

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, April 21, 2008 - 6:30 p.m.
Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: None.

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 the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exception of Councilmember Hansen, who was expected to arrive later.

(a) Proclamation of Volunteer Appreciation Week

Mayor Ryu read the proclamation declaring the week of April 26 - May 3, 2008 as Volunteer Appreciation Week in the City of Shoreline. Taylor Hartman, a volunteer with the City's Specialized Recreation Program, accepted the proclamation on behalf of City volunteers and thanked the Council for this recognition.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

(a) Presentation by Representative Ruth Kagi

Representative Kagi provided an update of the past legislative session. She said the forecast for the state budget was that it would be down \$422 million. However, at the end there was a reserve of \$850 million. She noted that Governor Gregoire vetoed an additional \$15 million. She noted that \$190M was spent in required expenditures for caseloads, prison, and K-12 education. Additionally, \$300 million was appropriated for the supplemental budget. The biggest portion went to K-12 which funded cost of living adjustments (COLA) for teachers and .5% to make up the COLA that wasn't funded when the budget was in deficit. She summarized that the total increase for teachers was 4.9%. The Basic Education Funding Taskforce will address the funding formulas next session, she said. She discussed education and said the state will have end-of-course assessments for math in the future, instead of the math WASL. She noted that full funding

was retained for full-day kindergarten. Regarding healthcare, there was a health insurance partnership created with small businesses so they can provide affordable healthcare. The insurance commissioner was given the authority to approve rate increases for health insurance. Additionally, she said there will be incentives offered for those that enter the primary care system and a bill was passed to create standards for health counselors. She stated that the state is putting \$7 million into augmenting caseworkers for the foster care system and adding a new category of specialized foster care for high needs children.

Continuing, Representative Kagi said she also sponsored the urban forestry bill which was supported by Councilmember Way which provides funding to the Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development to develop model ordinances on urban forests and for the Department of Natural Resources to develop an assessment. She also sponsored a bill on family court, and if the court chooses to apply it they must commit to a two-year period so there is consistent coverage. She concluded that it was a very successful legislative session and there was \$2.3 million in the capital budget allocated for the repair of the St. Edwards Seminary. There was also \$270,000 allocated for the Fircrest master planning and funding for a community assessment for the public health laboratory. Finally, she said the idea of tolling on State Route 520 was introduced, but a plan that assesses impacts to the jurisdictions and other roadways must come before the legislature first.

Councilmember Hansen arrived at 6:44 p.m.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if the legislature would have to approve any plan for dual tolling on State Route 520 and Interstate 90. Representative Kagi replied affirmatively, adding that the legislature would have to approve any tolling before it is imposed.

Councilmember Hansen commented that people are very pleased with the Tacoma Narrows Bridge and the toll system. He suggested the same thing happen on State Route 520. Representative Kagi said it has clearly had an impact on congestion; however, she felt the situation with the Tacoma Narrows Bridge is different because going around it takes a lot more time. She said the bridge makes this route a lot shorter.

Councilmember Eggen said he is interested in the school funding formula. He asked if the idea is to have a simplified formula. He also wanted to know if there is going to be the opportunity to do levies. Representative Kagi replied that she is sure levies will continue to be available for local school districts. Councilmember Eggen urged her support to ensure there is enough funding for inner city schools. Representative Kagi said there needs to be an adequacy of financing because right now the state isn't putting adequate funding into K-12.

Councilmember Way said she enjoyed working with Representative Kagi on the Evergreen Cities bill, which, although small, will accomplish much. She also thanked Representative Kagi for her work on early childhood education, K-12, and the math WASL. She asked Representative Kagi her opinion on the state health laboratory expansion proposals.

Representative Kagi responded that Secretary Saleki led this tour and the building will be shaped like an open rectangle and filling in the empty space with more laboratory. She noted that there has been a growth in population since the laboratory opened in 1983, so they need to expand.

Councilmember Way asked her to help watch that carefully. She added that the community has had a lot of input into the Fircrest growth issue and she would like the health laboratory to remain in an appropriate envelope. She wanted this process to be transparent with the public on what is being proposed.

Councilmember Hansen thanked Representative Kagi for the great job she has done for the City for several years.

Mayor Ryu thanked Representative Kagi for her work with K-12 and early childhood education. She said access to education is important and that is where the funding should be allocated, not to prisons.

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided a report on various City news and meetings. Among his announcements, he noted that Shoreline has a new Department of Licensing Office located at 18551 Aurora Avenue N.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Eggen reported on the topics discussed at the SeaShore Transportation Forum, including the Alaskan Way viaduct and the Sound Transit proposal. He said Sound Transit is trying to decide whether to go back on the ballot in 2008 or 2009. He said the City should be prepared to make public input concerning this in the near future.

Councilmember Way attended the City's Earth Day celebrations and pulled ivy at South Woods. She commented that there were long lines at Central Market for natural yard care giveaways. She said she also attended the Judge Ronald Annual Luncheon and attended the "Cool Cities" workshop in Tacoma. She highlighted that the theme of the event was sustainability, drainage, and climate change.

Councilmember Hansen said he attended a seminar on the "Take Back" medicine disposal program in SeaTac. He said Bartell Drug is mastering a pilot project for the State of Washington and possibly copying the program in British Columbia. The program will start primarily in Snohomish County in 10 stores located in Edmonds, Lynnwood and Shoreline.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, urged the Council to set five goals for their upcoming retreat because there have been too many goals in the past. She said she based the number on the workloads of the City staff and the citizens. She commented that the Council is elected to represent the citizens, and in other bodies and cultures the senior person is recognized. Councilmember Hansen, she noted, has voted on every law in this City and as the most

experienced Councilmember, he knows parliamentary procedure. She urged the Council to use him as a mentor at the retreat.

b) Art Maronek, Shoreline, thanked the City Council and City staff for the March 31 legal opinion on "air condos." He stated that the City made the language clear that single family rules were applicable. He said this City has a very capable and responsive City Manager and City Attorney.

c) Dale Simonson, Shoreline, concurred with the previous speaker. He stated that he lives next to the development being discussed. He wanted the Planning Commission and Council to know that he is thinking about the development everyday and doesn't want his concerns to fall on deaf ears.

d) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, stated that the Fircrest community meetings were visioning exercises and there isn't much information on how it's going to work. He was concerned that City maps are being updated that show the public there may be a plan in the works that wasn't even considered in the legislature. He said now there are rumors and innuendo about the master planning process before it even starts.

e) Les Nelson, Shoreline, summarized what he's learned about zoning over the past 9 months. He said the City adopted the King County zoning and RB was only R-36 with a 35-foot height limit. Then, he said, the Comprehensive Plan and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) were generated. He noted that the 2008 code amendments refer to the 1998 EIS as the City's most up-to-date environmental document. He stated that the EIS reinforces the assertion that unlimited densities are not included in the current code.

f) Joe Krause, Shoreline, thanked the Councilmembers who look out for citizens, not developers.

Mr. Olander stated that the legislature passed additional funds to carry forward the Fircrest Master Plan but he hasn't heard from the state on the timing of the process yet. He also said he doesn't know why the property is mislabeled on the map, but the state laboratory now owns it.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Trail Corridor Update

Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS) Director, joined by Jason Henry, Berger Architects, provided an update on the work and funding for trails and trail redevelopment as funded through the Parks Bond. He explained that successful trail strategies feature a well-designed system with a maintenance strategy. He communicated that there is much more trail use now than in the past and it is perceived as a low-impact recreational experience. He added that the PRCS Board created a citizen-based Trail Study Group which came up with Trail Route recommendations.

Mr. Henry displayed through a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the extensive system of existing trails in Shoreline. There are trails existing in South Woods, Hamlin Park, Boeing Creek Park/Shoreview Park, and in the Innis Arden Reserve, he said. He noted that there are other trails to include a linkage between the Interurban Trail and some community connectors. He noted there are some ivy and holly removal projects that need to occur that will also incorporate some needed revegetation.

Mr. Deal stated that there has been some experimentation done on trail surfaces, and he will come back in May to identify the areas in Hamlin Park and different types of planting and soil materials. He said the City staff needs to figure out what plants will do well in order to determine what to plant. Mr. Henry continued discussing Hamlin Park and adjacencies. Mr. Deal stated that there are linkages in the Fircrest master plan between Hamlin and Fircrest.

Councilmember Way asked about including the right-of-way along 165th Street as a route, which would be a way to avoid erosion.

Mr. Deal responded that they are trying to stay away from adjoining properties and are more concerned about existing connections. Mr. Henry added that the goal is to develop a primary system of trails which will reduce some of the impact on secondary routes.

Councilmember Way inquired about bike usage within the parks. Mr. Deal responded that there are no rules against bicycles at this time.

Mr. Henry continued and stated that the main focus in Hamlin Park is the restoration of the under story because it has been worn away. He said Innis Arden Reserve is the least developed park out of all the ones studied.

Mr. Deal stated the City will be putting signs in the Innis Arden Reserve M, Boeing Creek Park and Shoreview Park. He added that Hidden Lake is a fantastic opportunity for outdoor education. Additionally, he discussed surfacing and said that basalt is a good hard wear surface. He added that Boeing Creek Park is unique. He pointed out that Shoreline Community College students can no longer park on the Shoreview property, and there are discussions regarding a possible property trade between the City and the College to create a trailhead at Boeing Creek. He noted that there will be analysis to determine ways to cross Boeing Creek. He said the next steps will be to continue with design development with public meetings in the fall, completing the design process by end of 2008, and construction beginning next spring. He reviewed the proposed funding slides which he explained are estimates until the design development phase is completed.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Dick Nicholson, Shoreline, member of the Trail Corridor study group, said he is impressed by the group, which contributed extensively to the study. He said he is also a member of the Shoreline Breakfast Rotary, which is working on an arboretum project at Ronald Bog. He said it is funded from trail funds. He noted that the group has staked out the route and it has been

approved. He said the trail is 475-feet long and will be installed around the arboretum with some unusual native trees.

Councilmember McGlashan asked about the thinning in Hamlin Park and wanted to know what the plan was to get sunlight down into it. Mr. Deal said there are a variety of sites and experimenting going on.

Councilmember McGlashan asked about an e-mail concerning tire tracks being found in north end of Hamlin. Mr. Deal said those were from PRCS equipment that was brought in to assist the Seattle Urban Nature people with a project they were doing. He said the area is blocked off and there were only small utility vehicles in the area.

Councilmember Eggen inquired if there was any requirement to develop a certain number of trails for disabled access. Mr. Deal responded that there is no requirement; however there will be some surfaces that can accommodate some people with disabilities.

Councilmember Eggen said the City needs to accommodate disabled people. He commented that the trail at Hamlin Park is so busy and wondered how it could be designed to make it better.

Councilmember Way asked if there is any consideration on how to link bicycles with this and if it could run from Hamlin Park to and through Paramount Park. She also asked if the workforce would consist of volunteers.

Mr. Deal replied that there is \$1.35 million for soft surface trails and that's one of the sites that would be considered after the big projects are completed. He also responded that the best scenario would be for the City to utilize Earth Corps and scouts to assist with the maintenance and revegetation of the parks. He said that volunteers would continue to be used when the trails are functional.

Deputy Mayor Scott commented that this City has a wonderful parks system. However, he stated that the Innis Arden Reserve M access points aren't clear to him. Mr. Deal replied that there are two access points to the Innis Arden Reserve M: One access point is on 14th Avenue NW; and the other is on 15th Avenue NW.

Mayor Ryu discussed the need for bike and non-motorized transportation options. She asked if there was a way to influence people into bicycling by having more bicycle trails.

Mr. Henry highlighted that Hamlin has east-west pedestrian movements, and there is a fairly nice connection for bicycles and it is possible to have a bicycle trail, but more study is needed.

Mr. Deal commented that the Planning and Public Works Departments need to get involved for more detailed analysis. He added that there is a King County Levy for Trails and Shoreline will be receiving \$100,000 for the next six years for trail connections. He also stated that the City is in line to receive \$500,000 for Boeing Creek. He thanked the citizen groups for their assistance.

RECESS

At 8:27 p.m. Mayor Ryu called for a five minute recess. The meeting reconvened at 8:34 p.m.

(b) Transitional Area Code Amendments in Response to the Moratorium, Ordinance No. 488

Paul Cohen, Planner, presented the Planning Commission recommendations for transitional area code amendments in response to the moratorium. He noted that the moratorium has been refined in Ordinance No. 488. He said the Code amendments focus on those properties most impacted by the diminished development potential. He said that the Planning Commission thought the moratorium should be expanded to include all zones. He read the Code amendment summary and said that under this proposal, 70 parcels are affected.

Councilmember Way said she compared this to the Overland Trailer Court location. She noted that page 81 is an odd optical illusion and it is an interesting problem they encounter at this location. She said that you can configure projects various ways on a given site.

Mr. Cohen noted that the picture shows a six story building, and it is a couple of stories less than what is reflected in the photo. He felt the rendering is much bigger than what the actual project would look like.

Mr. Olander commented that this started off as a limited moratorium to deal with these transition issues. Particularly, the Planning Commission has returned with ways to deal with the design and setbacks between low density and high density residential properties. He noted that it does include all properties, not just those adjacent to residential zones. He pointed out that balancing the equities is the big task because Aurora Avenue lots are very narrow, so not reaching too far is advised. He said there are already certain height and density limitations and the moratorium didn't reevaluate the zoning or the densities. He added that the Planning Commission wisely added a caveat that the traffic would have to go to an arterial, and additional work is required to discourage neighborhood cut-through traffic.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, felt that land use is one of most important topics the Council has to deal with. She said this moratorium has prevented owners from using their private property rights. She said there needs to be space on top of the building for an elevator shaft, air conditioning equipment, satellite dishes, etc. Therefore, she felt limiting the roof of a building won't work. She said the people who were presumed to be interested in property, the SHAG Retirement Community, has a putting green on their roof at another development. She said it would be great to allow that kind of creativity for this development.

b) Les Nelson, Shoreline asked if the building would be allowed to be 80 feet tall. He suggested taking more time to do this right. He read the moratorium findings of fact and noted this will have a visual impact on the community. He said this revision will be taking an abundance of properties out that were originally in the moratorium. He noted that Ordinance No.

488 instituted a 40-foot height limit, but that's not addressed as a standard. He concluded by suggesting that the language should be more restrictive from the start.

c) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, noted that transition zoning wasn't a problem until market forces changed things. He said the problem is that the City has never done planning for high density development and the developers are getting cheated because the City is scaling back. He pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan has a maximum of R-48 and does not envision "built out" everywhere. He asked the City for some serious visioning and planning in the future to embrace density.

d) Randy Peterson, Seattle, on behalf of Dr. and Mrs. Murray, owners of the Overland Trailer Park, said the Murrays have owned and managed it as a low-income trailer park for 30 years. He said that in 2006, Dr. Murray asked him to help sell it. The property sold in 2007 and the residents were given one-year notice in 2007. The park was shut down in February 2008. In November 2007, Shoreline passed the moratorium and Dr. Murray wrote a letter to the Council asking for consideration of his situation. He said the situation is that the rules and regulations would require a 25% reduction in the development potential of his site. He asked that the Council consider the concept of fairness. He said a 25% taking to allow transition is more than enough.

e) Dwight Gibb, Shoreline, discussed the relationship between specialized and comprehensive thinking. He said planning involves comprehensive thinking. Specialized thinking leaves little to say about parking, transportation, aesthetics, recreation, etc. He said it is a mistake to begin specific changes then refine them later when the comprehensive plan is analyzed. He added that Aurora Avenue is a very narrow corridor and in the 2006 community survey there was a desire for more planning. He noted that a Seattle Times article by Joe Tovar, the Planning Director, demonstrates this kind of thinking.

f) Joe Krause, Shoreline, stated that the Murray's don't live in Shoreline. He discussed the parking and traffic issues caused by the abundance of vehicles at the Linden Avenue Apartments. He noted that he called one day and they told him to park at the strip mall because there is a parking problem. He said the same overcrowding that happens there will happen on NE 152nd Street.

Councilmember McGlashan inquired if decks are allowed on the 2:1 stepbacks. Mr. Cohn responded that they can be, but they have to be under the slope. Councilmember McGlashan noted that 800 square feet cuts straight up and asked if the building can be three stories high without an elevator. Mr. Cohen responded that he would speak to the developer and architect to determine if it can be done. He noted that this would lead to a diminished development potential if the building is built to three stories.

Councilmember McGlashan wondered if the Council would consider a 1:1 slope on the side facing street. He noted that 2:1 would add an extreme cost to the development and expressed concerns about making the base of the building thicker, thus taking more property and possibly taking out more trees, since the developer can't build it any higher.

Councilmember Eggen commented regarding elevator placement and asked what changed in the definition to decrease the number of affected properties from 94 to 70. Mr. Cohen said the difference is that the former language included all commercial properties within 90 feet within any single family zones; this language only deals with single family zones that abut or are across the street from the three commercial zones.

Councilmember Eggen commented that Ridgecrest used design standards to get the properties to look like single family homes. He noted that there are concerns from the neighbors concerning home values and whether or not they would drop. Mr. Cohen stated that there are multi-family design standards. Mr. Olander added that while he didn't have any data regarding home values, he assumed there would be some value concerning the improvement of the views because of the transition zones.

Councilmember Eggen stated he is also concerned with parking and said there was some discussion about a code interpretation leading to 0.5 cars per unit. Mr. Cohen noted that the Development Code has a list of uses and the required parking for each use. He clarified that not every single use is listed and the developer can ask for a code interpretation.

Councilmember Eggen wanted to know if the 0.5 cars per unit is the standard allowance with reduction by the Planning Director. Mr. Cohen responded that the allotment is site specific. For example, the Code has senior housing parking with stalls of 0.33 per unit. He added that the developer proposed a compromise between senior housing and single family. Mr. Cohen stated that he can give more information at a later time.

Regarding the Overland Trailer Park site, Councilmember Way stated that she has letters between the developer and the City staff pertaining to parking issues. She said notice was given to the community in 2007, and that's what brought the moratorium. She said the public was searching for answers and had trouble accessing the documents. She handed out copies of the administrative order. She said the first letter was written in August 2006 and this shows how difficult it is to access this information in a timely manner. She said there wasn't public notice until October 2007.

Mayor Ryu wondered if potentially significant inquiries could be maintained in a log. She noted that there were times when technical staff said things weren't happening, but the senior planning staff was talking to property owner/developer a year earlier. She wondered if there is a way to set a "trigger point."

Mr. Cohen replied that the City staff has always had pre-application meetings, which can occur a year before. He said there is no reason that the City staff would hide information, adding that perhaps the problem arose from how the questions were asked.

Mr. Olander responded that there are hundreds and thousands of inquiries every year. He noted that any City staff member can look up the history of applications. The log, he explained, is property-based, and the "trigger point" would have to be fairly well-known if one is to be set.

Councilmember Way said that the public needs access to the documents and legal notice. She said the "trigger point" is public anxiety, noting that there was a parking exception given to this proposal.

Councilmember Eggen felt there should be differentiation in the roof structures to provide visual relief.

Mr. Olander commented that the parking issue applies to all properties in the City and maybe the Council can revisit the Development Code.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m., Councilmember Way moved to extend the meeting to 10:30 p.m. Mayor Ryu seconded the motion, which carried 6-0, with Councilmember Hansen abstaining.

Councilmember Hansen inquired what the City staff would bring back next week if the Council doesn't make any suggestions concerning this ordinance. Mr. Olander responded that the City would bring back a recommendation by the Planning Commission in the form of an ordinance, which would have the major points that Mr. Cohen discussed included.

Councilmember Hansen asked if this would alter and extend the moratorium or if it would eliminate it. Mr. Olander responded that if Council passes the ordinance next week, there is a slight gap because it takes five days for publication. In order to cover that gap there needs to be a 10-day extension, or a motion to extend the moratorium.

Councilmember Hansen questioned if it is the staff intention to repeal the moratorium within the legal limits. Mr. Olander responded that he was correct. Councilmember Hansen referred to the property drawings and asked why setbacks are required if the requirements also include a wall of trees between properties. Mr. Cohen responded that there needs to be space for landscaping and screening. He added that this takes the overall bulk of the building and sets it back 20 feet. He noted that the Planning Commission recommended the Council adopt these code amendments and the Planning Department refined the recommendation.

Councilmember Hansen commented that trees make an effective wall. Mr. Cohen expressed concern about solar access and said language was added in case the adjoining property owner doesn't like the tree screening. Councilmember Hansen said there is an area in Edmonds where shore pines were planted and they grew to over 40 feet tall. Then a lawsuit was initiated and they had to cut them down to 25 feet.

Councilmember Way referred to the Planning Commission minutes, page 37, where Mr. Cohn refers to the proposed changes as a "short term patch." She said this is like a temporary fix on a problem. She also noted that the language in the Development Code and in the Comprehensive Plan concerning commercial land use is confusing to the average person.

Mr. Olander agreed that the Comprehensive Plan is confusing. He explained that the Comprehensive Plan says that in the Community Business (CB) zone there are a number of

potential zones that are allowed as separate options, including Neighborhood Business (NB), Community Business (CB), Regional Business (RB), Office (O), R-12, R-18, and R-48. He added that the confusion of terms is very unfortunate and when the Comprehensive Plan is modified it will be very useful to get rid of the duplicate terms because it is very confusing. Additionally, in order to determine the density maximums you would have to refer to the Development Code. However, there is no legal conflict between the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code.

Councilmember Eggen inquired if, at the time the Comprehensive Plan was developed, the RB zone had unlimited density and if there was a limit when the environmental impact statement was developed. Mr. Olander responded that he could find out, but the concept of unlimited density is not correct. He said even if it's not there to begin with, the SEPA documentation should indicate one.

Councilmember Way said the environmental impact statement is still in effect, and this proposal changes the land use designation without a Comprehensive Plan update or new environmental impact statement. Mr. Olander explained that the area is already zoned RB and the moratorium actually reduces what's there now. Councilmember Way replied that the Comprehensive Plan map has it designated as CB, which allows for a number of zones.

Mr. Olander responded that the Comprehensive Plan map has all of the land in south Aurora designated as community business, which allows a number of zones. He added that R-48 is a separate zoning category that could apply to it. He said it could be R-8, R-12, R-24, or R-48. He said it could also be CB, RB, or O, and what the Council selected was RB as the zoning, not R-48. He noted that RB allows the broadest range of commercial activities and residential uses, and to determine what density is allowed you must consult the Development Code.

Councilmember Way noted that eliminating the moratorium would automatically refer the area to RB.

Deputy Mayor Scott said Mr. Olander's explanation brings up the point that if it is confusing to the Council, it must be even more confusing to the citizens. He questioned if it is time to do a visioning process and involve the citizens to determine what they want Shoreline to look like. Mr. Olander commented that visioning is one of the topics on the agenda for the Council retreat.

Mayor Ryu summarized that the Council has three options: 1) deal with the topic on the table and find a short-term solution; 2) check back with the public on a visioning process to determine what they want the density to look like and come up with design standards; and 3) commit to a full Comprehensive Plan review. However, she cautioned that there are lots of pieces that need to be addressed before embarking on a comprehensive study.

Councilmember McGlashan said the Council needs to be aware of property values and the fact that "downzoning" properties will not be accepted by property owners. He said the transitioning needs to be done carefully.

Councilmember McConnell felt the Council has a duty to come up with amendments to get this done. She said they have to find a compromise between the community and the property owners. She added that as elected officials they have to make the difficult decisions. She urged the Council to come to the meetings prepared. She said the City staff has made several amendments to the ordinance and she agreed with them.

(c) Council Subcommittee Recommendations for Study Sessions and Public Input/Involvement Opportunities

This item was postponed to a future Council meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:31 p.m., Mayor Ryu declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk