He said very little of the Comprehensive Plan is aimed at enhancing services for the disabled. He also preferred more emphasis on retention of low-income housing in Shoreline.

(q) Darlene Howe, Shoreline, questioned why the City is proposing to vacate Ronald Place North before the Central Subarea Plan even has a chance to be adopted. She noted that the red brick road at Ronald Place is nearly 100 years old and has significant historical value to the community. She said the King County Office of Cultural Resources identified Ronald Place as one of five potential candidates for the national register of historic places. She said citizens want the brick road preserved, and didn't want it “commemorated in a tiny brick place somewhere.” She urged the Council to consider this historic landmark and not to disregard the subarea process.

(r) Ken Howe, Shoreline, expressed concern that citizen input does not seem to be equally considered in the City. He pointed out that a petition with over 200 signatures was submitted to the City Council supporting the historic landmark status of Ronald Place North, but there was no follow-up by staff or the Council. He said many citizens participated in the subarea planning process, but the Comprehensive Plan does not seem to address this.

(s) William Monroe, Shoreline, noted that he and other Planning Commission members worked very hard on the original Comprehensive Plan, which was uncomplicated and easy to understand. He said it appears there is a concerted effort to dismantle the original plan in an attempt to promote personal, political and special interest agendas. He favored a more open and transparent process, noting that the plan should include more citizen participation.

(t) Marylyn Hawkins, Shoreline, opposed the change to housing policies H-8 which eliminates the phrase “while maintaining opportunities for public involvement and review.” She emphasized the importance of having an adequate amount of affordable

# DRAFT

housing. She felt that the Comprehensive Plan is replete with incentives for business, developers, and utilities, yet there are no incentives offered to the very households that permit the City to meet its affordable housing targets. She said as the density in neighborhoods increases, public confidence and acceptance must be nurtured and maintained. She said the City is creating the very circumstances that prevent people from keeping up their homes because of the lack of innovative, sustainable incentives.

(u) Virginia Agnew, Shoreline, felt the Surface Water Master Plan takes a very piecemeal approach to the flooding problems in Shoreline. She also felt it does very little for stream habitat enhancement. She said mitigation seldom works, noting that wetlands never return to areas where the stream beds and buffers have been destroyed.

(v) Donn Charnley, Shoreline, described the proposed Comprehensive Plan as “narrow,” “restricted,” and “sporadic,” and “not comprehensive.” He said the City’s storm water management policies are not consistent with State Department of Ecology requirements, and development restrictions within floodways and plains are inconsistent with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). He emphasized the importance of preserving wetlands and trees, noting that they have a “sponge effect” by absorbing excessive quantities of storm water. He said there are several development proposals that threaten to endanger the environment, particularly on the west side of Shoreline. He urged the Council to write a proper Comprehensive Plan.

(w) Bob Barta, Shoreline, paraphrased a letter from Virginia Botham which urged the Council to be fiscally conservative and fund those priorities identified by the public: roads, surface water, sidewalks, parks, and public safety. He cautioned against spending City funds on “grandiose development schemes,” noting that the City has support for safety and modest improvements along Aurora Avenue and North City. He said if present and projected income is spent on the Aurora Corridor and City Hall, the City will fall drastically behind in the income-expense relationship, and the City will be forced to raise taxes or cut basic City services. He urged the Council to live within its means by reprioritizing large items and staying within an affordable budget. Finally, he noted that Item #238 of the matrix seems to change the existing policy of developing safe roadways to reducing four-lane arterials to three.

(x) Bob Chute, Shoreline Water Commissioner, felt that the draft Comprehensive Plan was lacking citizen involvement. He urged the Council to look at the Water Commission’s Comprehensive Plan as an example of a good policy document.

(y) Patricia Webber, Shoreline, identified what she believed to be detrimental changes in the Comprehensive Plan relating to Essential Public Facilities. She said the elimination of the phrases “reduction of sprawl development” and “compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan” imply that suburban sprawl will be approved and adherence to the Comprehensive Plan will be diminished. She noted that in Item #91, EPF9, an entire section relating to Essential Public Facilities is proposed for elimination, and elimination of “should be” from LU68 will make it much weaker. She feared that the elimination of policies EPF10 and EPF11 might allow Fircrest RHC to be developed under “far looser



# DRAFT

restrictions.” She felt the duty of public officials is to hold the very highest vision and not make a moderate public but substantial private short-term profit the highest priority.

