

CITY OF SHORELINE

**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING**

Monday, February 11, 2013
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Eggen, Councilmember Hall, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember Winstead, Councilmember Salomon, and Councilmember Roberts.

ABSENT: none

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:08 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor McGlashan, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor McGlashan led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

3. REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER

Julie Underwood, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Winstead reported on a Celebrate Shoreline citizens' committee and on a Council of Neighborhoods meeting. Deputy Mayor Eggen provided a report on the Municipal Solid Waste Advisory Committee, and Councilmember Reports reported on the reopening of plans to discuss transfer stations. Councilmember McConnell reported on a Regional Water Quality meeting.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Jerry Patterson, Shoreline, commented on the City's negotiating strategy and the traffic corridor workshops regarding the Point Wells development.

b) Ginny Scantlebury, Shoreline, expressed concerns about the City's negotiating strategy and the traffic that will be created by the Point Wells development.

c) Dennis Casper, Shoreline, expressed concerns about several aspects of the Point Wells development and urged the City to focus on the things it can control.

d) Zach Hiatt, Shoreline, on behalf of Save Richmond Beach, urged the City to encourage the State Supreme Court to take review of the Point Wells vesting lawsuit as an amicus party in order to increase the chance of success.

e) Tom Jamieson, Shoreline, commented on the need for citizens to monitor their government through such laws as the Open Public Meetings Act and the Public Records Act.

f) Dave White, Shoreline, discussed the impacts of the potential traffic volumes that could result from the Point Wells development.

Mayor McGlashan then introduced newly-appointed King County Councilmember Rob Dembrowski, who provided brief remarks.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Winstead and unanimously carried, the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Winstead and unanimously carried, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:

(a) Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of January 28, 2013 Minutes of Business Meeting of January 28, 2013

(b) Approval of expenses and payroll as of January 31, 2013 in the amount of \$1,494,931.87 as specified in the following detail:

***Payroll and Benefits:**

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
1/6/13-1/19/13	1/25/2013	48748-48942	12288-12312	52635-52642	\$544,359.82
					<u>\$544,359.82</u>

***Wire Transfers:**

Expense Register Dated	Wire Transfer Number	Amount Paid
1/28/2013	1064	\$2,938.05
		<u>\$2,938.05</u>

***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
1/22/2013	52500	52501	\$52,785.36
1/24/2013	52502	52505	\$41,026.24
1/24/2013	52506	52517	\$19,799.74
1/24/2013	52518	52529	\$16,317.13
1/24/2013	52530	52569	\$382,987.06
1/30/2013	52570	52594	\$105,530.38
1/30/2013	52595	52610	\$24,953.56
1/30/2013	52611	52623	\$239,100.66
1/30/2013	52624	52632	\$9,513.97
1/30/2013	52633	52633	\$55,039.90
1/30/2013	52622	52622	(\$2,000.00)
1/30/2013	52634	52634	\$1,000.00
1/31/2013	52643	52643	\$1,580.00
			<u>\$947,634.00</u>

(c) Motion to adopt the Echo Lake Master Plan

At 7:39 p.m., Councilmember Hall recused himself from the Point Wells Update and left the meeting.

8. STUDY ITEMS**(a) Point Wells Update**

Debbie Tarry, Assistant City Manager, Rachael Markle, Planning and Development Services Director, and Mark Relph, Public Works Director, provided the staff report. Ms. Tarry highlighted the history, timeline, and significant events surrounding a proposal to develop Point Wells under an Urban Center land use designation, including the actions of Blue Square Real Estate (BSRE), Snohomish County, the City of Shoreline, the Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB), and the state legislature. She emphasized the City's limited influence in the Snohomish County development process. Ian Sievers, City Attorney, provided legal opinion regarding the City's strategy with respect to the citizen lawsuit, the Court of Appeals decision, the GMHB, and potential Supreme Court action.

Ms. Tarry outlined the City's letter of intent to pursue an interim agreement in order to mitigate short and long-term impacts and maintain quality of life and ongoing services. She outlined the alternatives that are deemed either illegal or not likely to be successful, such as blocking access, changing the street classification, or creating a park district.

Mr. Relph provided information on the transportation corridor study component of the interim agreement, which waives City opposition to traffic-related elements of the Snohomish County State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process in order to get traffic caps and other satisfactory mitigation and more public participation. He provided information related to traffic caps, traffic

counts, average daily trips, right-of-way, intersections, cut-through traffic, level of service (LOS) measurements, and the public outreach process.

Ms. Markle updated the Council on the Comprehensive Plan docket process and the Planning Commission's review, noting that now is the time to analyze the Point Wells impacts and agree to mitigation because it must be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Debbie Tarry summarized the following key milestones that would result as the process moves forward: 1) 2013 Comprehensive Plan docket; 2) Snohomish County EIS scoping; 3) Transportation Corridor Study; 4) Council review; 5) mitigation plan; 6) development/annexation agreement; 7) Comprehensive Plan approval process; 8) Planning Commission review; 9) adoption of Comprehensive Plan amendments; 10) Council approval of BSRE agreement; 11) approval of interlocal agreement with Snohomish County. Ms. Underwood, no agreement, might never be one. SEPA and EIS moving forward, if no agreement, that is all we'll have.

The Council responded to the staff report with questions, comments, and concerns. Councilmembers affirmed the legitimacy of citizen concerns in this matter and acknowledged Shoreline's limited options and difficult legal hurdles. There was general agreement that the City has little control over the development and is in a weak negotiating position. They clarified that the future steps, including the traffic corridor study and interlocal agreement, gives the City the best possible chance of mitigating the development impacts and providing some benefit. They urged the public to participate in the traffic corridor study in order to provide the strongest possible voice for mitigation.

Staff responded to Council questions regarding the goals of the public workshops and expressed the need to hear the public's concerns about road conditions, right-of-way, intersections, and cut-through traffic. There was a Council request for staff to provide concrete examples of the potential traffic volumes at the public workshops. Staff also responded about the need to include Point Wells in the Comprehensive Plan update because the agreement is based on the corridor study, which the Comprehensive Plan requires.

Staff responded to Council questions about the LOS calculations for estimated traffic volumes based on phased development as well as total project build-out over time. Following a brief discussion, staff concluded that the Snohomish County SEPA process will decide the LOS. Staff clarified that the City would seek a financial agreement as a backup in the event Snohomish County does not want annexation included in the agreement. It was noted that the developer is dependent on a functioning transportation network. Councilmembers requested staff to mail out a flyer to residents.

Mr. Sievers responded to questions about the City joining the lawsuit via an amicus brief to the Supreme Court. He offered opinion that if the City is a litigant it could hurt the negotiated agreement, although a Council motion or resolution might be persuasive. He clarified the intent of the agreement is to control the intensity of development in Snohomish County.

Mr. Relph responded to Council questions about peak hour traffic, traffic cap calculations, and the phased nature of the development process.

Due to the lateness of the hour, the Council postponed consideration of the 2012 Annual Traffic Report, the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program, and Discussion of the 2013-2014 Crime Prevention Workplan.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:38 p.m., Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk