

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Monday, October 6, 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 McConnell who arrived shortly thereafter.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Bob Olander, City Manager, announced the Community Conversations Vision Workshop upcoming schedule. He stated that all of the meetings begin at 7:00 p.m. and are being held as follows:

- October 7, Echo Lake Elementary Cafeteria
- October 8, Meridian Park Elementary Cafeteria
- October 8, St. Dunstan's Church
- October 9, Meridian Park Elementary Library

He noted that the Fall Recycling Event was held last weekend and it was a success. He noted that the Aurora Corridor Project was awarded the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Award of Excellence. Mr. Olander thanked Cathleen Davis, Director of Highways and Local Programs, WSDOT, Dan Mathis, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Lorena Eng, Northwest Regional Administrator, Ed Conyers, WSDOT, and Sam Schuyler, WSDOT for the Award. Ms. Davis presented the award and Mr. Mathis, Division Administrator, congratulated the City of Shoreline for this accomplishment. She noted that this project is the model for the Aurora Corridor and it adds a sense of community to Shoreline.

Mayor Ryu accepted the award and thanked them for the recognition.

Councilmember Hansen stated that the Aurora improvements are really noticeable driving from Seattle to Shoreline.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Way said she attended workshops and went to a session called "Understanding the Nearshore Environment" hosted by WRIA-9.

Councilmember Eggen thanked Kirk McKinley and the City staff on the Aurora Corridor Project. He said he went to the YMCA Grand Opening. He added that he attended a SeaShore Transportation Forum meeting and that one of the main subjects was Highway 520 tolling. He urged everyone to contact him, Mayor Ryu, or Deputy Mayor Scott if they wanted to give input.

Councilmember Hansen said he attended the Regional Water Quality Committee meeting and provided an update on Brightwater. He said that the sewer outfall has been laid on the bottom of the Puget Sound.

Councilmember McConnell commented that the YMCA opening was fantastic with about 1,000 people in attendance. She commented that she supports the facility for community reasons and noted that they have a daycare facility and youth programs. She commented that she is a member of the National League of Cities Human Development Steering Committee, where they are discussing health care reform. She noted that she thoroughly enjoys being on the committee.

Councilmember Hansen commented that the rotary sponsors a "Rotocare" project in Lake City, which is a free health clinic with a new facility underway. Councilmember Eggen asked if this was the breakfast rotary group. Councilmember Hansen replied that it is sponsored by the Lake Forest Park Rotary.

Councilmember McGlashan informed the Council that he would provide a report next week.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Mary Weaver, Shoreline, discussed median household income and stated that it isn't to be confused with family or personal income. It is the combination of all earners (two usually) in a home with resources pooled together. She stated that during the Arabella discussion last week the number \$56,960 for one family member was used, so the figure is really out of line.

b) Cindy Neff, Shoreline, on behalf of the YMCA Board, commented that they worked hard to plan, fund, and build the YMCA and encouraged everyone to see it. She said at the September 22 Council meeting there was a zoning issue discussed. She said Mayor Ryu noted that there are letters from the 98177 zip code and she wanted to know the significance of 98177. She concluded that she is disappointed that the hard work of the City staff isn't acknowledged by the Council and that the Council cannot come to decisions.

Flannary Collins, Assistant City Attorney, advised the Mayor not to answer the question because it pertains to a quasi-judicial matter.

c) Charlotte Bachman, Edmonds, commented that she volunteers at the Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Senior Center and said it is a great place.

d) Judy Parsons, Shoreline, congratulated the City staff and Council on the Aurora Corridor project award. She announced that the Senior Center and Friends of Third Place Commons are hosting a vintage fashion show on October 15.

e) Greg Logan, Shoreline, discussed the Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC), land use, and flexibility. He said Vision Shoreline is about land use and land use is dependent on the law. He said conditional use permits must meet criteria, and compatibility is important. He read Chapter 20.20.014 definitions and stated that there is no definition for "compatible" in the SMC. He felt this means that it gives the Planning Department unlimited flexibility in interpretation.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) CleanScapes Update

Mr. Olander introduced Jesus Sanchez, Public Works Operations Manager, and Rika Cecil, Environmental Programs Coordinator.

Mr. Sanchez presented a summary of the activity that has occurred with the City's new solid waste program. He noted that in October 2007 the City executed the agreement with Cleanscapes and the transition process included public education, outreach, driver training, billing systems implementation, etc. This, he stated, is the six month report.

Ms. Cecil provided the staff perspective on working with CleanScapes. She noted that the City staff has been collaborating with them to create a business outreach program tailored to the Shoreline community.

Jerry Hardabeck outlined the accomplishments in the first six months of the contract. He noted that CleanScapes was also awarded half of the City of Seattle contract. He noted that people are recycling more to decrease garbage levels due to higher garbage rates. Call Center performance, as outlined by the contract, states that all calls will be answered within 20 seconds or less and he stated that they are exceeding the goal. He reviewed weekly waste tonnage statistics and said he would like to reduce the overall amount. City of Shoreline residents are recycling 59% of their waste stream, he said. Total recyclable collectibles per multi-family home is 29% and commercial recycling is 15%. He added that CleanScapes has collected 55% more recyclables from commercial this year compared to last year and attributes the success to community involvement.

Councilmember Hansen thanked CleanScapes for a great job and asked if there was a cleaning service for garbage cans. Mr. Hardabeck replied that they don't do it yet, but drivers have painted over graffiti on their cans.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment. There was no one wishing to provide public comment.

Councilmember McGlashan commented that he lives in a condominium and there are usually 18 cans placed at the head of the driveway. He said he noticed that after they dump all of them the cans are lined back up in a neat and orderly fashion. He felt CleanScapes is doing an excellent job.

Councilmember Eggen discussed multifamily recycling and asked if the problem is that there is no room for recycling or it is education. Mr. Hardabeck replied that it is a matter of space and public education.

Councilmember Eggen discussed the food scrap recycling policy and whether or not it will be enacted. Ms. Cecil commented that the County has issued a variance to the Public Health Department and the contract is waiting to be executed.

Mr. Hardabeck clarified that there are utensils made from corn that are recyclable.

Councilmember Way thanked the CleanScapes staff and the residents. She asked about utensils and plastic bags. She wondered about CleanScapes' theory on having compost-able and/or biodegradable plastic bags. Mr. Hardabeck replied that they would like to see fewer bags used no matter what they are made of. He urged people to get into the practice of using canvas grocery bags.

Ms. Cecil commented that at the event this Saturday the City will be distributing samples of bio-bags, which are compost-able. She noted that more people recycle when they use the bio-bags.

Councilmember McGlashan questioned if CleanScapes takes styrofoam trays if they are marked with a certain number. Mr. Hardabeck replied that they didn't do it here in Shoreline.

Deputy Mayor Scott noted that the past provider gave customers a collections calendar. Mr. Hardabeck commented that they are developing a calendar and encouraged everyone to go online and look at the collection calendar.

Councilmember Way asked if there was any analysis done on how the public facilities are doing. Mr. Hardabeck said it is possible to measure facilities like the schools and City Hall. He added that it will be done in the future.

Councilmember Hansen said he has never seen detailed reports like this before now. He said the reports are great to have and they are doing an excellent job.

Mayor Ryu thanked CleanScapes for their great service.

Mr. Sanchez commented that although contracting with a new service provider was a risk, the City is pleased with the outcome. He added that the customer response is excellent and this is a great working relationship.

(b) New Room Format for Study Sessions

Julie Underwood, Assistant City Manager, provided the staff report. She said she has heard from citizens who don't like the format, but a study session is a different kind of meeting. She commended the Council for piloting this and being open to experimentation.

Mr. Olander commented that he has tried to address the problems with the sound and lighting. However, the main issue is that the audience couldn't see the PowerPoint presentations, but staff now provides additional copies for the public. He noted that changing rooms started as a Council initiative and now it is up to the Council to decide if this room meets its needs.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Gretchen Atkinson, Shoreline, said she is disappointed that the City staff recommended staying in the room. She said this location also costs more money and the Council should keep the budget in line. She said the room is costing between \$1,200 - 1,400 which is half of a mini-grant or a part-time salary. She said the environment in this room has improved greatly, but it still isn't as good as the other room. She urged the Council to move back to the other room.

b) Les Nelson, Shoreline, felt that maybe the Council should concentrate on the layout and design in the new Council chambers. He said it would be nice to have a table to work at.

c) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, felt that meeting in a different room is a good idea, but this room is so small. He said he liked the idea that the other room distinguishes that meetings in there are formal.

d) Dwight Gibb, Shoreline, stated that if a circle set-up contributes to dialogue then it is fine, but the audience doesn't like it. He said it feels like the Council doesn't care about the public. He noted that the other room is in a semi-circle and the attendees can see everything.

e) Jim Dipeso, Shoreline, appreciated the intent, but said there is no evidence that this provides any more fruitful discussion.

Councilmember Eggen appreciated the City staff's work and Councilmember McConnell's intent to have more informal interaction, but felt the cost is too high and the room inconveniences the public. He noted that the City budget is going to be in a deficit and the Council needs to respect the budget. He proposed the Council move back to the other room.

Councilmember McGlashan agreed and expressed concern about costs.

Councilmember Way appreciated the effort to try something new, but is not comfortable if it isn't welcoming to the public. She thanked the camera operators and technical staff. She added that she wants to find ways to improve things in the other room.

Mayor Ryu appreciated the thought and experiment, but is concerned about the difficulties the public are experiencing and the costs. The layout of the new Council chambers needs to be discussed, too. She favored moving back into the Mt. Rainier Room.

Councilmember McConnell commented that the meetings could be shorter and more efficient. She stated that it is frustrating and favored meeting the public's need to see the Council, but the length of the meetings could be cut down.

Councilmember McGlashan favored using the Highlander Room and noted that study sessions are different from regular meetings.

Deputy Mayor Scott appreciated the opportunity to give it a try, but is sensitive to costs and finds staying in this room tough to justify. He said if the Council moves back to the other room he wants to keep the meetings informal and dialogue enriched.

Councilmember Hansen preferred staying in the current room, but said it probably won't make much difference. He noted that the meeting attitude has changed since they have been utilizing this room.

Mr. Olander highlighted that if a Council effort is made to be less formal for study sessions and provide more open dialogue in the other room the good parts will be retained.

(c) Final Direction on Ordinance No. 507, Annual Comprehensive Plan and Associated Development Code Amendments relating to Master Planned Areas

Mr. Olander stated that the Council expresses continued concern about the Master Plan process for Fircrest campus. He suggested moving ahead with the less controversial elements, such as Crista Ministries, the Public Health Lab, and Shoreline Community College (SCC).

Joe Tovar, Planning & Development Services Director, and Rachael Markle, Assistant Planning Director, provided the staff report. Ms. Markle noted that the City just received a proposal to do Fircrest as a separate process and maybe meet with the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), Fircrest, the Planning and Development Services Department (PADS), and the Planning Commission (PC) to work on the new uses issue with Fircrest.

Mayor Ryu commented that if Councilmember Eggen's proposal is reviewed and this is separated into two tracks, one for expansion or maintenance of existing uses and the other for proposed new uses that would need to be approved with an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, this may actually resolve itself.

Councilmember McGlashan asked how the campuses could be separated.

Mr. Tovar commented that he is concerned because people are adding something nobody has seen yet and even if the Council feels comfortable with Councilmember Eggen's suggestion it needs to be remanded back to the PC. He felt there would be no problem separating Fircrest out and creating standards for the other two parcels.

Councilmember Hansen commented that if this is remanded back to PC for a public hearing it will be weeks, maybe even months away before this can return. He said he thinks separating the issues is a problem and stated that Crista Ministries and SCC are getting very frustrated. He doesn't think it should be remanded back to the PC for more study.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Boni Biery, Shoreline, read language on page 21, "positive fiscal impact and ongoing benefit to the host jurisdiction" in LU 74. She said some examples would help her understand what ongoing benefit means. She made a statement that the six story buildings being constructed in Ridgecrest and other places are causing the Fire Department to have to invest in new \$5 million dollar trucks, which isn't an ongoing benefit. She commented that the Planning staff decides what their recommendation will be long before public input is provided. On page 23, she read language concerning the "maximum housing potential of a site." She felt if density is maximized it will create tenement housing. She thanked the Council for increasing the radius to 1,000 feet as noted on page 26, item 7. Additionally, she noted it is the same radius for off-leash dog parks which extend to a quarter mile.

b) Jim Hartman, Seattle, said he is the legal voice for twenty-five people at Fircrest School, Friends of Fircrest, and an advocate for developmentally disabled residents. He said many of the Fircrest residents have been Shoreline citizens for over forty years. He urged a comprehensive planning process which should maximize public involvement. He said this area requires low density and is a low stress environment. DSHS planning was disappointing, he said, and the final product they have proposed puts Fircrest residents at risk.

c) Maria Walsh, Lake Forest Park, on behalf of her son at Fircrest, said new uses should require much more scrutiny because there are too many dangers from high density housing. Councilmember McGlashan asked Ms. Walsh if she objected to housing units on the campus. Ms. Walsh responded that she opposed having housing units next to the school.

d) Jim Walsh, Lake Forest Park, concurred with previous speakers and said the whole process should be open to the public. He is concerned that the DSHS process might be quasi-judicial. He said the process should be legislative and include citizen input and it should apply to Crista Ministries and Shoreline Community College.

e) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, said the PC meetings had little public testimony about this and asked if the PC was confused with what this really meant. He said SCC just wants to expand and if they are expanding uses there should be thresholds. He noted that Fircrest has no property lines around it, which is an existing use, and the surplus property is a new use. He felt this is Comprehensive Plan versus zoning because some want to expand and some have vacant land, but creating a process that fits everything doesn't work. He felt it isn't fair to remand this back to the PC and the reason it is in front of Council is that a planning step is missing.

f) Les Nelson, Shoreline, said the CP amendments for 2008 haven't changed much since they were reviewed by the PC and the public isn't able to keep up with it. He said 99% of

citizens wouldn't understand it. He asked if the revisions have been sent to the GMA. He felt that the Master Plan definition is good, but no definition exists for Institution/Campus (IC) and he wonders whether Crista is qualified. He pointed out that there is no CP amendment for Ridgecrest and that PLA2 has lots of features significant to that one area. He favored keeping the MP process in the CP, then adding Ridgecrest.

g) Saskia Davis said she attended the visioning workshop and is impressed. She said having an MP process included in the CP to consider future uses excites her. She added that her sister lives at Fircrest and concurred with the previous speakers, but urged the Council to consider the needs of the people residing at Fircrest along with needs of people in Shoreline. She felt a compromise could be reached.

h) Jim Walsh felt that what the residents want is not what they are going to get. He said that it isn't a foregone conclusion that the City needs high density housing on the Fircrest campus. He urged the Council to consider that the process of getting public input on this is more important than a preconceived idea about what should be on that property.

Ms. Markle replied to Mr. Nelson's comment and said that the definition of IC is in the CP and that it replaces LU 43 on page 20. She noted that PLA2 was an original proposal to the PC for Ridgecrest and all the areas would have been called PLAs. She added that they stripped it down to the essentials in the MPA process. A CP amendment isn't needed to change Ridgecrest, she said. She explained that a definition for compatible is subjective and the City staff based their recommendation on whether the project is compatible with the Council goals, vision, strategies, GMA, CP, and public comment.

Mayor Ryu asked about the definition of IC in LU43 concerning the term "large." Ms. Markle replied that IC is defined by the Council and is site-specific based on the CP land use map.

Councilmember Way asked about Ms. Biery's question concerning maximum housing potential. Ms. Markle replied that this is going to differ for each site and it doesn't just depend on the maximum financial yield; it includes environment, infrastructure, and how it fits into the CP. Policy statements, she stated, are subjective.

Councilmember Way further questioned what process would determine the maximum housing potential. Ms. Markle responded that it would be done through the MP area permit process.

Councilmember Eggen said he has received an abundance of calls and has talked to lots of citizens about this issue because he lives two blocks from Fircrest. He said he knows a lot about the GMA and went on the Municipal Research Services Center (MRSC) website and investigated every city in Washington with populations over 40,000. He stated that one city allows MP with a legislative approval process. He outlined that the GMA appears to want all planning in the CP, then the code and regulations outside the CP. He believed if basic planning for density and infrastructure is put in the MPA the City is putting planning in the regulation process, which is improper. He commented that the division would allow Crista and SCC planning to go forward. He noted that he wrote a letter to the City Council and the staff and added some amendments in it to implement this division. He read the two track proposal and

stated that residents adjacent to Crista are concerned about potential new buildings. He noted that there is also a sunset provision in the letter.

Mr. Tovar asked Councilmember Eggen if he envisioned that the process would include a specific site plan or something more specific than the statement in LU43.2. Councilmember Eggen replied it would be less than what would be done in designating a site as RB.

Mr. Tovar asked if Councilmember Eggen is contemplating adding or knowing specific uses, dimensions, and setbacks. He noted that everything the he is articulating is normally contained in a site plan.

Mr. Olander pointed out that a CP includes fairly general policy statements.

Councilmember Eggen didn't think the City should approve a specific plan as part of a legislative action. He explained that if the CP defines land use with general statements about uses, it also talks about what zones can be placed in a given LU area. He felt there needs to be some broad limitations, but there is still some ambiguity.

Mr. Tovar commented that this is a notion of an overlay zone which is something he said he hasn't seen in the legislative process before. He asked if it is possible to write regulations that apply to the PLA zone concept controlling what can and cannot happen, but it's normally done differently than what is being done here. He noted that a legislative code amendment is not as precise or flexible.

Mayor Ryu questioned which one will get the public more involved. Mr. Tovar replied that they both allow the same amount but they look at different things. He said an MP permit is a very specific site plan and an overlay zone is less precise and tries to do it legislatively. He noted that this process is less flexible on the applicant's side, but spelling out standards as a regulation in MP might be a way to move in the direction the Council wants.

Councilmember Way asked how an MP permit or a legislative overlay compares to an actual CP planning exercise. Mr. Tovar responded that the GMA definition of a CP is a generalized LU policy statement. He summarized that there can be no specific regulations within the CP.

Councilmember Way wanted to know how Mr. Tovar envisions this as a CP process, as compared to the other two. She asked if it is more like a visioning process where people come up with general ideas of what they like to see. Mr. Tovar replied that the CP isn't quite as uncertain as the visioning process, but still not specific like regulations. He said there is a phased "drill down" period from the CP, to the MP, to the permit.

Mayor Ryu asked if this was possible without remanding it to the PC. Mr. Tovar said he didn't think it was.

Mr. Olander said on page 27 there was a lot of specific information added to the decision criteria, narrowing down more than other CP policies. He noted that the specificity was put in the

decision criteria and that provides the Council with a fair amount of control. He agreed with Mr. Tovar that if we pursue the overlay or Councilmember Eggen's ideas it should go back to the PC.

Mr. Tovar felt the City should start with a new amendment, new SEPA, and new hearings. He felt that Fircrest can be separated in order to concentrate on Crista and SCC first.

Mayor Ryu said she is interested in the legislative overlay zones and then leaving the MP process to quasi-judicial proceedings. She suggested adding Councilmember Eggen's addition to #8.

Ms. Markle commented that if this is cut into two processes there would be less data and detail in the MP process. She noted that an MP area permit is similar to a conditional rezone and the Council won't have the data to make an informed decision.

Mr. Olander added that with new uses the Council can condition an MP permit based on criteria and can gain more control of it through the MP process. He noted that he has heard Councilmembers say that they don't feel the decision criteria give sufficient flexibility to control that outcome.

Councilmember Way said she likes the improved decision criteria and would like to understand where the Council is going in this process. She asked if Mr. Tovar is referring to a new version of a CP amendment and a new MP permit process or overlay.

Mr. Tovar explained that he is trying to determine if there is interest in splitting the process, where there is an MP process for Crista, SCC, and Fircrest for existing uses and then having an additional process for new uses.

Councilmember Way asked if the Council would still need a CP amendment if they separate Fircrest.

Mr. Tovar replied that some work would be required on LU43.2. However, he would like to think about it before coming back to the Council with a proposal. He noted this would have to be brought back as a package with new notice and new SEPA.

Councilmember Way said this is similar to the Ridgecrest process. Mr. Tovar clarified that the Ridgecrest plan wasn't amended and zoning was created. In this case the City staff is suggesting the creation of a policy statement.

Councilmember Way noted that the map needs to be fixed. She said that South Woods and Hamlin need to be shown as park land. She also said she is still concerned with Crista and their process. She asked about the Crista MP permit application and what phase they are in.

Ms. Markle responded that they have submitted a complete application and it was accepted because the City staff is using them for Development Code (DC) amendment criteria. She noted that Crista just needs a code amendment, but hopes Council adopts new policies with specificity.

Councilmember Way inquired how the City can have MP permit applications without a MP permit process.

Ms. Markle explained that technically there is a code amendment to change the zoning of Crista to MPA1, MPA2, MPA3, or MPA4 depending upon what they qualify for. She noted that it is the same application process as the Transfer Station. She said the City can accept them as code amendments, but the City staff is helping interpret the code.

Mr. Tovar commented that the City staff would be more comfortable with the proposal to persuade people to reapply. He noted that the City staff does its best with what is available until something better is created.

Mayor Ryu asked if the Crista MPA is under new use or existing use.

RECESS

At 9:40 p.m. Mayor Ryu called a five minute recess. Mayor Ryu reconvened the meeting at 9:47 p.m.

Councilmember Way expressed concern with page 20 of the staff report. She noted that four sites were proposed to be included but she is concerned about the Public Health Lab being designated as a separate entity. She said the issue is that the Washington State Department of Health (DOH) has not really been very clear on what area they're talking about. She said if the City proceeds with the MP process they can proceed without having to define areas or uses. She added that DOH hasn't been clear about Hamlin Creek and the boundary between them and the Fircrest cottages. She said the safety of Fircrest residents is a major responsibility.

Councilmember Hansen asked if they should be excluded from the MPA process since they are a separate owner.

Councilmember Way commented that if Fircrest is taken off the table, then the Health Lab should be.

Mr. Olander commented that all of the stated reasons are reasons why the City staff wants to deal with them separately. Dealing with these entities separately gives the Council more control over that specific site. He agreed that the City needs to separate the potential Health Lab MP and Fircrest MP from Crista and SCC.

Mayor Ryu supported pulling the Health Lab and Fircrest.

Councilmember Hansen stated that the current conversation is a bit confusing. He said he is trying to figure out the direction the people want to go. He wondered how the issues will be resolved if both entities are pulled out of the MP process.

Councilmember McGlashan felt Councilmember Eggen's amendments should become decision criteria and not introduced as CP amendments.

Mr. Tovar commented that a better place for Councilmember Eggen's amendments is in the code.

Mayor Ryu said the current proposal creates "carte blanche" and she is hearing neither SCC nor Crista is asking for approved new uses. She said even if the Council strikes the words in #8, that doesn't delay SCC or Crista.

Ms. Markle commented that she is correct and the City could also just rewrite the regulations to strip out new uses and allow Fircrest, the Health Lab, Crista, and SCC to apply for a MPA permit with the new criteria for expansion of existing uses. Then the City would need to craft regulations for new uses.

Mr. Tovar commented that if the MPA language is taken out so it doesn't apply to Fircrest or the Health Lab, that doesn't mean they can't apply for a permit to expand. Additionally, the permit to expand wouldn't be covered by any of the criteria the Council is considering.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m., Councilmember McConnell moved to extend to the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Councilmember Hansen asked if Fircrest and the Health Lab could be removed from the MP process right now. Mr. Tovar replied that it would work for those two entities, but they both can still use the existing Development Code regulations.

Mr. Olander added that the Council still wants to proceed with some MP for Fircrest as far as new uses, which will still benefit the state and the City. He said that process still can continue, but the City still needs a long range plan for Fircrest.

Councilmember Hansen suggested eliminating LU43.2 and LU43.3.

Councilmember McConnell stated that she favors Ms. Markle's suggestion to take out new uses.

Councilmember Eggen noted that his original recommendation was to remove new uses because it allows SCC and Crista to move forward.

Deputy Mayor Scott felt that Council consensus was to pull Fircrest and the Health Lab in order to allow SCC and Crista to move forward. He also stated the Council consensus to pull new uses.

Mayor Ryu asked if there was a way to put #10 and #11 into the code criteria.

Councilmember McGlashan clarified that he heard that the Council wanted City staff to take out new uses.

Councilmember Eggen noted that either pulling Fircrest and the Health Lab or pulling new uses would have the same effect.

Councilmember Way agreed with Mr. Olander's suggestion of meeting with DSHS to clarify their intent.

Councilmember Eggen expressed concern with removing LU43.2 and LU43.3 because it would have to wait until next year.

Mr. Tovar commented that the City can bring back two alternatives. Mr. Olander summarized that the City staff will analyze the options and bring them back for the Council to consider.

(d) Impacts of Initiative 985 (I-985)

Scott MacColl, Intergovernmental Programs Manager, provided an analysis of the impacts of I-985, the Reduced Traffic Congestion Initiative. He noted that it redirects a portion of sales and use taxes. He noted that the initiative is expected to result in a \$40 million loss of revenue to cities and a \$3.1 million loss in toll charges during off-peak hours on SR-167. Additionally, transit agencies have estimated a loss of \$20 million over five years in federal transit funds due to the opening of carpool lanes to general traffic during non-peak hours. Finally, he noted that the state general fund would be reduced by \$573.9 million over five years.

Councilmember Hansen commented that if Shoreline had red light cameras it would be an easy decision on whether to acquire them. He felt the state should have to pay for district court costs if it receives red light revenues.

Councilmember Way asked if the initiative puts congestion relief as the top state priority. Mr. MacColl replied that it does.

Councilmember Eggen said that it seems education is stated as the state's top funding priority.

Mr. Olander explained that the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) has taken a position and individuals can access it through the SCA website.

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:21 p.m., Mayor Ryu declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.