(z) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, noted that LU48 recommends distinctive street and urban design in the center part of the Aurora Corridor (N 175<sup>th</sup> to N 185<sup>th</sup>), while the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan recommends mixed-use redevelopment of Midvale Avenue between N 175<sup>th</sup> and N 185<sup>th</sup> Street. However, neither the development at 175<sup>th</sup> nor the one at 185<sup>th</sup> are distinct or mixed-use, which she felt to be “pushing the density requirement into the neighborhoods.” She concurred with previous speakers that the plan should include more directive language such as “shall,” “will” and “should.” Regarding level of service (LOS) standards for roadways, she pointed out that the proposed plan degrades the LOS standard to LOS E, which is a decrease in service quality. She stated that no LOS standard is defined for Aurora N or Ballinger Way NE. She felt these should be specified so there is at least a stated goal. She also felt that sidewalk construction should be included in the Transportation Policy “Safe and Friendly Streets,” noting that the adopted CIP only proposes to build 10 percent of the City’s unmet need in the next ten years.

(aa) Tom Dunnihoo, Shoreline, expressed concern about traffic speeds and volumes on residential streets. He said three different surveys found that over 60% of the traffic on his street is non-resident traffic. The speed regularly exceeds 35 miles per hour. He wondered why the east side of the City has different traffic designations than the rest of the City. He felt that reducing lanes has caused traffic to spill over into residential neighborhoods and the City should be doing something to resolve the problem rather than working on grandiose plans such as City Hall, Aurora Corridor, and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He said he does not want his street becoming an arterial roadway.

(bb) Pat Sumption, Seattle, Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund and member of the King County Board of Conservation Voters, said her organizations strive to elect people to government who care about the environment. She recommended that the Council consider the advice of its “biggest resource,” citizens who speak on environmental issues. She expressed disappointment with the quality of the Comprehensive Plan update, noting that the Council should direct staff to make revisions with the intent to protect the environment. She urged the Council to consider the comments and testimony submitted by the Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund. She said most organizations conclude that the City’s EN3 policy of “maintaining existing indigenous fish and wildlife populations” does not go far enough, and that the City needs to start over again and write policies that protect its valuable natural resources.

(cc) Eileen Dunnihoo, Shoreline, expressed concern about the lack of pedestrian safety on her neighborhood street. She suggested that the City build sidewalks to address the pedestrian safety hazard on 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE at NE 178<sup>th</sup> Street. She suggested that the City adopt more proactive policies regarding traffic and roads. She felt that transportation policy T27 weakens the City’s ability to provide safe walkways for children. She also felt that policies T9 through T58 should retain the language that is recommended for elimination.

# DRAFT

(dd) Elaine Phelps, Shoreline, commented that the Comprehensive Plan update is not a “plan” since it leaves too much room for staff interpretation. She said it should include more absolute language so there is no doubt about the City’s environmental policies or the need to preserve environmentally sensitive areas. She said the City is obligated to protect the natural environment, which does not mean “protect it if you can.” She said the plan’s duty is to ensure that developers follow all environmental regulations. Staff’s job is to implement the plan to ensure that developers conform to environmental policy.

(ee) David Fagerstrom, Shoreline, liked the Comprehensive Plan matrix but stressed the importance of accuracy and public involvement. He noted that other jurisdictions have been penalized for not complying with GMA requirements related to public notice. He emphasized the need to achieve growth and revenue targets while balancing the interests of business and average citizens. He urged the Council to retain standards for quality, especially regarding the recent cottage housing moratorium. He said quality housing does not necessarily require expensive materials. He also suggested that the City have the full involvement of the public in both the development of cottage housing policies, and in the permitting process. He urged the Council to consider revising the plan to include more specific language and to consider other modes besides cottage housing. He commented on the lack of affordable housing in the region, stating that no city is meeting its targets on affordable housing.

## MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to extend the meeting until 11:00 p.m. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

(ff) Rick Stephens, Shoreline Merchants Association, said that Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) accident statistics indicate that capacity and safety on Aurora Avenue are not jeopardized by the current road geometrics. He said overall safety will be reduced and neighborhood traffic will increase by eliminating two-way left turn lanes. He also commented on the conflict between “green time” on east-west arterials versus Aurora Avenue. He said the increasing east-west demand for “green time” continues at the expense of decreasing “green time” for north-south Aurora Avenue, which is now noticeable at N 175<sup>th</sup> Street and N 185<sup>th</sup> Street, where traffic backups are much longer. He felt that \$30 million spent on a one-mile section of Aurora Avenue from 145<sup>th</sup> to 165<sup>th</sup> will not produce the capacity or safety improvements to justify the cost. He also said that raised medians will be economically detrimental to adjacent businesses, and that the design will not significantly reduce accidents or improve service levels. He said Aurora Avenue has never been in the top 77 of high accident traffic corridors, and that traffic accidents have been decreasing consistently in the last four years. He argued against spending so much money on sidewalks along Aurora Avenue when there is a demand for sidewalks near schools. He urged the Council to think of the needs of the entire community.

