

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, November 25, 2019
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor Hall, Deputy Mayor McConnell, Councilmembers McGlashan, Scully, Chang, Robertson, and Roberts

ABSENT: None.

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:00 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor Hall who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

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

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Debbie Tarry, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Scully said the emphasis of the recent Salmon Recovery Meeting was to report on the continued decline of Coho. He said there is no action for Shoreline to take at this time since the identified causes that prevent salmon from reaching maturity are increases in lake temperatures and predation.

Councilmember McGlashan said he was one of several Councilmembers who attended the National League of Cities (NLC) Conference in San Antonio, Texas. He attended a class on regulations for Airbnb's, which he suggested the Council add as a future discussion. He reported that many of the available sessions focused on affordable housing. He said while there he realized that the NLC has not taken a solid stand on climate change, and that he came away with the suggestion to appoint a staff member as a volunteer coordinator as on the Emergency Management Team.

Mayor Hall said Senator Jesse Salomon and Representative Cindy Ryu from the 32nd District Delegation joined the Council at tonight's dinner meeting for a discussion on Shoreline's 2020 Legislative Priorities.

Councilmember Roberts recapped his experiences at the NLC Conference. He reiterated Councilmember McGlashan's statement that the NLC has not taken an explicit stance on climate change. He offered that the Energy, Environment and Natural Resource Committee passed a resolution titled "Supporting and Advancing Resilient Communities to Prepare for Changing Climate and Extreme Weather Events", stating there is some momentum behind the issue. He said he attended a panel on Equity and Housing, which included an eye opening report and was a valuable source of information.

Deputy Mayor McConnell said at the NLC conference she spent much of her time involved with Board duties. She said that while she is completing her second term on the Board of Directors, there is still great representation from the State of Washington. Deputy Mayor McConnell offered that she is planning to apply for the Transportation Committee. With the passage of State Initiative 976 (I-976), she said she is passionate about trying to make sure the City is a well-informed and active participant in conversations on the Initiative's repercussions. She said she values the conversations and connections with other elected officials that the conference provides.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Peter Bocek, Seattle resident and architect, spoke regarding townhouse design standards. He shared his professional design experience in Shoreline. He said from a development perspective, adopting these amendments will make common midblock single lot development economically infeasible, neighborhood density will decrease, housing costs will increase because of more expensive development associated with the new rules and requirements, and much needed housing will be slower to come to market as stakeholders adjust to new costs.

Jack Malek, Shoreline resident and Planning Commissioner for Shoreline, addressed townhouse design standards. He said he agrees with most of Mr. Bocek's comments and said the goal of achieving higher density should be supported and maintained, and any delays implemented should be carefully evaluated, since changes will create hardships for developers and homeowners. He said he supports adopting the standards as recommended by staff.

Erik Eckstrom, Lake Forest Park resident, said that as a townhouse developer and someone who grew up in Shoreline, he is proud to be both personally and professionally invested in the City. He said that he agrees the Shoreline Municipal Code needs to do a better job addressing residential development that falls between single family detached and apartment housing. He thanked the City and Planning Commission for the outreach done to stakeholders; suggested Council consider any changes to the code in totality and context of the overall set of regulations; expressed concern that the proposal will restrict the yield of quality developments; and elaborated that well intentioned code is often written through a narrow lens which results in rigid and narrow application. He concluded that the City should strive for flexibility to meet the intent of the code without creating unintended consequences and recommended revisions.

Joseph Irons, Shoreline resident and business owner, reminded the Council that his Comprehensive Plan Amendments would be coming before Council next week. He referenced the local support behind his business and asked that the Council help make it work so his

business can continue in its current Shoreline location. He said there are some deed restrictions on his properties and that would prohibit certain types of businesses on the property.

Melissa Irons, Shoreline resident and business owner, spoke on Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 3. She explained that a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would allow her business to continue operations while mitigating neighbor concerns. She said that although it would only partly meet the company's needs, they want to be flexible. She reviewed the CUP criteria, explained how her business meets it, and asked Council to make an informed decision that would allow her business to continue to operate in the current location.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Councilmember McGlashan and seconded by Councilmember Robertson and unanimously carried, 7-0, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:

- (a) Approving Minutes of Regular Meeting of October 28, 2019
Approving Minutes of Special Meeting of November 11, 2019**

- (b) Approving Expenses and Payroll as of November 8, 2019 in the Amount of
\$5,425,218.36**

***Payroll and Benefits:**

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
9/22/19-10/5/19	10/11/2019	87578-87836	16722-16751	76391-73696	\$714,207.29
10/6/19-10/19/19	10/25/2019	87837-88100	16752-16775	76578-76585	\$926,083.73
Q3 2019 (L&I)	10/31/2019			76576	\$75,961.88
Q3 2019 (ESD)	10/31/2019			76577	\$18,863.39
					<u>\$1,735,116.29</u>

***Wire Transfers:**

Expense Register Dated	Wire Transfer Number	Amount Paid
10/25/2019	1152	\$8,408.90
10/31/2019	1153	\$1,904.83
		<u>\$10,313.73</u>

***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
10/15/2019	76320	76348	\$466,520.79
10/15/2019	76349	76373	\$198,456.65
10/16/2019	75674	75674	(\$543.65)
10/16/2019	76374	76374	\$543.65
10/16/2019	74031	74031	(\$15.25)
	76060	76060	(\$358.00)
10/16/2019	76375	76390	\$6,960.09
10/21/2019	76397	76397	\$2,576.80
10/21/2019	76398	76399	\$72,211.38
10/21/2019	76400	76400	\$2,745.00
10/23/2019	76401	76421	\$298,224.01
10/23/2019	76422	76440	\$700,345.11
10/23/2019	76441	76443	\$303.00
10/23/2019	76444	76464	\$1,170,452.38
10/23/2019	76465	76475	\$1,769.05
10/30/2019	76476	76506	\$320,352.56
10/30/2019	76507	76543	\$754.85
10/30/2019	76544	76565	\$25,201.18
10/30/2019	76566	76575	\$185,306.41
10/31/2019	66506	66506	(\$12.00)
	67729	67789	(\$68.98)
	67883	67883	(\$159.00)
	68465	68466	(\$20.25)
11/6/2019	76586	76614	\$134,276.74
11/6/2019	76615	76659	\$1,970.51
11/6/2019	76660	76680	\$84,126.72
11/7/2019	76681	76684	\$7,868.59
			<u>\$3,679,788.34</u>

(c) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Professional Services Contract with Stewart, MacNichols, Harmell, Inc., P.S. for Public Defense Services through December 31, 2024 in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,403,440

(d) Authorizing the City Manager to renew an Interlocal Agreement for Inmate Housing with the South Correctional Entity (SCORE) through December 31, 2024

8. ACTION ITEMS

(a) Adopting Ordinance No. 872 - Amending the 2019-2020 Biennial Budget by Increasing Appropriations in Certain Funds

Sara Lane, Administrative Services Director; and Rick Kirkwood, Budget Supervisor; delivered the staff presentation. Ms. Lane outlined the previous discussions and actions regarding the Ordinance and reviewed the amendments that were incorporated after the November 18, 2019 Council Meeting. She displayed a table reflecting the budgetary impact of Ordinance No. 872 as amended. She explained that the City is required to adopt a balanced budget, which Shoreline does by adopting an ordinance of expenditure appropriations. She shared data on the actual impact on appropriations the amendments to the Ordinance will make and said with the inclusion of all amendments the biennial budget would be \$218,260,487 Million.

Ms. Lane stated that prior to tonight's scheduled adoption of the Ordinance, Council is being asked to consider two separate amendments. The first is a staff recommended amendment that would add Exhibit D to the Ordinance which details the impacts of the amendment revenues and expenditures. The second potential amendment would provide one-time budget reductions to address the impacts of I-976. She explained the difference between the appropriations that could be reduced and the savings the City would set aside for future use. She displayed the proposed amendment language and explained the method in which the Council could further amend the proposal.

Councilmember Scully requested additional description of the staff recommended amendments to add Exhibit D to the Ordinance, and Ms. Lane walked Council through the table. Mayor Hall described the historical steps of budget adoption and the budget documentation that accompanies the Ordinance. He offered that this table stemmed from his request to see the line items reflecting the revenue lost with the passage of I-976. It was confusing to him from a transparency perspective to not see the lost revenue. He said the impact of I-976 will not be felt this year because the current plan is to use fund balance and grant revenue to continue to do some of the transportation projects. Mayor Hall said this table is an attempt by staff to demonstrate where the revenues come from and where they go. Ms. Lane said there is no impact to not adopting the table. She said from a public transparency perspective it provides good information, and all of the detail is included in staff reports and presentation. Councilmember Scully said he recommends using the table as an advocacy tool but not to adopt it, in fear of inadvertent inconsistencies. Councilmember Roberts agreed that the table would be helpful as reference.

Mayor Hall pointed out that since this is the first go-around with a biennial budget, it is the first time the revenue amendments have not been in front of them. He said the advantage to a biennial budget is to avoid doing all of the budget preparation annually, but it made him realize that it means the budget book available to the public does not reflect all the updates. He said it would be his preference that there is documentation available that demonstrates how the failure of I-976 affects the revenues and fund balance.

The Councilmembers discussed the procedure to budget amendments.

Councilmember Chang confirmed that the motion on the table does not include the budget amendments recommended by the City Manager. Councilmember Chang said she would like to have a discussion about the list, because she does not know what she would eliminate from it. Ms. Lane reviewed the City Manager's proposed options for reductions and described each one.

Councilmember Roberts asked for the cost of snow equipment rental in 2019 and Ms. Lane explained that the dollar amount was not significant; the issue was the equipment used was not intended for winter snow, which left employees running it exposed to the elements.

Councilmember Scully moved to amend Ordinance No. 872 to reduce the amendment appropriations by \$940,922 as presented on Table 3 and consistent with the notes in the staff report for items one through five and seven and direct staff to ensure all other savings totaling \$376,200 are placed on hold pending future Council action. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Robertson.

Councilmember Scully moved to strike items one and two from the preceding amendment to the motion. Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor McConnell and Councilmembers Scully, Robertson, Roberts, and McGlashan, expressed support for the amendment.

Councilmember Scully explained that most of the items are not actual expenditures yet, so this amendment would free up revenue to fix potholes and sidewalks while preserving the snow removal equipment purchases. He said he would have preferred snow removal to be done through a contract with an outside company, but he understands that that possibility does not exist.

Councilmember Robertson clarified that by striking items one and two, it supports the purchases they reflect.

Mayor Hall said he would not be supporting the amendment to the amendment because it is a \$300,000 overreaction to a rare snow event. He said the costs to maintain the equipment are high, whether the equipment is used or not.

Councilmember Chang said she is concerned with making such a big investment right now. She would be ok with the purchase of a snowplow blade and spreader attachments but would not feel comfortable supporting the entire amount.

Deputy Mayor McConnell stated that the City has a responsibility to the health and safety of the residents. She said she believes that catastrophic weather conditions are likely to continue, and snow response preparedness is important.

Councilmember Roberts clarified that the ongoing funds for the items in one and two would be going toward the Vehicle Replacement Fund.

The motion to amend the amendment passed, 5-2, with Mayor Hall and Councilmember Chang voting no.

Councilmember Roberts asked if paving the Highland Plaza Storage construction site, to create temporary parking until construction occurred, would generate additional costs. Ms. Lane said no, since the planned storage facility would not require foundation work.

Councilmember Robertson said she is concerned with item three in the list, which transfers the Sound Transit Construction Easement revenue away from parks funding. She said she is interested in preserving money for parks.

Councilmember Robertson moved to strike item three from the preceding amendment to the motion. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.

Councilmember Robertson explained that Sound Transit's work has drastically changed the Ridgecrest neighborhood and it is significantly impacting the Ridgecrest Park, so if that money was intended to mitigate the construction destruction that is happening as a result of the Light Rail expansion, she feels the money needs to stay there.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if the money is currently designated for a specific park. Ms. Lane said at this point it would be transferred into the General Capital Fund where it would be designated for as of yet unidentified parks projects. She said that determining the use would be part of the next Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) update. Ms. Tarry explained that the funds provided are in compensation for the construction easement but there are no restrictions on use. She added that it is her recommendation that the money be dedicated for park improvements, but it is not funding to mitigate changes to parks.

Mayor Hall said he will not be supporting this amendment because he prefers taking the precautionary approach of shrinking the budget until they have a better idea of the big picture. He commented that as they have conversations on how to backfill the hole in the transportation budget, the Council will also need to discuss how to try to address the voter identified need for the Shoreline Recreation, Aquatics, and Community Center and Parks Improvements, since the majority of voters supported the Ballot measure but it failed to meet the 60% threshold for passage.

Deputy Mayor McConnell asked if the Council could designate the revenues from Item Three for parks tonight. Ms. Lane explained that as it is proposed in the amendment, a portion of the money was earmarked for the parks budget, but the specific projects had not yet been identified.

Councilmember Robertson replied that while she made a strong case for improvements to Ridgecrest Park, even without specific allocations, keeping money available for parks improvements is a general concept she supports.

Councilmember Roberts confirmed that the City Manager's recommendation keeps the easement revenue in the general fund, but the main motion would eliminate the transfer and funds would be held for future use. Councilmember Robertson's amendment to the amendment would retain the funds in the General Capital Fund. Mayor Hall summarized that a vote in favor of this amendment to the amendment would retain in the proposed budget the authority for this portion of money to be transferred into the General Capital Fund.

The motion to amend the amendment passed, 4-3, with Mayor Hall and Councilmembers Chang and Scully voting no.

Mayor Hall restated the amendment on the table as a motion to amend Ordinance No. 872 to reduce the amendment appropriations by the amount of the items as presented in Table 3 and consistent with the notes in the staff report for items one through five and seven, with the exception of items one, two, and three and direct staff to ensure other savings are placed on hold pending future Council action.

The motion to amend the amendment passed 6-1, with Councilmember Roberts voting no.

Councilmember Roberts moved to direct the City Manager or her designee to make the necessary revisions to Ordinance No. 872 to incorporate amendments adopted by Council. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGlashan, and passed unanimously, 7-0

Mayor Hall said he will be voting against the main motion because the Council has an opportunity to cut \$1.3 Million out of the budget in an attempt to start balancing a bigger deficit. He commented that he is very concerned about having the ability to deliver on both transportation projects and the parks and pool facilities that the community wants.

The main motion passed, 6-1, with Mayor Hall voting no.

9. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Discussing Ordinance No. 871 – Townhouse Design Standards Development Code Amendments

Catie Lee, Associate Planner, delivered the staff presentation. She thanked the members of the public who shared their perspectives during the Public Comment period. Ms. Lee stated that the Subarea Plans for both Shoreline Light Rail Station areas envision townhouses as part of the mix of housing options. She said the vision for both areas is to “create a walkable, safe, healthy, and livable place for people of all ages and cultures...” and described the ways in which the townhouses depicted in the Subarea Plans reinforce this vision. She said townhouses have been an allowed use since the City’s incorporation, with increased usage since the Light Rail Station rezoning. She displayed a graph of the townhouse permitting trends that depicts the dramatic increase in approved units.

Ms. Lee stated that the City’s current design standards for townhouses are better suited for small apartment buildings. She said it is important that townhouse developments be appropriately designed to be both functional and desirable places to live. She said the overarching goal of the proposed amendments is to yield quality townhouse developments that add value to the community and enhance the pedestrian experience. She reviewed the project development process, which included research, stakeholder meetings, a community survey, a public workshop, study sessions and a public hearing with the Planning Commission, prior to tonight’s discussion.

Ms. Lee reviewed the proposed standards and said they work together as a package to prioritize pedestrians and enhance and beautify sites at a human scale. She described details of the

recommendations for outdoor spaces, landscaping, building design, site configuration and building orientation.

Councilmember Roberts confirmed the impact on requirements if two side-by-side lots were combined versus left separate, and Ms. Lee explained the application process for combining properties.

Ms. Lee said the Planning Commission recommendation is to adopt the proposed amendments in Ordinance No. 871, and the staff recommendation is to adopt the proposed Code as presented at the October 3, 2019 Public Hearing. She displayed the policy discussion topics and reiterated that the staff recommendation to retain the original language proposed at the October 3, 2019 Planning Commission meeting stems from the vision to create a human scale relationship with the street. She described how the decision will impact narrow lot, mid-block property owners. Over time the City-proposed regulations will ensure that townhouse developments are oriented street side but accepting the Planning Commission recommendation would mean that mid-block lots would maintain the perpendicular orientation to the street currently seen in the City.

Ms. Lee said if the Council were to adopt the Planning Commission recommendation, staff recommends three changes and gave examples for each of them:

- Changing the definition of “Mixed Single Family Attached Development” to reduce the requirement that 70% of the units have to be attached to at least 60% (to permit developments with three units on the parcel).
- In MUR-45’ areas, require building variation on front of building and side that faces the access drive.
- In MUR-45’ areas, waive the landscaping requirement on interior setback that does not abut vehicle access.

Ms. Lee stated that after tonight’s discussion, the next step is the scheduled Council adoption on January 13, 2020.

Councilmember Robertson asked how any changes would impact the applications currently under review. Ms. Lee said there would be no impact on any completed application.

Councilmember Robertson said she is willing to sacrifice a slightly slower development rate in order to preserve the City’s design vision.

Councilmember Chang asked for an explanation of the decision to allow the same site configuration and building orientation in both MUR-35’ and MUR-45’ zones, rather than continuing to allow the front facing configuration on midblock lots. Ms. Lee explained that in MUR-45’, single family detached homes are not a permitted use and after conversation with the Planning Commissioners, this is the compromise that was reached. Councilmember Chang said she likes the improved aesthetics and said it encourages massing of properties. She asked what the tree retention requirements in MUR-35’ are. Ms. Lee said that 20 percent of significant sized trees have to be retained.

Councilmember Scully asked for staff to create a simple chart depicting the key differences between the Planning Commission recommendation and the staff recommendation to facilitate the next discussion. He asked how many lots in the Subareas are less than 70' in width, Ms. Lee said in her sample research most were platted at 60' wide. Councilmember Scully said he thinks that a significant portion of the lots will fall within this designation, so the decision being made is a crucial one and asked for staff to determine a number. He recognized that the standards need to be amended, but said he is inclined to keep the time frame short to minimize impact on the development process. Mayor Hall said he would be comfortable moving the adoption sooner and agreed that a comparison chart listing the Planning Commission and staff recommendations side-by-side would be very helpful. He said he does not want to accelerate the conversion of every lot to a townhouse, since he would like to see small businesses in the area, as well.

Councilmember McGlashan said he likes the Planning Commission recommendations, particularly the building orientation facing the street. He said he hears feedback from the community on townhomes without this orientation. He asked staff if there are any legal issues in delaying the effective date. Margaret King, City Attorney, said Washington has generous vesting laws, so the only risk would be that more developers would be allowed to vest under the old regulations.

Councilmember Roberts asked if there is any flexibility with design options and Ms. Lee explained the administrative design review process that affords the opportunity to apply for flexibility in configurations based on the constraints of the lot while articulating a narrative of how the purpose of the Code is being met.

Councilmember Roberts asked if there is a way to allow shared driveways across properties. Ms. Lee replied that shared access is preferred since curb and driveway cuts disturb the pedestrian environments and explained the benefits to this option.

Councilmember Roberts requested an amendment be drafted for 25% frontage requirements, rather than the current 30%, for when this discussion returns to Council. He said he does not think there should be a delay, and he would like to see it return on December 9, 2019. Deputy Mayor McConnell agreed that she would rather not delay adoption, since the amendments provide aesthetic improvements. She asked if there was any flexibility for development design on a lone midblock lot at 60' or under if both sides are already developed, and Ms. Lee said this situation would be an opportunity for the administrative design review process, which allows staff to negotiate the best possible outcome for the particular property and project.

Mayor Hall asked what the development options are in MUR 35' and MUR 45' zones. Ms. Lee listed the possibilities and described some of the development in the works. Mayor Hall recognized that an objective of the rezone was to permit mixed uses, and so far there has only been residential development. He asked if it is easier to meet good design standards on larger lots. Ms. Lee said that more space allows for accommodation of all the considerations. Mayor Hall asked what form of development has the higher unit count. She explained that apartments generally allow the highest density, while townhouses are held to the row house configuration,

with less variation in square footage. She added that the parking requirement is more stringent for apartments.

Mayor Hall asked which form of housing achieves more walkability and Ms. Lee explained that the most density intense uses would likely be closer to the station areas, with a broader mix as you move further out. She said in order to get the commercial uses, which the City is not yet seeing, a critical mass of density is needed. Mayor Hall asked which form of housing is the most affordable and was told apartments due to the affordable housing requirements in the Subarea. He reiterated that the vision for the Subareas is for mixed use, not to build townhouses on every lot.

Mayor Hall said that since the open space requirement increases as a project becomes larger, he is worried the recommendations create an incentive to do multiple smaller projects instead of a larger singular project. He stated that he wants to avoid creating design standards that force an aggregation of projects and then creates an incentive to split them back up. Ms. Lee described the Planning Commission's thought process in drafting the amendment. Mayor Hall asked for an amendment to consider using the same open space standard regardless of unit count and said he would send staff draft language once he determined it.

Upon being asked for a description of 'private outdoor space', Ms. Lee explained the possibilities and the minimum lineal requirements to allow the space to function as an amenity. Councilmember Roberts expressed a preference that ground level outdoor spaces be common, rather than private.

Councilmember Roberts asked if it was best practice to put images in the code. Ms. Lee said her personal opinion is that illustrations help to clearly enhance the text of the requirement.

The Councilmembers discussed with staff the best approach for taking action and the motion language that would be most helpful in amending the proposal. It was agreed that staff would draft language for individual amendments to the Ordinance when it returns as an action item, and after conversation it was agreed it should return on January 6, 2020.

(b) Discussing the 2020 State Legislative Priorities

James Hammond, Intergovernmental Program Manager, delivered the staff presentation. Mr. Hammond stated that proposed 2020 Priorities carry over themes from 2019 but focus on the points of interest to Shoreline. Mr. Hammond said that Debora Munguia is the City's new advocate for support in Olympia, and he gave an overview of her background and credentials. He explained that the role of Legislative Priorities is to provide clear direction to City representatives, to convey consistent information about City priorities, and give policy guidance. Mr. Hammond stated that the recent passage of I-976 will likely play a major role in legislative activity/focus during the 2020 Session and he described the 2020 legislative environment.

Mr. Hammond listed the Shoreline-specific priorities of transportation funding support for the 148th Street pedestrian/bike bridge and project visibility for the North 145th/I-5 Interchange in future transportation packages and described the status of both projects. He said that additional

City-specific interests include continuing to advocate for Shoreline's goals and interest in the redevelopment of the Fircrest Campus and working for amendments to state laws on annexation in partnership with the Town of Woodway. He said the broader Shoreline policy interests include transportation policy changes for new resources and funding, supporting City fiscal health, continuing to promote incentives/resources to address homelessness and affordable housing, offering tax-increment financing options to support economic development, and to continue to advocate for regional and cross jurisdictional ways to address fish-blocking culvert issues and issues related to climate change. He shared information on upcoming Legislative events.

Councilmember Scully said some of the priorities stated are too broad, and in the future he would like to drill down on what staff should focus on. Mr. Hammond replied that as a document, the priorities list is meant to be policy guidance, but not a workplan.

Councilmember Roberts requested four amendments to the list:

1. Change 'Shoreline-Specific Interests' to 'Shoreline-Specific Priorities'
2. Add a priority to restore the Transportation Benefit District Authority to Councilmanic Vehicle License Fees
3. Move the Annexation work from the Shoreline-Specific section to the Legislative Issues section
4. Amend "pursue a comprehensive set of transportation policies that provide new financial resources and local funding options" to conclude with the phrase "to cities in metropolitan planning organizations".

Mayor Hall agreed that Councilmember Roberts' fourth amendment is consistent with the City's belief that the more money that flows to regional transportation organizations, instead of the Washington State Department of Revenue means the funding would be put to better use on local projects.

Councilmembers generally agreed that Councilmember Roberts' suggested amendments No. 1, 2, and 4 should be included when the Ordinance returns to Council, but that his suggested amendment No. 3 would remain on the Shoreline-Specific Priority List within the Priorities. It was agreed to see this next as a Consent item.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:49 p.m., Mayor Hall declared the meeting adjourned.

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk