

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Monday, October 19, 2009 - 6:30 p.m.
Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Councilmember Eggen

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 Eggen.

Upon motion by Councilmember McGlashan, seconded by Councilmember Hansen and carried 6-0, Councilmember Eggen was excused.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events. He announced that the City of Shoreline was awarded the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Certificate of Distinction for Performance Measurement. He then provided various public reminders.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Way said she attended a conference at the University of Washington called "Design for Livability" presented by the Cascade Land Conservancy. She said there was a report given by Sarah Philips of Lake Forest Park from Third Place Commons about how they make the public organization work for the community and how it helps the bookstore thrive. She felt it is a model that could be copied in Shoreline.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Debbie Kellogg, Shoreline, said she has election concerns and wondered if candidates are telling the truth about themselves. She inquired if Shari Tracey was really the Chief of Staff the whole time while employed by King County Councilmember Bob Ferguson. She said she looked at the King County organization chart and her name was listed but not as the Chief of Staff. She added that Ms. Tracey applied for a position on a Shoreline committee in March 2008 and wrote that she was a staff assistant to Bob Ferguson on the application.

b) Bronston Kenney, Shoreline, discussed campaigns and the accusations and smears. He stated that Councilmember McGlashan received rezoning for his own gain and was arrested in New Orleans. He stated that the Shoreline residents deserve a full accounting and wants to know which Councilmembers or staff were involved or knew about the events in New Orleans. He said he wants to know the status of the case. He stated that he wasn't in New Orleans to party, but to work for the City.

c) Carina Johnson, Shoreline, said she lives next to Kruckeberg Garden and has been following the master planning process carefully. She said she felt the Parks department lied to the residents. She said she expects accurate and honest information from employees. She added that the City has noted that they are going to be cutting specimen trees to create a parking lot. She also said the City has communicated that there needs to be more room for plants and expansion to meet their income needs.

d) Bill Bear, Shoreline, commented that he is on the Financial Planning Citizen Action Committee and opposed the levy lid lift. He noted that while on the committee, Shari Tracey said if people cannot afford to pay taxes in Shoreline they should move. He commented that the Mayor supports the idea of reducing costs and he shares her sentiment.

Councilmember McConnell noted that Mr. Bear's comments represented the minority report of that committee. She inquired how will citizens become involved if they are singled out individually for their opinions in a committee. Mr. Bear replied that there were a large number of people on that committee that didn't think taxes were the solution. However, he said, Ms. Tracy favored it. Councilmember McConnell stated that there were over twenty people on the committee and most of them collaboratively agreed with items that he opposed. She said it is important for citizens to be a part of a committee for the City of Shoreline and not fear being separated.

e) Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline, commented that in September she was told about Councilmember McGlashan's incident in New Orleans. She said that as a candidate, she made a choice not to bring up the allegations. She said she told a reporter that Councilmembers should be held accountable for their actions. Her campaign, she commented, is focused on issues that are important to Shoreline and she feels she is more qualified to make decisions. She stated that there are local banks that will close and small business loans have been suffering. She felt it is important for some large banks to close but the City needs to have locally-owned banks and businesses remain solvent.

f) Dwight Gibb, Shoreline, commented that public trust is important and a key to making government work is by having a high level of public trust. He said there have been smear campaigns in the past and last year there were accusations about secret meetings which did a great deal of damage. This year there are charges against Mayor Ryu that have been repeated over and over. He felt she is a hardworking Councilmember with great integrity. He stated that the "politics of negativism" can be turned around and he looks forward to the day when candidates exercise respect and restraint.

g) John Chang, Shoreline, President, Shoreline Sister Cities Association, stated that on November 8 - 12 the City will be hosting twelve members from the City of Boryeong, Korea. He said the delegation will be led by the Deputy Mayor and twelve other members. He noted that some students from Boryeong are enrolled at Shoreline Community College (SCC) and the University of Washington, which benefits this area economically. He urged the Council and the City staff to assist in welcoming them.

h) Bob Ransom, Shoreline, discussed the Choi property and the questions raised involving Cindy Ryu. He said Mayor Ryu was not involved and recused herself. He noted that the Choi property is 83,000 square feet of property on Aurora Avenue and there is a \$100 million development plan. He stated that the original proposal from Mr. Choi was 10 stories and the City staff proposed 12; however, neither proposal was adopted. He added that proposals were brought to the neighborhood for eight stories and in the end the final height that was agreed to was 65 feet. Unfortunately, due to permitting problems the financing for this \$100 million project fell through and did not happen.