# DRAFT

(gg) Larry Owens, Shoreline, emphasized the need to include policies relating to energy conservation and renewable energy in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that many cities and townships have been addressing this and are adding sections in their comprehensive plans to incorporate provisions for responsible energy practices and the use of renewable energy sources. He provided various examples of how other jurisdictions are promoting energy conservation in site planning, landscaping, and structural design. He felt the Council should be proactive and recognize and incorporate specific policies and plans to encourage and increase the use of solar energy.

(hh) Maria Walsh, Mountlake Terrace, expressed concern about the level of service her developmentally disabled child would receive if Fircrest RHC becomes part of the City of Shoreline. She noted that Fircrest includes all the amenities and facilities to be self-supporting campus. She warned that the City's costs for police, fire, and other emergency services would inevitably increase if Fircrest is administered by the City. She urged the Council to consider this when updating the Comprehensive Plan.

(ii) Walt Hagen, Shoreline, noted that he and several other citizens put a lot of time and effort in creating the first Comprehensive Plan, which was easy to understand. However, he felt no one is able to understand the new draft due to the change in format and the many additions and deletions that are proposed. He also felt that the new version is confusing because specific, clarifying language has been suggested for removal. He did not feel the City was following the required process for amending the plan, noting that he wrote 120 amendments for the original Comprehensive Plan that had to go through a much more extensive review process. He said staff has mismanaged the hours the Council has assigned to them and have spent time making changes instead of considering those elements that support the citizens' vision for Shoreline.

(jj) Bill Blaylock, Shoreline, said the conceptual plan for the Innis Arden Reserve M property was developed without regard to environmental impacts or the cost of mitigation. He said the site has steep unstable slopes and extensive wetlands, and development would likely result in significant adverse impacts to residents of the adjoining property. He opposed the proposal to develop beach access across the railroad, noting that a pedestrian bridge already exists at Richmond Beach Saltwater Park. He said the residential neighborhood is not designed to accommodate significant levels of street parking, and some streets are not readily accessible by emergency vehicles. He felt this area should not be made more accessible to the public, since there is already a problem with illegal activity. He said this property is one of the few remaining, wooded tracts along the Puget Sound that offers a distinct alternative to the park experience at Richmond Beach. He urged the Council to recognize its value as such and not include this development proposal in the Parks Master Plan.

(kk) Pat Crawford, Shoreline, speaking on behalf of Twin Ponds Fish Friends, said the Surface Water Master Plan does not comply with storm water requirements and priority species habitat. She said although the plan mentions water quality numerous times, it fails to address storm water quantities. She said the plan totally ignores storm flow quantities, and is not in coordination with the Washington State Department of Fish

# DRAFT

and Wildlife or the Department of Ecology. She said the City is using an outdated storm water manual and using storm water fees to pay staff, the City Manager, City Attorney, and City Council. She said the proposed plan is “not a plan for the people,” noting that Planning Commission workshops were held during the day when working people were not able to attend. She concluded that there was no public input process, noting that the matrix did not include an analysis of comments from the public.

(ll) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, described his involvement in the first iteration of Shoreline’s Comprehensive Plan. He emphasized the importance of establishing “neighborhood subarea plans,” and urged the Council not to radically change the existing plan. He felt the Council should take more time examining the issues and not approve the proposed plan. He pointed out that the zoning for Fircrest is still an unresolved issue that should be addressed in this plan. He advised the Council to implement “interim development controls” to delay detrimental development until a formal plan can be established.

(mm) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, asserted that City staff asked the Council not to provide protections to pedestrians, to “ruin the environment,” and to build a City Hall instead of sidewalks. He also implicated City staff in the death of David Townsend’s daughter.

Mr. Crawford was ruled out of order because of the nature of his comments. He left the podium.

## RECESS AND ADJOURNMENT

At 10:30 p.m. Mayor Hansen declared a five minute recess. Deputy Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Gustafson left the room. At 10:31 p.m. Councilmember Grace moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

## 10. ADJOURNMENT: 10:31 p.m.

The following items were not addressed:

- 8(b) Public hearing to consider citizens’ comments on the purchase of the Echo Lake property for the City Hall site
- 9(a) Review of the Gambling Tax Rate
- 9(b) Motion to authorize the Mayor to execute modifications to the City Manager’s Employment Agreement

---

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk