

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Monday, April 7, 2008 6:30 p.m.
Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ryu, Deputy Mayor Scott, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember McGlashan, and Councilmember Way.

ABSENT: Councilmember Hansen.

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 6:30 p.m. the meeting was called to order by Mayor Ryu, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Ryu led the flag salute. Upon roll call by Ronald Moore, Deputy City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Councilmember Hansen. Mr. Olander reported that Councilmember Hansen would not be attending the meeting.

Deputy Mayor Scott moved to excuse Councilmember Hansen. Councilmember Eggen seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

(a) Proclamation of National Library Week

Mayor Ryu read the proclamation and presented it to Judy Weathers, Managing Librarian for the Richmond Beach and Shoreline Libraries. Ms. Weathers thanked the Council and the attendees for the proclamation.

(b) Recognition of Outgoing Library Board Members

Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, presented a plaque to Yoshiko Saheki and Jane Hinton for their service on the Library Board. Ms. Saheki thanked the City and the attendees for the plaque and encouraged people to visit the City's libraries.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Bob Olander, City Manager, reported on various events taking place in the City of Shoreline. He announced that the City of Shoreline and the Shoreline Fire Department will be holding a three-week Community Emergency Response Team (C.E.R.T.) Training on April 15. He noted that there is a Community Capital Development workshop called "*Go Figure: A Class for Financing*

Your Business” on April 18. Finally, he reported that the City has selected Dan Pingrey as the new Police Chief.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Way asked about a Council of Neighborhoods workshop featuring Jim Deere. Mr. Olander replied that there was a workshop on April 26 regarding asset-based community development. Councilmember Way reported that she attended the first meeting of the Lake Ballinger Basin group.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Les Nelson, Shoreline, discussed public notification concerning developments and stated that sometimes notices are not listed in the newspaper. He said Channel 21 was out for the past two weekends and there are some major items that would be interesting to people. He said there are SEPA reviews coming up on April 18 and a discussion meeting on April 17. He added that it is important for people to get the documents to prepare their documents.

Mr. Olander responded that the power has been out at City Hall for a while and the programming for Channel 21 this weekend was affected.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) City Council and Planning Commission Work Plan

Mr. Olander suggested the Planning Commission open their meeting.

Vice Chair Will Hall called the Planning Commission to order. He noted that several members would arrive at about 7:30 p.m. Commissioners present included Vice Chair Will Hall, Commissioner Broili, Commissioner Behrens, and Commissioner Piro.

Mr. Olander announced that Planning and Development Services Director Joe Tovar has an injury that precludes his attendance tonight. He suggested the Council hear the Lake Ballinger Basin item first until more Planning Commission members arrive.

(b) Lake Ballinger Basin

Mark Relph, Public Works Director handed out a map of the Lake Ballinger Basin area and discussed the issues on the map. He discussed the December flooding issue and stated that water quality and flows have been an issue in the area for a while. He reviewed the history of the Lake and what has occurred at the site over the past 36 years. He noted that Lake Forest Park has come to the table to discuss the issue and that Shoreline has taken a “back seat” recently because the area is outside of City limits. He discussed the specifics of the map and where the boundaries are for the basin and creeks in the area, noting that there are minor maintenance problems at McAleer Creek. He said the statistics are presented in Attachment A concerning the area, inflow,

outflows, and depth. He stated that the City staff suggests the Council adopt a resolution for the City to join with the local jurisdictions to promote the stewardship of the Echo Lake/Lake Ballinger/McAleer Creek Basin area.

Mr. Olander stated that the City has been working with other jurisdictions and this will provide not only direction to staff but also notice to the other jurisdictions that the City wants to begin the process. He stated that an interlocal agreement between the City and other jurisdictions will be the next step and it would be brought back to another meeting on the Consent Calendar.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Bill Bear, Shoreline, stated that Lake Ballinger represents a major watershed in the area and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, and Council have stated it is not significant. He stated that it is clear that if one tree is taken out it isn't significant. However, if it is done over and over again it becomes significant. The flooding and loss of salmon has resulted in having a significant impact, and the Council and Planning Commission need to understand the cumulative effect.

b) Bettelinn Brown, Shoreline, stated that there needs to be more awareness of the Lake Ballinger area. She said she has attended the Neighborhood Council meetings and it is hard for the residents in the Ballinger area to attend the meetings because there is no strong association and the area is divided by Ballinger Way. Therefore, she felt the Council should give them some support in dealing with their specific and unique problems.

c) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, stated that Tony Angel began to clean up McAleer Creek about 40 years ago and she suggested the City utilize him as a resource. She also noted that Mimi Bolander who was a founder of the Lake Forest Park Stewardship Foundation and Roger Lotion, former Mayor of Lake Forest Park can help, too. She said they are very knowledgeable of McAleer Creek and the area.

Councilmember Eggen stated that the City will be complying with more stringent runoff regulations and asked to know if there would be changes in the way the City does business.

Mr. Relph stated that they have been discussed for decades and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will begin to implement more stringent regulations in 2013. He said in the near future, quantity will be looked at, but not necessary the quality of the storm water.

Councilmember Way commented that she is very pleased that the City is considering this resolution. She discussed the watershed east of Meridian Avenue and an impact will be made because the City will enhance the headwaters. She stated that Lyon and McAleer Creek meet and make a "mess" for the people that live below when there are heavy rains. She suggested that the Council add Lyon Creek to the resolution and asked if there was some funding in the state budget that was acquired by Representative Marko Liias.

Mr. Relph said he would research the funding. He added that he is trying to communicate with the Public Works Director in Lake Forest Park about a characterization report they are doing concerning the Lyon Creek Basin.

Mr. Olander stated the cities involved will depend on what the boundaries are for Lyon Creek.

Councilmember Way stated that she was at a meeting with the five cities and four State Representatives and Lyon Creek was to be a part of the upcoming legislation. Mr. Relph responded that he thought the same thing; that is why he has to confirm with Lake Forest Park about this characterization report he has heard about.

Deputy Mayor Scott favored crafting a proposed resolution. He agreed with Councilmember Way and stated the staff can look at Lyon Creek.

Councilmember Eggen commented that all five cities have a similar resolution and he recalled that our city is the only one to add Lyon Creek to this. He supported the resolution as it is and to add Lyon Creek if it is easy to do.

Mayor Ryu questioned if Lyon Creek can be added without any additional funding.

Mr. Olander responded that some priorities need to be put into place by the Council if Lyon Creek is to be added. He mentioned that the City is currently working on the Ronald Bog Drainage Basin, Boeing Creek Drainage Basin, Lake Ballinger, and maybe Lyon Creek will be a fourth area to work on. He said the City will know more when a scope of work is developed, but Shoreline is a minority in this so expect minimal funding.

Mayor Ryu favored adopting the resolution and possibly adding Lyon Creek to it.

Councilmember Way stated that there are other important drainage sheds from the northeast because there are deep slope and sedimentation issues. She also mentioned that it is important for the City to work on this because it will come up on Phase III of the Aurora Avenue Project. She noted that Senator Cantwell lived on the Lake Ballinger Basin.

Mr. Olander summarized that the City staff will move forward and research adding Lyon Creek.

(a) City Council and Planning Commission Work Plan

Commissioner Kuboi took a second roll call of the Planning Commission and all Commissioners were present.

Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, introduced this item. He announced that there are five major items for discussion. There was a brief review of the overall work program of the Planning Commission. He discussed each item the Commission would be working on in 2008, including implementing the Housing Strategy, the moratorium regulations, the Environmentally Sustainable Community Strategy, and the Fircrest Master Plan.

Commissioner Kuboi stated that the Commission has a lot of work in front of them.

Councilmember Eggen thanked the Planning Commission for the work that they have done. He stated that the work plan is very full and there are some items that are missing. He asked if they are missing because they are too minor to include. He mentioned the low impact development standards and its requirements in certain areas. He also said there should be a requirement for recycling in multifamily housing, and some work on parking in North City depending on later discussions. He also said the Council discussed the Comprehensive Plan versus a development "vision" pertaining to where certain developments could be located, which would require a public hearing.

Councilmember Way said she is anxious to hear from the Planning Commission. She is concerned about noticing issues and would like to see impact fees addressed. She also said the subarea committee report should be communicated to the public by the Commission and it will be interesting to hear what the public says about that. She applauded the staff for including the design review and tree canopy impacts in the work plan. She is concerned about the quasi-judicial rezones going to the hearing examiner and wanted to discuss it.