Mayor Ryu clarified that these were not Council meetings to recuse herself from; Mr. Ransom agreed and stated further that she did not participate in these meetings about the Choi proposal.

i) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, thanked all those who wished her well after her stroke. She stated that Ron Medved, who was to become the King County Assessor, suffered a stroke a month after she did and he died this morning. She said she is fortunate things went so well for her.

j) Elaine Phelps, Shoreline, commented that campaigns should be based on issues rather than negativity between candidates. She added that it is illegal for a United States cabinet member to allow a photo of him/her to be used in a political endorsement. She assumed Shari Tracey doesn't have permission to use her picture with Gary Locke. She said there are things in the Tracey campaign that aren't fact-checked, and due diligence is essential for a councilmember. She added that support for Shari Tracey comes from the Innis Arden Club and Peter Eglick. She commented that Innis Arden has to comply with all City codes rather than relying only on their own covenants. She stated that Mayor Ryu considers every part of the City. She concluded that the people who are writing negative letters and making false statements should talk about the issues concerning the City.

k) Laethan Wene, Shoreline, commented that people with disabilities want their dances in the City. He wished to inform the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, Dick Deal that it is important to have dances for specialized recreation participants.

l) Shari Tracey, Shoreline, responded to the allegations about her campaign. She noted that her position in Bob Ferguson's office began as Operations Director, but when she left his employment it was clear that she was Chief of Staff. She stated that the comments about the work on the Long Range Financial Citizen Advisory Committee have been distorted. She said the committee's task was to figure out how to close the budget gap through cutting services or increasing revenue. One of the five recommendations was the creation of a Transportation Benefit District (TBD) and funding transportation improvements with a \$20 car tab fee. The other recommendation was to give the electorate a chance to vote on a levy lid lift. She stated that she would never tell people who can't afford to live in Shoreline that they should leave.

m) Paul Herrick, Shoreline, as a member of the Long Range Financial Citizen Advisory Committee, disagreed with Mr. Bear's comments. He stated that he never heard Ms. Tracey make the statements attributed to her. He said a statement like the one Mr. Bear claims she made would be totally out of character for her and is a bald-faced lie. He added that Mr. Kenney should be ashamed of himself for stooping to "McCarthy-like" tactics instead of debating the issues. He noted that the ad by the Shoreline Partnership Council (SCOMMISSION) against McGlashan included a phony mug shot and police report and didn't mention that the charges were dropped. He said this is a "McCarthy-like" character assassination. He said Michael Mann, the original SCOMMISSION director, said he dropped out of the SCOMMISSION because he felt the ad was wrong.

n) Dan Mann, Shoreline, noted that his son, Michael, got involved in the SCOMMISSION, a political action committee, at work. He said his son dropped out because he didn't have the time to do it. He said Mayor Cindy Ryu promised to protect neighborhoods, small business, and the environment, and she has kept her word. He stated that cottage housing ended up in his neighborhood prior to Mayor Ryu and changed the neighborhood character. He commented that Mayor Ryu supported small business and she fought for changes to the Aurora corridor. Small things like that make a difference, he said. Additionally, he said the City doesn't have any environmental suits being filed against it.

o) Pat Murray, Shoreline, said the remarks made about fellow citizens and Councilmembers are not relevant. He said he doesn't like to see smear campaigns and the people should be concerned about what happens here in Shoreline. He said people cannot do whatever they want with private property; responsibilities come with private property rights. The City has a liberal tree ordinance and developers can cut trees. However, signature trees are disappearing. Additionally, businesses feel they can make remarks and transfer their shortcomings onto others. He said he is disturbed about some aspects of the current campaigns and felt a degree of civility is needed in the City.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Discussion of Proposed Permanent Regional Business (RB) Zone Regulations

Steve Cohn, Long Range Planner, along with Will Hall, Planning Commission Chair, and Michelle Wagner, Planning Commission Vice Chair, explained the process used to arrive at the Planning Commission recommendation for regulations in the RB Zone.

Commissioner Hall discussed the recommendation to create a mixed use zone, which addresses compatibility between RB and the surrounding neighborhoods. He noted that the Planning Commission has been working on permanent regulations so the Council can pass it before the moratorium expires. He noted that the recommendation won't allow anything taller than 65 feet. It sets a base height of 35 or 45 feet depending on whether or not there are commercial uses integrated into the building. Structures higher than 45 feet will require incentives and balances the interests of the property owners and the neighbors. He said while parking continues to be a major concern with this community, this is an attempt to balance the framework goals to achieve a more predictable development environment.

Commissioner Wagner added that there was a lot of debate about the details, which is included in the minutes. She noted that the zoning would be located in the Central Shoreline area, and it would be valuable to know if the Council feels that it is appropriate as the City moves forward.

Councilmember Way asked for clarification of the "Central Subarea Plan concept" and stated that she wasn't familiar with it. Mr. Cohn explained that this has been renamed to the "Town Center plan," but it is a citywide change that will affect all RB zoned properties. Mayor Ryu commented that unless a particular parcel already has a permit, it applies to all developments from now on, wherever they are located. Mr. Cohn confirmed that if the Council adopts it, it would affect all developments that would be applying for a building permit from now on. Mayor Ryu asked what would happen to the four or five parcels that aren't fronting an arterial. Commissioner Hall replied that the recommendation is to have the developments height based on the distance from residential zones. He said this is based on compatibility by ensuring there is a transition between residential zones and the RB or "mixed use" zone.

Mr. Cohn discussed the Commission's four major ideas when reviewing this item. They are; 1) incentive system that trades density for public amenities, 2) more stringent rules for transition, 3) increased notification of large development, 4) and more open space. Steve Szafran provided an overview of the incentive system as documented on page 3 of the Council packet. Mr. Cohn commented that the City staff and Commission struggled with the concept of transitions. However, the Commission dealt with it as they did the Midvale Demonstration Area. The Commission, Mr. Cohn explained, had two ways to deal with open space: 1) make it private open space; 2) make it a public gathering place at 1,000 square feet per acre of site. Mr. Szafran discussed how the City would notify

residents of large development proposals. He stated the developer would have to have a neighborhood meeting to specifically identify impacts caused by the new development. Mayor Ryu inquired if there was a recording requirement at these developer meetings, and Mr. Szafran replied that there was not. However, the City staff is present. Councilmember Way stated that developers should take notes at the predevelopment meetings. Mr. Cohn added that an important part of the transition is screening. He also informed the Council that the name of new zone was contentious and the City staff suggested several names with mixed use zone (MUZ) being selected by the Commission.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Bill Bear, Shoreline, stated that he visited Rockville, Maryland and it has excellent public space with stores on the ground floor and residential above. He felt it is possible for it to work and if done correctly it can provide for higher density. The move from the term regional business is good, he said. However, the aspect of regional business is a part of the equation and should be a part of the end result, whatever it is called.

b) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, commented that land use planning is the single most important thing in the City and opposed the ordinance. The ordinance, according to her, is so descriptive in its detail that it makes it impossible for developers. She said the City cannot restrict developers to 45, 55, or 100-foot setbacks, or require outlets for electric cars. All of these restrictions makes this ordinance onerous. However, if the Council decides to proceed, she urged Councilmember Way to recuse herself from the discussion and decision. This item will become before the Council and the electorate has asked that Councilmember Way recuse herself. If this decision takes as long as November 12, she felt the decision should be delayed and the moratorium extended until next year. She stated that this is a land use action that affects the entire City and it is being rushed through prior to the election.

c) Bob Ransom, Shoreline, said the original Council goals included the river walk model for the Interurban Trail and it would be an incentive to businesses to have access to the trail, which isn't included in the legislation. He added that allowing an additional 10 feet in height along the trail encourages this type of walk and felt that it is still a very valid idea. He said the City also needs to think about property taxes and how to keep them down. He commented that developers don't want to build here because of the height restrictions, but it would decrease the tax burden. Development on Aurora Avenue is important to raise the City's assessed value, he concluded.

d) Pat Murray, Shoreline, opposed Mr. Ransom's remarks. He said quality of life trumps business interests and pushing parking impacts into neighborhoods is unconscionable. The City, he said, needs to create significant financial penalties if developers fail to meet the City's standards. He asked why there is no discussion about building depth requirements in addition to height requirements.

e) Sue Melville, Shoreline, asked if the 45, 55, and 65-foot height restrictions included the extra 15 feet for utilities and elevators. She asked about restrictions on cell phone towers and other structures. She questioned if the City is on track to ensure there are adequate utilities that will serve everyone, new and old. She wondered if the Planning and Development Services Department (PADS) is taking steps to protect adjacent property from erosion and flooding during construction. She added that she didn't receive notice of the Overland Trailer Park development, which is unusual because she is an adjacent property owner.

f) Boni Biery, Shoreline, commented that sometimes she receives notices and sometimes she doesn't. She stated that she is concerned about the amount of outside open public space in Shoreline. If the City's population increases, that ratio goes down, and one open space requirement is not enough. She asked what would happen to current RB zoned properties that are adjacent to single family residential properties. She assumed the zoning would change for those types of properties, but she wondered how it would happen.

Mr. Cohn responded to the public comments. He highlighted that page 3(c) allows developers to erect buildings up to 45 feet in height; Top Foods is one example of this. He didn't see the proposal as restrictive but as making a better transition between intense commercial and single family residential. Mayor Ryu commented that this was like taking a "wedding cake approach" to this issue. Mr. Olander added that if there was an existing RB structure within 100 feet, the height would be non-conforming.

Commissioner Hall stated that there is tremendous value in having more open space. He pointed out that most of the RB zone fronts or backs along the Interurban Trail. He noted that there is a huge utility corridor there and felt with that huge asset, trying to use the remaining land more efficiently would work out fine. He said that they ended up with a compromise.

Councilmember Hansen stated that being able to put an 86,000 square foot structure on an acre is a little misleading because there are units involved that require square feet of open space to include zero setbacks. He commented that this is probably a three story, 35-foot tall building.

Councilmember McGlashan discussed the Stephens letter and it recommended a 50 foot setback from residential zones, or a tiered setback. Councilmember McGlashan looked at page 4 and read the information concerning buffers between residential and adjacent buildings. Mr. Szafran further explained that this information refers to the current code requirement of 20 foot setbacks from single family.

Councilmember Way thanked the Commission and public for all the amazing work. She asked for some visual examples of open space requirements. Additionally, she noted the difference between items d (2) and d (3) and said there is nothing in d (3) about open space. Mr. Cohn explained that the requirements in d (2) also apply to d (3).

Councilmember Way inquired about the differences in the definitions of common open space and recreational space. Commissioner Hall stated that there are two different parts of open space requirements. One would be public open space which is available to the general public, and the other is the 40 square feet per unit space requirement which could be private. Mr. Cohn stated that the administrative design review considers usable open space. Some, he explained, could be used in setbacks, but most of it has to be in used in big "chunks." Referring to page 94, Councilmember Way said she is concerned about the removal of trees under exemption in 20.50.310 (5). She also noted that the 8-foot fence requirement should be done away with because it is important to have connectivity between neighbors and neighboring properties.

Deputy Mayor Scott complimented the Commission staff and stated this isn't going to please everyone. He said it comes very close though and he likes what he sees. He said these are the best regulations he has seen that respect the single family neighborhoods. He pointed out that the Aurora corridor is 88% of the City's tax base. He questioned how the City would ensure the corridor is not overcome with residential housing and loses opportunities for large retail. Additionally, he asked if there is potential for the Aurora corridor to shift to MUZ with small retail development.

Commissioner Hall replied that there is a scarcity of large parcels on Aurora for people to build residential housing. Additionally, there is a 10-foot height limit for buildings that are designed to accommodate commercial uses. This, he stated, will provide an incentive and a step in the right direction. Mr. Olander commented that this is a critical issue to consider and he would like to reexamine it again as the City looks at Town Center and subarea plans along Aurora Avenue. There should be protections for medium to large parcels. Deputy Mayor Scott said the issue of noticing is important too and there must be a way to contact everyone.

Councilmember McGlashan discussed the items on page 2(d) and 3(d). He clarified that common recreational space can be inside, like a gym, but are not considered public gathering spaces outside. Mr. Cohn explained that the expectation is that these are separate and would be additive. He explained that if an apartment complex wanted to have a public gathering space, it could be gated or for the residents only. Mr. Cohn noted that apartment and condominium units would have to provide both types of open spaces and security. Mr. Olander noted that this is partially where design review comes in. He added that there is also security through environmental design.

Councilmember Hansen clarified that commercial and public space could be one in the same. Commissioner Hall concurred, if there is a place where the public could gather and sit, like Third Place Commons.

Mayor Ryu commented that the purpose of the moratorium was to respond to neighborhood concerns, and she felt it was the right direction. She added that one way to protect people is to inform them; she wanted to know if there is a better way to provide notice. She asked if there was a way to guarantee 85% notification and have better and bigger signage. She inquired about impact fees for connection to utilities and surface

water impact fees. She discussed other cities, design standards, administrative design review, and noted there would be more applications if developers knew staff would approve. She inquired if there could be "cookie cutter" processes generated. She also asked if there could be real examples of results with 50, 100, and 200 foot setbacks.

Councilmember Way highlighted page 90, item 2(c), which concerns landscaping and tree preservation for transition area setbacks. Mr. Cohn stated that this section only applies to R-4, R-6, and R-8 zones. Councilmember Way noted that the residents next to Top Foods have to go out to the street to get to the store, which doesn't really make sense. She hoped the City can find a way to address issues like pathways and have 4 and 5-star Built Green standards outlined. Mr. Olander asked for the Council to have their questions sent to the City staff by noon Thursday. He also thanked the Commission for their work.

Councilmember McConnell commented that this item is on the Council agenda for action next week and reminded the Council to write down their questions and get them to the City staff quickly. She said she would like to get rid of the moratorium.

Mayor Ryu asked if the Department of Ecology needed to be contacted or whether a SEPA review is required. Mr. Cohn responded that a SEPA review was done, and as people come in with projects additional SEPA reviews will be done.

RECESS

At 8:40 p.m., Mayor Ryu called for a five minute break. The meeting reconvened at 8:45 p.m.

(b) 2010 Budget - Presentations and Council Discussion

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, provided the staff report and reviewed the City departmental 2010 budget requests, including any significant changes between the 2009 budget and the 2010 proposed budget. She reviewed the following department budgets: City Council; City Manager; Community Services; City Clerk; City Attorney; Finance; Human Resources; Police; Criminal Justice (Jail & Court); Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services; Planning & Development Services. She noted that future budget workshops are planned for October 26 and November 2, and Attachment A to the staff report is a suggested schedule for topics that will be covered at each of these workshops. Public hearings on the budget will be held on October 26th and November 2nd. The hearing on November 2nd will have special emphasis on revenue sources and the 2010 property tax levy, and the budget is scheduled for adoption on November 23. She pointed out that copies of the budget are available online, at the libraries, City Hall, and the police neighborhood centers. Additionally, the budget is available for purchase in book form for \$27.00 or on CD for \$2.00 in the City Clerks office.

Ms. Tarry pointed out that revenues for 2009 were reduced by almost \$2 million primarily because of the recession. In response to that the City Council authorized a

budget reduction and to use some savings from the Revenue Stabilization Funds. She then reviewed the budget reductions and the 2010 salary and benefit cost changes for the City Council, City Manager, City Clerk, and Community Services departments. She noted that there are three fewer City positions than in the 2009 budget which has led to a savings of \$160,000. She also noted that the cost of benefits had decreased by 10% because of a reduction in the employer contribution rate for the State Retirement System. She then reviewed each department's budget in detail.

Councilmember Way inquired about the Customer Response Team (CRT) now that the lead position has been vacated. She wondered about their ability to respond to emergencies. Mr. Olander replied that they provide the immediate response to rain events and LaDonna Smith did the supervising. Randy Olin was promoted and it reduced administrative duties, but Randy still responds to service calls. Councilmember Way inquired about tracking and keeping records, and Mr. Olander replied that Randy and David will handle that piece. Councilmember Way questioned the interaction of code enforcement, emergency management, and CRT. Mr. Olander responded that there is good interaction and coordination between all four groups.

Ms. Tarry highlighted the specific changes in the proposed 2010 Budget, which is 2010 is over \$250,000 less than 2009. Mr. Olander clarified that even with the reductions the City will maintain its human service allocations. Ms. Tarry noted that the City Attorney budget is \$14,000 less than 2009 because of reductions in legal professional services.

Councilmember McGlashan asked about the key objectives on page 169 concerning the potential long term lease option for the City Hall building. Mr. Olander noted that long term means between five and ten years. Councilmember Way asked how much lease income might be derived from leasing the third floor. Mr. Olander replied that the lease rates have not been set yet and lease income is not included in the budget.

Councilmember Way stated that the City needs a voter drop box.

Ms. Tarry added that the current election year costs have been added to the 2009 budget. She continued and discussed contingencies.

Ms. Tarry then discussed the Finance budget of \$2.7 million dollars, which staffs nearly 18 FTEs. The reduction is based on some one-time expenditures that took place in 2009, such as network equipment upgrades, aerial photos for the City's GIS system, and one time funding for the move into the new City Hall.

Ms. Tarry reviewed the Human Resources budget. Mr. Olander noted that some of the City's support services are very low, such as the Human Resources Department and the City Attorney's office.

Ms. Tarry discussed the Police budget and stated that it is still financially effective to contract for police services with King County, even though it is \$9.9 million. Additionally, she commented that our per capita cost for police services is significantly

lower than many comparable cities with their own police department. Mr. Olander added that the residents have determined that police services are essential, so positions weren't cut. Councilmember Way said that she appreciated the street crimes unit and felt that the investment has paid off because the City's crime rate has decreased. Mayor Ryu questioned the 5.5% increase in the King County police services budget. Ms. Tarry responded that by contract the King County Sheriff's Office has to give the City its estimated increase amount by September of each year. Then, based on the King County Budget another figure is obtained. The contract, she explained, states that the City will pay the lower of the two figures. Additionally, the contract states that the officers will have a 5% annual cost of living increase over the next five years. Ms. Tarry added that this budget also includes the municipal court costs and the public defender. She noted that the 2010 budget totals \$1.5 million and shows a decrease from 2009 as a result of a reduction in the number of jail days as well as alternative sentencing.

Ms. Tarry then outlined the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Service (PRCS) budget. In 2010, the PRCS budget totals just over \$4.3 million and includes parks maintenance, recreation programming, pool, and the public arts fund. The programming portion of this budget has been reduced by \$120,000 when compared to the 2009 budget.

Councilmember Way questioned the increases in irrigation reflected in the packet. Ms. Tarry responded that the City staff underestimated the cost of water in the parks this year. Councilmember Way asked if there was any way to look at it again and determine how much watering needs to take place. She stated that reducing water use is in line with the Council goals. Mr. Olander stated he would continue to monitor this and possibly utilize more drought-tolerant plants. Councilmember Hansen commented that the summer was warm and dry, but rainfall for this year is up.

Ms. Tarry discussed PRCS user fees. She noted that the PRCS staff is anticipating a slight increase in revenue in 2010 due to athletic field rentals. She noted that revenues from the pool are slightly lower due to the recession and the YMCA. Additionally, Lake Forest Park has terminated its use agreement with the City which means all Lake Forest Park residents will have to begin paying the "non-resident" fee when utilizing Shoreline's facilities and parks.

Mr. Tarry reviewed the \$2.6 million Planning and Development Services (PADS) budget with 24.1 FTEs. She noted that this budget has been reduced from 2009. She explained that the department has also made reductions in office supplies and printing/binding. Ms. Tarry highlighted that there was a carryover of \$53,000 that was brought from the 2009 budget. She added that the City staff is projecting to collect a little more than \$700,000 in development revenue in 2009, which is about half of what the City collected in 2007. For 2010, the estimate is a little more than \$800,000 in development revenue.

Mayor Ryu questioned the use of code abatement funds; Ms. Tarry responded that it was established with general fund money. It was set aside to be used when the City needs to do code abatement work, which would be refunded through liens against the property or payment by the offender.

Ms. Tarry summarized the budget and Mr. Olander encouraged the Council to email the City staff with questions. He noted that the budget is tight and there have been a lot of reductions from 2009 to 2010, but the Council has set aside reserves to help maintain services during recessions.

Councilmember McGlashan inquired about animal control and asked to know where those figures fit into the budget. Mr. Olander responded that the City is looking at a number of options regarding animal control, which may present an opportunity to improve animal control in Shoreline.

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

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:54 p.m. Mayor Ryu declared the meeting adjourned.

/S/ Scott Passey, City Clerk