

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, July 13, 2020
7:00 p.m.

Held Remotely via Zoom

PRESENT: Mayor Hall, Deputy Mayor Scully, Councilmembers McConnell, McGlashan, 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. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Deputy City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Debbie Tarry, City Manager, shared reminders of the COVID-19 precautions and guidance in place and gave an update on the phased reopening schedule for Shoreline Parks and Recreation, as well as reports and updates on various City meetings, projects and events.

Ms. Tarry welcomed King County guests Rod Dembowski, Councilmember; Leo Flor, Director of the Department of Community and Human Services; and Patty Hayes, Director of Public Health Seattle/King County. Councilmember Dembowski expressed appreciation to the City for the work and support in establishing the Shoreline Assessment and Recovery Center and reflected on the early efforts to site the Center. Mr. Flor expressed gratitude for the leadership demonstrated by Shoreline in helping establish the medical facility. Ms. Hayes shared details on the initial work to set up the facility and said it is important to reflect on the power of communities coming together in times of crisis and commended Shoreline's contributions. She thanked the City for helping communicate health messages during the pandemic. Mayor Hall said the Shoreline Councilmembers feel fortunate that they represent a welcoming community that cares so deeply about each other. He thanked the guests for their work at the regional level, helping to guide the City in its support of public health.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Roberts said he attended the Association of Washington Cities Annual Conference and shared information on the work done there. He reported on the Puget Sound Regional Council Annual meeting and described the actions taken at that meeting.

Councilmember Robertson reported attending the Puget Sound Regional Council Economic Development District Board and that they are working on updating their strategic plan for 2022. She said every aspect of the plan is being looked at through a COVID-19 filter and focusing on what being a 'region' means in this time of telecommuting. She said the relationship between public health and economic health was discussed. She also said she attended the first meeting of the North King County Shelter Task Force and shared details on the introductory conversations, and the group's desire to go beyond just creating a shelter to also helping provide a pathway to permanent housing.

Mayor Hall said he recently issued a proclamation for Childhood Cancer Awareness Month in September.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Dan Adams, Shoreline resident, shared his dissatisfaction on how the pool has been dealt with since the failure of the bond measure for a new Community and Aquatics Center and expressed his opinion that the current pool could continue to serve the community with maintenance. He asked for a technical reason for why the pool is beyond renovation.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

(a) Approving Minutes of Regular Meeting of May 18, 2020

(b) Approving Expenses and Payroll as of June 26, 2020 in the Amount of \$2,394,814.67

*Payroll and Benefits:

Payroll	Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount	Paid
	5/17/20-5/30/20	6/5/2020	91727-91924	16997-16998	79487-79492	\$774,831.13	
	5/31/20-6/13/20	6/19/2020	91925-92134	16999-17014	79581-79588	\$941,200.43	
						<u>\$1,716,031.56</u>	

*Wire Transfers:

Expense Register Dated	Wire Transfer Number	Amount Paid
6/24/2020	1162	\$13,577.37

\$13,577.37***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
6/9/2020	79409	79420	\$71,002.16
6/9/2020	79421	79446	\$4,395.46
6/9/2020	79447	79450	\$1,822.27
6/9/2020	79451	79469	\$17,171.14
6/9/2020	79470	79486	\$14,237.87
6/16/2020	79493	79503	\$32,097.59
6/16/2020	79504	79507	\$1,075.10
6/16/2020	79508	79528	\$22,430.47
6/16/2020	79529	79529	\$63,197.14
6/16/2020	79530	79533	\$49,143.89
6/16/2020	76793	76793	(\$2,245.50)
6/16/2020	79534	79534	\$2,245.50
6/22/2020	72074	72074	(\$1.70)
6/23/2020	79335	79559	\$187,338.11
6/23/2020	79560	79565	\$9,901.72
6/23/2020	79566	79580	\$191,394.52
			<u>\$665,205.74</u>

(c) Approving the Property Tax Exemption Program Contract for the 145th Street Apartment Project Located at 3108 NE 145th Street**(d) Approving the Coronavirus Relief Fund Subrecipient Grant Agreement with King County in the Amount of \$86,091 for Small Business Support Grant Funding****8. ACTION ITEMS****(a) Adopting Ordinance No. 890 - Amending the Shoreline Municipal Code Chapter 2.60 Purchasing Code**

Sara Lane, Administrative Services Director, delivered the staff presentation. Ms. Lane gave an overview of the Ordinance, explaining that this Chapter was adopted in 2001 and some of the monetary limits it established have not been updated since. She summarized that the proposed Ordinance adjusts monetary limits and makes housekeeping changes as detailed in the staff report. She described the recommended substantive changes to the purchasing thresholds. Ms. Lane responded to Council's questions from earlier discussion of the Ordinance, and shared factors contributing to the proposed threshold increases and the benefits the changes would bring. She said beginning in 2021 staff would generate a contract report to provide a summary of activity to the Council.

Councilmember Robertson moved to approve Ordinance No. 890. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Roberts.

Councilmember Robertson said that her experience working with staff has led her to have the utmost faith in their decision-making ability, and that while she appreciates the need for Council oversight, the types of purchases being discussed do not need to be micromanaged, so she is very comfortable with the changes the Ordinance makes.

Mayor Hall agreed that this Ordinance provides for oversight at the appropriate level and allows for efficient governance.

The motion was approved, 6-1, with Deputy Mayor Scully dissenting.

(b) Adopting Resolution No. 462 – Updating the Employee Handbook Furlough and Layoff Policy

Don Moritz, Human Resources Manager and Organizational Development Director, delivered the staff presentation. He explained that tonight's action is on the proposed revisions to the Employee Handbook sections regarding furloughs and layoffs. He reviewed the business need for the changes and explained the work environment has seen significant changes since the handbook language was written in 2011. He added that this is an appropriate time for revisions and review, especially considering the new legislation since the COVID-19 pandemic began. He stated that the City needs to take into account the possibility of implementing furloughs and layoffs in order to balance its budget and it is important to be equipped with all the tools available when facing tough decisions. He said it is important that policies related to reduction in force are up-to-date and compliant with the law, as well as offer maximum flexibility to the City Manager so that the City is positioned to navigate the current, and upcoming tough economic times.

He said that while the current handbook briefly mentions 'furlough' it does not define or clarify the policy or impacts, which these changes would do. Mr. Moritz described the proposed changes to the layoff policies, stating the substantive ones are: affirming the opportunity for the employee to meet with the decision maker prior to implementation of the layoff, adding the ability of the City Manager to transfer or offer a voluntary demotion to an employee when facing layoffs, and proposing a revision to the current severance payout.

Mr. Moritz described the current severance package and said that while the package is better than many jurisdictions, in considering whether or not to modify the package, it is a question of assessing what seems most fair and reasonable given the organizational values, whether it is financially sustainable, and if it is where the City wants to be positioned relative to other organizations. He shared data describing the current workforce tenure levels and said it is important to consider the costs if the City were to move to the proposed graduated severance package based on years of service. He said under the proposed severance package years of service are directly linked to the cash amount that an employee would receive if they were to be laid off. He displayed the originally proposed severance package and shared the rationale used in formulating it. He then described two alternatives to the package as presented in the staff report.

Mr. Moritz said a graduated severance package strives to represent a level of fairness by providing additional compensation based on commitment to the organization as demonstrated by years of service. He illustrated the differences between the alternative packages by using the six regular pool employees currently facing potential layoff as an example.

Mr. Moritz stated that staff recommends adoption of Resolution No. 462 as proposed.

Deputy Mayor Scully moved approval of the Resolution No. 462 as proposed by staff. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGlashan.

Deputy Mayor Scully moved to update the Employee Handbook as presented by staff in Exhibit A by deleting section 8(D)5 in its entirety and replacing it with the severance language set forth in Attachment B to the 7/13/2020 staff report. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Robertson.

Deputy Mayor said his concerns include fairness and cost. He said there is a significant increase in benefits between a new hire and someone who has been with the City for 20 years. He said the rationale being provided by staff for the difference is that it is more difficult for someone with more seniority to find a new job and he argued that this is not always true. He observed that more funds will already be provided to someone with greater seniority simply because their salary is higher. The existing policy provides four weeks of pay for everybody, which is fair across the board. Deputy Mayor Scully said, in terms of cost, Shoreline would be the lone comparable jurisdiction offering such a generous severance package. He said if the City is in the position to need to implement layoffs, giving someone three months of salary sends the wrong message. He encouraged the Council to amend the proposal to remove the changes to the severance package.

Councilmembers Chang, McGlashan, Roberts, McConnell, and Robertson expressed support for some version of a graduated severance package.

Councilmember Chang said it makes sense to reward people who have been loyal to the organization and who are likely to have a harder time finding a similar job. She pointed out that just because you have been with an organization for a longer time it does not mean that your salary is higher, it is dependent on the position. She said she would like to focus the discussion on which alternative should be adopted.

Councilmember McGlashan said he believes that people who have been with an organization for 20 years, no matter at what level, have a reason to be rewarded. He said he is leaning towards staying with the graduated package.

Mayor Hall asked Mr. Moritz if it was a normal practice to have employment policies based on a person's age; how many surveyed jurisdictions provide more than one month of severance pay to an employee who is involuntarily laid off; and if he was aware of any other cities or counties that provide more than one month of salary for severance. Mr. Moritz said there are some policies based on tenure, but not on age, and shared information on packages offered by the jurisdictions

surveyed. He added that he is aware of any local public sector organizations paying more than one month of salary.

Mayor Hall asked if the Everett program described in the staff report was still in effect, and Ms. Tarry said that the program established in March had ended. Mayor Hall then inquired if staff knew Everett's program was a one month, one time incentive program for voluntary resignations, or if staff thought it was for layoffs. Mr. Moritz said it was his understanding that it was for voluntary separations, and it was his error not including that distinction in the staff report. Mayor Hall followed up by asking if the City of Everett provides any severance pay to employees who are laid off, and Mr. Moritz said no, unless it was part of a collective bargaining agreement. Mayor Hall said his understanding that the purpose of Everett's voluntary separation program was to reduce compensation costs.

Mayor Hall asked if the City consulted with the Municipal Research Services Center (MRSC) on this as they do not recommend severance pay, and Mr. Moritz said no. Mayor Hall said that Council has an important oversight role in allocating public money to benefit the community. He stated that with the current financial challenges to the extent that the City is being forced to look at eliminating programs, he is not comfortable increasing costs as the proposed severance program would do. He recognized the impacts of layoffs on the employee and the employer, and noted the City pays for unemployment insurance for the whole purpose of benefiting employees who are being laid off. Mayor Hall urged support for the amendment and said he would be open to considering an incentive for people to take early retirement or to voluntarily separate instead of a layoff.

Councilmember Roberts said he did some research on other public agencies and their severance packages and the one that struck him was that of the U.S. Government. He stated that while there may not be many other cities that offer what Shoreline is proposing, there are other public agencies that do.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if having a severance package in place is beneficial for employee recruitment. Mr. Moritz said it would not be something that the City would use as a recruitment tool but added that candidates do look at the complete benefit package provided by potential employers, which gives a message about how the employer values their employees.

The motion to amend failed, 2-5, with Mayor Hall and Deputy Mayor Scully voting in favor.

Councilmember Chang moved to amend the updates to the Employee Handbook as presented by Staff in Exhibit A to Resolution No. 462 by deleting Section VIII(D)(5) Severance in its entirety and replacing it with the severance language set forth in Attachment C to tonight's staff report. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnell.

Councilmember Chang said it makes sense to have a graduated severance package, and that while she likes seeing it reduced to ten years, she has the same concerns about the cost of staff's

proposed package. She said the graduated package is good for the morale of the people who are remaining.

Councilmember Roberts confirmed that there is going to be an employee satisfaction survey this year. He asked if the demographics provided on the current lengths of service is common for other organizations, especially the high number of employees who have been with the organization for under five years. Mr. Moritz said it depends on the size of the employer and the degree of career advancement and the salary structure that is available. He said that while the total number of employees of the City has grown, it is still a mid-sized organization and advancement opportunities tend to be harder to come by, so that typically creates a greater turnover than a larger organization that has more room for internal advancement.

Councilmember Roberts said he supports the original staff recommendation because in the short term the number of people with 20+ years of service is not very many, and the cost difference is minor. He said while not a major burden on the organization, the extra two weeks of support could be significant for the employee.

Councilmember McConnell agreed that the financial impacts between the alternative and the staff recommendation is small. She said in her years of experience on the Council, the organization really values its employees and that much of the turnover she has noticed recently is related to retirement. She said sending the message of valuing employees goes a long way in the turmoil of layoffs. She expressed support for the original staff recommendation, but said she could support the alternative, as well.

Upon discussion of clarifying the parameters of the graduated severance package table, Ms. Tarry explained that the table reflects years of service, rather than hours worked, to include those employees in part time positions.

Councilmember Robertson said she would support either the staff recommendation or the amendment because it establishes the right tone for the organization and expresses concern for employees.

The motion to amend passed 4-3, with Mayor Hall and Councilmembers McGlashan and Roberts dissenting.

The main motion as amended passed, 6-1, with Mayor Hall dissenting.

9. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Discussing COVID-19 Pandemic Projected City Budget Impact Update

Sara Lane, Administrative Services Director; and Rick Kirkwood, Budget Supervisor, delivered the staff presentation. Ms. Lane said this is the second update brought to Council since the pandemic began. She reminded Council that three scenarios had been presented in an attempt to anticipate the financial impacts. She said they have updated their forecasted impacts for 2020 and the 10-year sustainability model and are currently looking closely at 2021 and 2022 in anticipation of developing the budget. She said in this update the likely impact to each revenue

stream was evaluated individually, with the end result being that the City is forecasting an operating budget shortfall of about \$6.2 Million in 2020. She continued that there is an anticipated impact of \$3.7 Million in the 2021-2022 biennium. She said the plan to address the 2020 forecasted shortfall involves using \$3 Million of 2019 revenue surplus as well as \$3.7 Million in operating expenditure reductions, primarily from one-time reductions of approved projects that have been put on hold, but also including routine operating reductions. She said there are no ongoing reductions or usage of the revenue stabilization fund planned at this time.

Ms. Lane displayed a slide illustrating the full 10-year forecast, and described the data depicted. She said the slide does not consider that the levy lid lift expires at the end of 2022. She continued that expenditures are projected to exceed revenues throughout the full life of the forecast. She said as evaluation of the 2021-2022 budget begins, staff is seeking Council feedback and guidance on how to address the shortfall. She said the first staff recommendation is to not reopen the pool between the current closure because of the pandemic and its scheduled shutdown in September of 2021. She said the anticipated operating expenses for the pool exceed the revenues by approximately \$800,000 annually.

Ms. Lane displayed a graph reflecting a 10-year operating budget forecast accounting for the COVID-19 impacts and the pool closure and explained how closing the pool earlier than planned would address some of the shortfall. She asked if Council would be open to using the Revenue Stabilization Fund (the 'rainy day fund') to address some of the remaining shortfall. She shared other options for continued pool operations, including finding another operator. She asked if Council supports the following staff recommendations:

- The City ceasing to operate the Shoreline pool in 2020 instead of 2021 to reduce the ongoing general fund budget by \$1.7 Million over the biennium
- The demolition of the Shoreline Pool in 2021 if another operator is not identified by 12/31/2020
- The use of the Revenue Stabilization Fund to address short term revenue losses due to COVID-19 economic impacts in 2021-2022

The majority of Councilmembers expressed support for the early closure of the pool and for eventual demolition if ownership cannot be transferred.

The majority of Councilmembers expressed support for use of the revenue stabilization fund.

Councilmember Roberts noted that the staff report assumes a 10 percent property tax delinquency. He asked how outstanding property taxes are collected. Ms. Lane said if not eventually paid by the property owner, the City would receive the taxes due when the property was sold. She added that because the City does not accrue the delinquencies, they are considered an impact in the year that it is not collected and, when paid, counted as unexpected income. She said the City is beginning to see sluggishness in property tax collections and would have an update in the second quarter report. He clarified that this report assumes no additional support from the federal government, and Ms. Lane said the government support received to date is offsetting the direct COVID-19 costs incurred.

Councilmember Roberts recommended that the Council continue to lobby the legislators to ask for Federal help. Mayor Hall said he and the Mayor of Kennewick co-authored an Op-Ed article published in the Seattle Times to show that this health crisis is not a partisan issue and encouraged the public to voice their opinions, as well.

Councilmember Robertson praised the creativity of staff in identifying solutions in this troubling situation. She asked if the revenue stabilization fund has been used before, and Ms. Tarry confirmed that while the City budgeted to use it in the last economic downturn, it was not used. Councilmember Robertson said there are a lot of questions regarding the possibility pool operations being transferred to another entity. She observed that the pool has been a financial drain for a long time and to continue to put money into it is throwing good money after bad. She said that while the City needs an aquatics program, she does not think the current pool will meet the needs of the community.

Councilmember Chang said that, looking at the list of suggested expenditure savings and reductions, it is clear that staff are good stewards of public funds. With the estimate that the recession is likely to go on longer, she asked if the City needs to be looking for other cuts at this point. Ms. Lane clarified that the City will be evaluating possibilities in all areas of operations, and the revenue stabilization fund would only be used to backfill short term revenue losses, and not for long term reductions. Ms. Tarry added the City will have to determine if additional reductions are needed when looking at developing a proposed budget for 2021 and 2022.

Deputy Mayor Scully said he is opposed to demolishing the pool this year and asked where the funds to pay for the demolition of the pool would come from. Ms. Lane said it would be a one-time budget request. Ms. Tarry added that there is some money set aside for a new maintenance facility that could potentially be reallocated. Deputy Mayor Scully said it makes more financial sense to mothball the pool until the revenue has stabilized. Ms. Lane clarified that the mothballing costs are \$155,000 annually to keep the pool serviceable.

Councilmember McConnell recognized that ongoing maintenance of the pool is required in order to maintain the integrity of the system. She would like to postpone the demolition of the pool in the hopes that another entity will take over operations.

Councilmember McGlashan said these are unprecedented times. He asked if the December 31, 2020 pool closure deadline had been established formally with the interested entities, and Ms. Lane said no. Councilmember McGlashan said if another party does take it over, he would not support the City supplementing funding for it. He said if no one else is identified to take it over he could support demolition, but an extended period of mothballing it is not a good use of resources.

Mayor Hall emphasized that the decision to close the pool early is in no way spiteful for the results of the bond measure last November, and that Council has agonized over funding for and maintenance of the pool for many years, but the reality is that it is past its useful life. He said that while he hopes the community will support the construction of a pool in the future, that is unrelated to this decision. He said given the COVID-19 realities, it is the financially responsible thing to do. He would love to find a partner to operate it and said if such a partner was identified,

he would be willing to consider providing some subsidy or partnership if the agreement offers programmatic benefits to the community at large. He thinks, with the anticipated increase in maintenance costs, the likelihood of this proposal being financially viable in the long term is very slim, and he would be cautious about bailouts. He said he prioritizes looking at other potential reductions prior to drawing on the revenue stabilization fund.

Councilmember Roberts agreed that if the City were to help subsidize a partner running the pool it would need to include some sort of public benefit. He clarified that the revenue stabilization fund was established by Council policy for short term revenue losses. He said he would prefer to postpone demolition while working to find another entity to run the pool, but added that if demolition occurs, he would like to preserve the mural.

Ms. Lane said the feedback provided by Council gave good information and reiterated that this is an interim update, prior to the final forecast update as part of the budget process.

(b) Discussing the 175th Street Corridor Project

Tricia Juhnke, City Engineer; and Leif Johansen, Capital Project Manager; delivered the staff presentation. Ms. Juhnke gave an overview of the project, which spans 175th Street from I-5 to Stone Avenue. She said this project was initially identified in the 2011 Transportation Master Plan; was partially funded by Transportation Impact Fees in 2015; received a design grant in 2018; and was rated the highest in the sidewalk prioritization plan but was not included in the list of Sidewalk Bond projects because it was included in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). She said this is the first project that is using Transportation Impact Fees, and she elaborated that three of the seven projects that are part of this corridor project are partially funded by these fees. She shared a timeline of the project process, saying it is currently in phase two of outreach, and displayed concept plans.

Mr. Johansen displayed the vicinity map and described the segments and scope of the project. He reviewed the evaluation criteria and said the initial feedback indicates that pedestrian walkability, flow of traffic, and transportation safety were identified as the three most important items. He reviewed the concept designs for each segment of the project. For the segment from Stone Avenue to Meridian Avenue, the concepts include either a widened shared use path with an additional pedestrian crossing or buffered bike lanes and 8' sidewalks. He said the segment from Meridian Avenue N to I-5 requires coordination with Washington Department of Transportation and includes shared use paths along both sides of 175th Street. The two concepts segment encompassing the intersection at I-5 includes either an improved traffic signal configuration and bike lanes (creating minimal impacts at Ronald Bog Park and tying into the new sidewalks at Meridian Park Elementary School) or a two-lane roundabout, which would improve operations and safety of the intersection, but create more impacts to Ronald Bog, and would not tie in to the new sidewalks. He described the steps and objectives in this phase of outreach and displayed a list of the options for public participation.

Mr. Johansen shared details on the budget and funding, including the requirements of the grant funding. He gave an overview of the project schedule, which would not start construction until

2025. He shared a list of the next steps and stated that later this year staff will bring to Council a preferred concept based on the community feedback and technical analysis.

Councilmember Chang said the shared use path would be safer for bicyclists and asked how safe it would be for pedestrians. Mr. Johansen said in general pedestrians do not like having bicyclists on a shared path but there has been a lot of feedback about keeping youth riders off the road, which is a benefit of this path. He said there has also been quite a bit of discussion about bike speed up and down the hill, and he looks forward to gathering more information at the open house. Councilmember Chang asked what the implications would be of taking some of the land at Ronald Bog. Mr. Johansen said it is too early in design to determine this, but there is a big difference in the impacts between two design options. Ms. Juhnke said that in addition to impacts to the Bog relative to mitigation, construction at the Bog would be unique and challenging because of the environment.

Councilmember Roberts asked if there was a sense of the differences in property impacts in Segment A between the shared use and buffered bike path options. Mr. Johansen said there are very similar impacts to private property, and the biggest impact on the Bog would be with the roundabout option.

Mayor Hall said it is important to account for potential future uses and emerging trends in design projects. He reflected on how scooter sharing is presenting new challenges and opportunities for rights-of-way in other cities. He asked what delays someone traveling eastbound on 175th might experience in high traffic times with a roundabout and if staff thought about whether a roundabout solution might disproportionately penalize Shoreline residents to the benefit of others. Mayor Hall said he looks forward to further information and discussion, and expressed his opinion that getting basic safety improvements faster and at a lower cost might be better than trying to squeeze a roundabout into that constrained intersection.

(c) Discussing Ordinance No. 892 – Amending Shoreline Municipal Code Chapter 13.12, Floodplain Management

Andrew Bauer, Senior Planner, delivered the staff presentation. Mr. Bauer described the purpose of floodplain regulations, and said they work in conjunction with the flood maps to regulate development in the floodplain. He said updates to the regulations are necessary to adopt the new flood maps issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) that go into effect in August 2020 and are a requirement of membership in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). He described the three components of NFIP's services of risk mapping, regulations, and insurance and said failure to adopt the amendments in Ordinance No. 892 would suspend the City's membership in the NFIP.

Mr. Bauer said there are approximately 110 affected properties within the City and displayed a map of the flood hazard areas. He described the City's shoreline management and critical areas regulations that are often associated with floodplains. He said the map updates include better coastal data but do not significantly expand or change the boundaries of the flood hazard areas.

Mr. Bauer shared a graphic of the characteristics of a floodplain and listed the environmental benefits floodplains provide. He listed the steps in the FEMA map update process and described the City's involvement. Mr. Bauer said the amendments adopt new flood maps, apply to all new development within the flood hazard areas, include the changes in the minimum standards from the statewide model ordinance, maintain flood protection elevation, maintain the current review process for floodplain development permits, clarify when habitat assessments are required, and bring consistency to definitions with the Development Code.

Mr. Bauer described the stakeholder notification process and concluded that the Planning Commission recommends Council approve the amendments and he said Ordinance No. 892 is scheduled for potential adoption on July 27, 2020.

Councilmember Robertson asked if tsunami patterns were defined as a flood event. Mr. Bauer said a tsunami would be considered a natural disaster.

Councilmember Chang asked if sea level rise was considered in the maps. Mr. Bauer said FEMA does not take into consideration sea level rise in their modeling. Mayor Hall said FEMA is required to use historical data in modeling, which is not a good way to plan for the future.

It was agreed that Ordinance No. 892 would return as a Consent Item.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:52 p.m., Mayor Hall declared the meeting adjourned.

Allison Taylor, Deputy City Clerk