Mr. Cohn affirmed for Councilmember McGlashan that the Southeast Subarea Plan doesn't include the Shoreline Community College Master Plan.

Mayor Ryu thanked the Planning Commission for their work and discussed the general status of the City to include transportation, economic development, the housing strategy, the sustainability strategy, and all of the work being done by the Commission and the City Staff. She added that she appreciated the Ridgcrest work and highlighted that public participation in the process was necessary. She felt there needs to be a "visioning" process done in the beginning where the problems are defined.

Mr. Olander stated that a majority of the low impact development standards will come from the Public Works department. However, the design review element can be discussed and be a part of what should be included in the design element. He noted that the big issue is the storm grading standards which the Council will review soon.

Mayor Ryu gave the floor to Commissioner Kuboi.

Commissioner Piro said he is very interested in this visioning process and there are several tie-ins when the design element is discussed. He said it will be a time to discuss visual impacts and what is going on with new development. He added that the subarea discussion will also be a good time to discuss this topic. He noted that the Growth Management Act mandates that the City do a complete Comprehensive Plan review by 2011 and he felt the City is really at a good time to begin the multi-year process.

Commissioner Pyle agreed with Councilmember Eggen's comments on things that can be added to the work plan. He said some of the things are included already such as sustainability and recycling. He said parking, noticing, and impact fees are a part of the Development Code and if there are noticing issues, the Development Code will need to be enhanced. He solicited

suggestions on impact fee. He felt the stormwater manual should not address low impact development standards because that belongs in the Development Code.

Chair Kuboi summarized that the Planning Commission wants to work on the visioning process and not remove anything from the work plan. He then yielded the meeting back to the Mayor.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Bill Bear, Shoreline, commented that he didn't hear any response to the cumulative impact question he posed and wants developers to fix their mistakes. He said the code fails to determine or define cumulative impacts and how they are measured. He added that subarea plans should include resident comment and those comments shouldn't be ignored. Although he wasn't present for all the Ridgecrest discussions, he said he knows that the residents don't want a six-story building. He felt the citizens are being ignored and they know what is best for them, not the Council and the Commission. He is concerned about allowing a hearing examiner to decide what is best for the community.

b) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, said he is fighting the community business and residential business transitioning and he wants people to read the Comprehensive Plan to recruit citizens to get involved in the process. He noted that hundreds of people attended meetings concerning the Ridgecrest process and at the end of the process there were more people at the meetings from other neighborhoods. He felt citizens are being "snowed" on these issues and asked for a simpler staff report so residents can understand the issues. He asked that the Council and Planning Commission slow down.

c) Les Nelson, Shoreline, agreed with the previous speakers, noting that he is also confused by the definitions. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan doesn't discuss how the subareas relate and that they don't act individually. He suggested the subarea plans be defined in the Comprehensive Plan with an explanation on how to implement each of the plans so there is some coordination between them. He said this should be done in accordance with state law. He said the Growth Management Act is all about using a Comprehensive Plan and following it. He added that the SEPA schedule is missing from the work plan and all the comments should be in by April 18.

d) Gary Batch, Shoreline, said he wants to see some design coordination instead of the City being an orphan of King County. He felt the City needs to put together tasteful developments.

Commissioner Kaje stated that as a new Commissioner he has spent a lot of time looking at the Comprehensive Plan and the Code. He suggested that the Planning Commission look at the Comprehensive Plan first and understand what parts have not been implemented. He said this is a very important first step.

Commissioner Behrens commented that public input is critical and the more people that get involved, the better the ideas will be. He said Mr. Bear's comments were well taken and said there needs to be encouragement to the residents that their ideas and comments are important.

The subarea plans need to have a planned process, otherwise there will be a ton of collected information with no determination on what is important. He noted that the information needs to be accumulated and evaluated or this will fail. Commissioner Kuboi passed the gavel to Mayor Ryu.

Councilmember Way addressed Mr. Bear's comments on cumulative impacts and said that there is not a defined place in the Code for it. She added that there needs to be a starting point and measures need to be put into place so the impacts can be monitored and included with the permitting process. She asked for suggestions from the City staff on how this can be accomplished.

Commissioner Broili commented that cumulative impacts are real and the Planning Commission is looking at code development. He added that if they are successful in bringing forth code amendments, many of Mr. Bear's issues will be addressed.

Commission Piro added that he had a meeting with the Parks Board to discuss the sustainability strategy, which he said will be a great opportunity to address cumulative impacts.

Councilmember Eggen asked what the City does about cumulative impacts now.

Mr. Cohn communicated that the City staff did look at it with the Code that is in place right now and mitigations are assessed based on the current Comprehensive Plan. Nonetheless, the SEPA process is intact and it takes into consideration items which weren't analyzed prior to the Comprehensive Plan update.

Mr. Olander added that the discussion needs to be elevated to the net tree canopy per community instead of how many trees get cut. There also should be net carbon goals and water quality parameters, including increases or decreases in the City's water quality. He felt the right direction is being taken, but standards need to be set. He noted that building and development standards need to be addressed because this is a fairly dense community. If current communities aren't rehabilitated there will not be any long term positive affects on the Puget Sound. He noted that there are improvements to water quality, street lighting, and other improvements that will move the City toward rehabilitation.

Deputy Mayor Scott inquired if there was a public education program for homeowners to address stormwater drainage and green building issues.

Mr. Olander responded that the building codes are governed by the State Building Codes Council and the City doesn't have any authority to adopt them. However, if a number of cities were to urge the legislature to move toward adopting green building standards in the building codes there would be more education offered. However, the City does refer residents to King County classes on yard care, recycling, and other topics. He discussed neighborhood yard care groups, noting that the only way to accomplish this is to find inexpensive ways for the City and homeowners to work together.

Councilmember McGlashan asked about rain gardens. Mr. Olander discussed having rainwater drainage going into gardens or into lawns to save water and add filtration.

Commissioner Kuboi opened the next item on the Planning Commission work plan and said subarea plans are used to clarify, apply and implement existing Comprehensive Plan policies.

Vice Chair Hall stated that there is a lot of value in subarea plans. He added, however, that there are some larger citywide issues. He said parking, upper floor stepbacks or transitioning, traffic, greenspaces, and waterways could be issues that can be addressed in subarea plans.

Commissioner Piro agreed with Vice Chair Hall and noted that one of the speakers discussed the Growth Management Act and it does have provisions for subarea plans as long as they are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He added that it is specific and detailed at what happens in specific neighborhoods.

Commissioner Broili said the neighborhood councils do have individuals and well-defined neighborhoods. He suggested that there should be subarea plans for each of them. The neighborhood councils are not being used to their fullest value and they can be with this.

Councilmember Kuboi stated that it is important that the communities know what a subarea plan is and what it isn't. He noted that all four of the current plans are different and the citizens are confused. He also said there needs to be a discussion of what will be the result of the process and what this document will do.

Councilmember Way said the subarea plans should include the parks. She suggested that natural boundaries be considered, to include the roadways. She suggested that Ballinger should be a subarea.

Commissioner Broili warned that the subarea plans are mechanistic and there needs to be a systemic view so they end up being holistic, not microscopic.

Commissioner Behrens noted that there are five areas that you could possibly have one block looked at one way and the next block looked at another way. He stated the areas should be looked at as systems and interrelated. He suggested that there needs to be a consistent approach so that a problem isn't moved from one spot to the next.

Moving on, Commissioner Piro raised the issue of moving quasi-judicial items to the hearing examiner for a period of one year. He stated there was discussion by the Planning Commission and the determination was that the work plan is large. He stated that the Planning Commission is looking at where they could use help and their meetings have been longer and more frequent. He added that the number of quasi-judicial hearings is increasing, and having the hearing examiner decide them would be less of a burden. However, he pointed out that there still would be a public comment process and the larger items could come to the Planning Commission if necessary.

Mr. Cohn stated that the hearing examiner would be looking at the same criteria as the Planning Commission and would be based on the code. Secondly, the hearing examiner would make a

recommendation to the Council. In turn, he explained that the Council would then make the final decision to concur or remand the item back to the hearing examiner for reconsideration.

Mr. Olander explained that the current hearing examiner charges the City about \$2,000 per hearing.

Mr. Cohn confirmed for Council that the fees would be paid by the applicant.

Councilmember McGlashan favored the recommendation.

Councilmember Way stated that she is concerned about this item because the hearing examiner process is more formal and not user-friendly. She was concerned that there is a perception that hearing examiners are biased because they are being paid by the City. She passed out a proposal to reform the hearing examiner process.

Councilmember Eggen stated that he supported the proposal by Councilmember Way and that public comment was confusing when he had a hearing examiner hearing.

Councilmember McGlashan asked that this item be tabled until there is a determination whether Council supports it.

Commissioner Pyle explained the process that is used in his work with other cities, which is similar to Councilmember Way's proposal. He added that there is a professional who puts together a conclusion for the Council and the process goes well.

Commissioner Broili commented that when the Planning Commission handles these quasi-judicial records it is hard for him to separate proposals and the developments relating to them. He agreed with the legislation because it is only for a one year period and the Planning Commission will still be in the loop concerning the hearings.

Commissioner Kaje suggested that the Council give consideration to the financial implications because the code gives strict direction about the fees and this would costly to the residents.

Commissioner Kuboi asked from remarks from the staff on this and wanted to know what the transition would be.

Mr. Cohn explained that the Council would either accept the decision of the hearing examiner or remand the case back to the hearing examiner for further recommendation. He clarified that the Council couldn't modify a decision of the hearing examiner.

Deputy Mayor Scott asked if these would ever be heard by the Planning Commission again if this is approved.

Commissioner Hall responded that he doesn't know the long term answer, but he suggested that the Council determine who they would want to review the criteria. He added that this is a tough

question; however, if this route is taken they would review the decisions and see if the process is working.

Councilmember Way read from the staff report and asked why there are more quasi-judicial rezones coming up.

Mr. Cohn explained they are coming forth because of economics and the generality of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Olander noted that the Comprehensive Plan has general land use regulations that cover broad areas and there is a high density of residential property in Shoreline. Additionally, he noted that the Comprehensive Plan allows rezoning to R-12, R-24, and R-48 based on economics. In the future, he said wide area rezones will address these individual quasi judicial hearings. In more general terms, he said the current zoning doesn't match what the Comprehensive Plan allows.

Councilmember McConnell supported the recommendation by the Planning Commission. She noted that if there are issues in the future with the hearing examiner handling quasi-judicial cases, then the Planning Commission should resume handling them. She opposed Councilmember Way's proposal.

Mr. Olander stated that since there are new Planning Commissioners he isn't sure whether or not they should reevaluate this item. He communicated that the City already has backup hearing examiners. He added that you may not have a large pool because it is critical that the hearing examiner knows the City Code.

Councilmember Way stated that hearing examiners are highly trained and if cases go to superior court there are pro tem judges that hear them. She felt her proposal would increase public confidence and would provide an additional step for the public to have their hearings heard. She thought there should be something in the code stating that one City staff member deals directly with the hearing examiner.

Assistant City Attorney Collins stated that all communications to the hearing examiner from the City Attorney, the appellant and the applicant are coordinated directly through the Deputy City Clerk.

Deputy Mayor Scott discussed the development review process and that there should be a design review committee to address issues in the community.

Commissioner Pyle commented that design review has been missing from the code for a long time and needs to be taken seriously. He said property rights should be taken into consideration. He supported Deputy Mayor Scott's recommendation.

Commissioner Broili echoed Commissioner Pyle's comments and said this is something that the City has needed for a while. He suggested taking a hard look at it.

Commissioner Piro thought both Commissioners are on track and this needs to be considered with the influx of population and redevelopment. He stated that a design review committee is much needed to ensure character is preserved.

Mr. Olander felt this would be a very good move and that a design review committee is only as good as the design review code. He added that it would be an outlet for residents to voice their concerns and that people sometimes accept density if they know what it will look like. He noted that there are several questions that will need to be addressed about this committee and suggested starting with a subcommittee of the Planning Commission, Council, and City staff to determine what is going on in the region then have the ideas brought back to the full Council and Planning Commission.

Councilmember Way said she favored design review with either the commission or director with standards. She added that design also includes interrelationships (pedestrians, traffic, landscaping, soils, stormwater, etc) and connectivity to environmental effectiveness and priorities which may lead into cumulative impacts. She suggested that this be an environmental design and review commission. She noted that Lake Forest Park has an environmental design commission.

Councilmember Eggen supported the proposal as long as there are clear standards to be implemented by this commission. He added that there are several aspects to design, and he doesn't think that too much can be taken on. He added that it also has the potential to grow into something purely subjective.

Commissioner Kuboi said this seems to be a solution, but urged looking for examples where things went wrong and how a design review process would fix the problems.

Mr. Cohn introduced that next item on the staff report.

Mr. Olander commented that sometimes the Planning Commission insight is missing in the recommendations to them. He questioned how the information that the Planning Commission presents to the Council could be more developed or improved. He suggested perhaps more meetings between the Planning Commission and Council.

Deputy Mayor Scott thanked Mr. Olander and noted that the Planning Commission does diligent work. He noted that all of the work done by the Planning Commission is missed by the community when it comes to the Council. He said it is integral for the Council to see how the Planning Commission comes to a conclusion based on the work they have done.

Councilmember Way suggested televising the Planning Commission meetings which would allow the public to view what is happening. She noted that the speaker series is viewed on the television. She felt it is beneficial and asked if the video recording staff can fit the Planning Commission meetings into their schedules and what the cost may be. She said it would be helpful if the Council could hear or view the Planning Commission meetings in totality.

Commissioner Wagner noted that the Planning Commission spent a lot of time reviewing its own goals. She added that they discussed utilizing *Currents* to notice upcoming events. She said the Planning Commission would love to be on television, but it is costly. She said she has tried to build the record for the Council when it comes to their meetings and has asked the City staff rhetorical questions for the Council's benefit and to have City staff provide a framework for issues heard at their meetings. She added that as records are being compiled, the Council should have City staff explain the issue and frame it as how the Planning Commission came to the conclusions that they came to.

Councilmember McGlashan noted that the Planning Commission meetings are already recorded and wanted to know if the City staff has considered putting them on television or doing "podcasting."

Mr. Olander stated that the staff will look into recording the Planning Commission meetings.

Commissioner Piro urged the Commissioners to feel free to discuss deliberations with the Council and staff.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, supported the suggestion of moving quasi-judicial hearings to the hearing examiner. She said the hearing examiner acts as a judge. Based on the codes the hearing examiner gathers the record and generates a conclusion. She is concerned about a city with uniformity and conformity, and supported individuality. She opposed the design review commission. She communicated that houses are different and people in them are different.

b) Tom Poitras, Shoreline, said there is a problem between the Council, Planning Commission and the City staff. He said the Ridgecrest area development still needs a lot of work, especially with the parking issues. He said there was a communication in the Planning Commission meetings that people were being taken seriously, but they weren't. He noted that when this issue went to the Council some of them took the issue seriously and the issues were solved. **(The Council meeting was interrupted by a fire alarm. At 9:55 p.m., Mr. Poitras continued his comments).** Mr. Poitras felt that the opinions expressed during the Planning Commission and Council meetings concerning Ridgecrest aren't representative of the community.

c) Les Nelson, Shoreline, commented that the design review committee sounds like a good idea and it would be good to have them review the transition proposal to see if they are matching what the community wants. He noted that the City will be taking a guess at this as they search for what will replace the moratorium and maybe certain aspects can be implemented and tested. He suggested having some beginning guidelines.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Councilmember Way moved to extend the meeting to 10:30 p.m. Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

(c) Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Charter

Mr. Cohn stated that the 2005 Comprehensive Plan update designated parts of the Briarcrest and Ridgecrest neighborhoods as special study areas, which means there is no long range plan concerning them. He discussed the proposed Comprehensive Plan map and noted that there would be policy recommendations and Development Code amendments specific to this subarea. He noted that the subarea plan process has been used in many cities and the community advisory committee process works as noticed in the City's housing committee. He added that it is a way to build leadership on the ground as they get a taste for City planning. He added that the advisory committee process is beneficial to the community. He noted that he and Miranda Redinger have been discussing the plan within the community and had a community meeting on March 19 taking in about 45 applications for the committee. He added that staff has been asked to hold a second meeting, and a consultant was retained to facilitate the next meeting. He noted that the advisory committee process would begin in September because it is difficult to hold the meetings in the summer. He commented that the members of the community should be representative of the stakeholders in the area and be diverse. He urged holding the size of the committee to 12 - 14 members. He said the housing advisory committee consisted of 16 members, and that was a bit large. He communicated that the citizen advisory committee would have its recommendation to the Council in May.

Ms. Redinger commented that the charter is similar to the housing committee and reviewed it with the Council.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Betty Lynn Brown, Shoreline, commented that she lives north of the subarea. She said she has been working on the Briarcrest newsletter for the neighbors so they would have a voice. She wanted the neighbors to be participants in what is going on in the area. She said that the PowerPoint presentation done by Steve Cohn is good, but the terms need to be familiar to everyone, and the word "charter" is unfamiliar to her. She said the next meeting will have more people who will be affected in it. She submitted a document to the Council concerning public involvement.

b) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, said he has tried to talk to the City Manager and the Planning Director and it took several phone calls to speak to them. He noted that he was told dates have been revised and asked for a spirit of trust and cooperation from the City. He said he is trustworthy and wants the City staff to note his value because he wants the City staff to excel. He said the City doesn't know how to recruit a community to get involved and is concerned that the committee should be different and run as it is in the charter, but all of the members should reside in the community. People need to work together and said he can't turn in an outline by tomorrow.

Mr. Cohn stated that there is no deadline yet concerning when the information can be submitted to the City. He said the City staff needs to work with the community to determine what the meeting should be about. He commented that there were 55 people at the last meeting and he wants the second meeting to be a success.

Councilmember Way thanked the Briarcrest neighborhood for the newsletter. She appreciated that the City staff has been trying to work with the community. She said she couldn't make it to the first meeting because there were three others she attended. She commented that she doesn't understand how the lines were drawn on the map because there is a boundary on the west side that isn't even a street and goes through a wetland. She commented that the people on the west side of the neighborhood didn't receive notice. She concluded that she has reservations about the boundaries and wanted to know how they can be fixed.

Mr. Cohn stated that they were focused on Comprehensive Plan areas that don't have a long range vision and the boundaries were squared and can be moved. However, to push it to the east doesn't make sense because everything is happening on the west side.

Mr. Olander noted that this was started in an area that was designated as a future special study area. He said it could be expanded, but the focus of the impact gets lost. Additionally, the areas to the east are high priority and those to the west could be expanded, but not too far.

Councilmember Way noted that the SEPAC process resulted in improper zoning next to the park and it needs to have special consideration so people by 8th Avenue and the skate park should be included.

Mayor Ryu summarized that the staff is asking for direction and said the staff is quite capable of working with the neighbors.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:30 pm. Councilmember Eggen moved to extend the meeting until 10:40 p.m. Deputy Mayor Ryu seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

Mr. Olander asked for direction on the boundaries and suggested extending the boundary to 8th Avenue.

Councilmember McGlashan suggested shrinking the boundary to 11th Avenue and creating a special study area between 11th and 8th Avenue to 155th and 145th separately to include the skate park, Paramount Park, and Paramount Open Space as opposed to extending it.

Mr. Olander responded that the park land use that that of the skate park are always going to be open space public areas.

Councilmember Eggen was concerned about keeping unity in the area. He stated that there is a unity between 11th and 15th Avenues and that the homes were built about the same timeframe.

He noted that the neighbors are worried that their zoning is going to be changed and that he is neutral on this item.

Deputy Mayor Scott suggested making the study area smaller and involving more stakeholders. He added that given the testimony there is some angst, but he wanted the neighbors and the City staff to work together.

Mr. Olander suggested expanding the boundary to 8th Avenue and notifying the neighbors. He added that the focus would be to deal with land use areas.

Mayor Ryu supported the process and said it is better to get as many members so they feel included in the process. She supported the City staff and the residents.

Councilmember Eggen noted that discussion on diversity is usually about gender and age. He felt economic status should be identified as a part of diversity.

Mr. Olander summarized that there is general direction to move the boundary to 8th and have up to 16 members. He added that the City staff will hold the second meeting and work with the residents and send out the appropriate notices. He felt the Briarcrest and Ridgecrest neighborhood associations have great mailing lists and contacts that the City can utilize. He commented that the City staff will negotiate a reasonable timeline and the process will begin.

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:40 p.m., Mayor Ryu declared the meeting adjourned.

Ronald Moore, CMC
Deputy City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.