

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

Monday, October 26, 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 City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

(a) Proclaiming America Recycles Day

Mayor Hall announced that he proclaimed November 15, 2020 as America Recycles Day and encouraged residents to continue their efforts toward recycling.

Additionally, Mayor Hall said he issued a proclamation recognizing November 1, 2020 as Extra Mile Day, which celebrates the importance of volunteerism in every community.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Debbie Tarry, City Manager, provided an update on COVID-19 and shared reports and information on various City meetings, projects and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Chang said it was reported at the Regional Transit Committee meeting that the results will soon be seen from Metro's adoption of the recommendations of the mobility framework, which emphasizes equity and providing services to priority riders. She said she continues to draw attention to the City investments made relative to transit oriented development and growth.

Councilmember Roberts said last week the Puget Sound Regional Council adopted the 2021-2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Councilmember McConnell said at the recent joint Transportation Boards meeting they heard updates on route and schedule planning.

Deputy Mayor Scully said he attended the exit conference for the City’s State Audit for Shoreline and reported that the outcome was uniformly good. He added that because of COVID-19, the Federal government may require a second audit.

Mayor Hall said the Governor’s Office has been holding periodic conference calls with Mayors to talk about COVID-19. He said recently the Governor shared data showing that the most common places of COVID-19 outbreaks are in restaurants and at grocery and retail establishments. Mayor Hall said he has had virtual meetings with State Representatives Ryu and Davis, and has a meeting scheduled with Senator Salomon, to share Council priorities. He said he attended the North Urban Human Services Alliance/Housing Development Consortium workshop on affordable housing. He also reported that members of the City Council, the Planning Commission, and the Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services/Tree Board participated in the first of a three-part Racial Equity Training.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no general public comment.

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 Robertson and unanimously carried, 7-0, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:**

- (a) Approving Minutes of Special Meeting of September 22, 2020  
Approving Minutes of Regular Meeting of October 12, 2020**

- (b) Approving Expenses and Payroll as of October 9, 2020 in the Amount of \$1,529,425.76**

**\*Payroll and Benefits:**

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
9/6/20-9/19/20	9/25/2020	93442-93643	17119-17127	80574-80581	\$908,816.83
					<u>\$908,816.83</u>

**\*Wire Transfers:**

Expense Register Dated	Wire Transfer Number	Amount Paid
9/27/2020	1167	\$5,559.64
		<u>\$5,559.64</u>

**\*Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
9/27/2020	80489	80504	\$157,955.41
9/27/2020	80505	80518	\$115,565.17
9/27/2020	80519	80566	\$692.44
9/27/2020	80567	80567	\$3,100.00
9/27/2020	80568	80573	\$50,508.51
10/4/2020	80582	80601	\$236,809.29
10/4/2020	80602	80650	\$1,029.11
10/4/2020	80651	80700	\$1,315.48
10/4/2020	80701	80708	\$18,976.96
10/4/2020	80709	80730	\$29,096.92
			<u>\$615,049.29</u>

**(c) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Professional Services Contract with Fehr & Peers in the Amount of \$548,651 for the Transportation Master Plan Update**

8. ACTION ITEMS

- (a) Public Hearing and Adopting Ordinance No. 906 - Interim Regulations for Adding Enhanced Shelter as an Allowable Use in the R-48 Zone

Nora Gierloff, Planning Manager, and Colleen Kelly, Recreation, Community and Cultural Services Director, delivered the staff presentation. Ms. Gierloff shared background information on the Council’s interest in addressing the homelessness crisis and the need for a 24/7 shelter in North King County. She recalled that in June the possibility arose for funding through the Department of Commerce (DOC) to expand homeless shelter capacity, and subsequently the City was asked to support a grant application by King County and Lake City Partners for a site at 165<sup>th</sup> and Aurora Avenue North. Following a City Council briefing on the shelter opportunity in August, staff was directed to proceed with developing an interim ordinance. And after discussion, Council asked for additional information and provided further direction to bring back code amendment alternatives, which will be presented tonight.

Ms. Gierloff stated that Ordinance No. 906 would create interim zoning regulations to allow siting a 24/7 Enhanced Shelter in the R-48 Zone and emphasized that interim regulations are effective for up to six months and renewable in six-month increments. She explained that it

would result in a new Use defining Enhanced Shelters being added to the Use Table. She then described the requested potential amendments to the existing Ordinance:

- Substituting the word ‘persons’ in place of ‘adults’, creating language that would allow for the consideration of family or juvenile shelters;
- Listing enhanced shelters as a Conditional Use, rather than Permitted Use;
- Requiring a “Good Neighbor Agreement”;
- Requiring annual reporting about shelter operations;
- Requiring an Interlocal Agreement, establishing negotiated operational requirements; and
- Requiring a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), establishing standards for operational and funding issues that would address impacts of the shelter.

Ms. Gierloff said there was also a suggestion to use an alternative interim ordinance to temporarily rezone the site to Mixed Business (MB), which then would require establishing interim zoning regulations to allow enhanced shelters as a permitted or Conditional Use in MB with interim Indexed Criteria.

Ms. Gierloff displayed a zoning map of the parcel in consideration that identified the adjacent MB zoning along Aurora Avenue and the residential zoning that backs up to the location. She reviewed the next steps and reiterated that if interim regulations were to be established, King County would ultimately need to pursue permanent changes to the regulations.

**Mayor Hall opened the public hearing.** The following people submitted oral testimony:

David Anderson, Shoreline resident, shared his reasons for supporting the location for the Enhanced Shelter. He expressed gratitude that the City is providing this needed resource.

Margaret Willson, Shoreline resident, said Shoreline has offered constructive programs to help the less fortunate and she spoke of her efforts to encourage Council to reject the policies being considered. She asked the Council how they want to be remembered from these decisions.

Jackie Kurlle, Shoreline resident, said her concern is the close proximity of the proposed location to schools and other child-oriented facilities. She said there needs to be better planning to ensure safety for the community.

Jack Malek, Shoreline resident and Planning Commissioner, expressed his support for the shelter, but opposition to the location. He said the municipalities that should be partnering with the City have not been engaged, the entire process has been circumvented, and this shelter will undermine the goals established for the Aurora Corridor.

Barbara Twaddell, Shoreline resident, shared her reasons for opposing the proposed low-barrier shelter. She asked that if the Council moves forward with the Ordinance, they support the proposed amendments and she gave examples of the benefits they would provide.

David Trainer, Shoreline resident, shared his experiences supporting the homeless, said the proposed facility is an ideal location for an Enhanced Shelter, and urged approval of Ordinance No. 906.

Nancy Morris, Shoreline resident, shared research on the efficacy and impacts of low-barrier shelters. She shared her displeasure with the proceedings and with siting this type of shelter at this location until better policies are in place. She encouraged Council to incorporate the proposed amendments if they move forward with the Ordinance.

Stephanie Henry, Shoreline resident, said there will always be people who disagree with the placement of a shelter, and thanked the staff and Council for their quick and compassionate work on this project. She suggested bias training be offered related to how we treat people who are experiencing homelessness.

Vinay Venkatesh, Shoreline resident, said he has shared his disapproval and concerns about this low-barrier shelter, but he has not heard back from the Council on any of the questions presented to them. He suggested putting mechanisms in place to track the success of the program.

Sudeeptha Jothiprakash, Shoreline resident, said it seems the Council is only concerned with the legal ramifications. She said the community had provided feedback on the impacts, and that Council is responsible for what is good for the community. She urged the Council not to not pass the Ordinance.

Gretchen Holtz, Shoreline resident, said her experiences as a social worker has made her certain that an Enhanced Shelter with private rooms and supportive services will be a way for the residents to begin healing. She said until the bigger systems can be fixed, we have to do the best we can for individuals in our community.

Brian Henry, Shoreline resident, said he supports an Enhanced Shelter because it will give people a sense of hope and that they deserve a second chance. He shared the ways a shelter can make a difference, and listed reasons why the location is appropriate.

Diane Pfeil, Shoreline resident, stated her opposition for the interim regulations and said a low-barrier Enhanced Shelter does not belong at this location. She would like the neighborhood concerns about spillover from a shelter addressed.

Carrell Tysver, Bothell resident, shared her positive experiences working with the Lake City Partners team and said this is an opportunity for Shoreline to become a social asset supporting homelessness.

Dicky Leonardo, Shoreline resident, shared negative experiences of living near a low-barrier shelter in Seattle. He said he is not opposed to supportive housing but does oppose low-barrier shelters near residential areas.

Nancy Pfeil, Shoreline resident, said she opposes the proposed site being used as a low-barrier shelter and shared results on her research about low-barrier shelters, concerns about drug activity, and the impacts of detrimental neighborhood quality on children.

Domenick Dellino, Shoreline resident, spoke in support of an Enhanced Shelter. He said he respects the fears people have expressed but said people should not discriminate against a class of human beings in their time of need. He said neighborhoods will be safer when services are available.

Brooke Lather-McElligott, Shoreline resident, spoke in support of the Ordinance. She said the unhoused are among the most vulnerable populations, and this shelter would be an opportunity to provide them a sense of safety.

Joanne Godmintz, Shoreline resident, said her questions regarding costs associated with the shelter remain unanswered and all of Shoreline will be put in an awful space if City services are reduced because of financial impacts. She expressed concern with the low-barrier aspect of the shelter.

Chris Chalcraft, Shoreline resident, said the people of Shoreline are open to providing resources for homelessness, but that this approach does not seem to be an effective one. He said having rules and consequences are important. He said drug users will draw drug dealers to the area.

Pastor Kelly Dahlman-Oeth, Kirkland resident and Pastor at Ronald United Methodist Church, shared statistics on mass incarceration and its associated costs. He said the real immorality is the nation's willingness to continue to profit from the imprisonment of Black, Brown, Indigenous, and poor people. He urged the Council to pass the Ordinance and make this alternative possible.

Tyler Husky, Shoreline resident, said he lives near the proposed site and has a lot of concerns about the facility and the way this proposal was put forth. He asked Council to take the time to reconsider this and identify a better solution.

Steven Kurle, Shoreline resident, said his children attend a daycare near the proposed facility. He said he cares about homelessness, but the pendulum has swung too far toward supporting homeless people at any cost. He understands the need for shelters but this shelter will create an undue burden on the neighborhood. He asked the City to come up with a solution independent of King County.

Jace Hanks, Shoreline resident, said he lives near the proposed shelter location. He expressed concern about the potential loss of property taxes from the site and a decrease in area property values. He said he was shocked at the lack of accountability that this project has.

Jean Muir, Shoreline resident, said it is her understanding that the shelter residents will be expected to leave the shelter during the day. She asked where they would go and expressed her concern over the population congregating in public spaces.

Chris Brown, Shoreline resident, said this is a poor decision. He said the University District has declined because of their overwhelming homeless population. He said King County and the City of Seattle should take responsibility for their lack of leadership in the homelessness crisis and stated that homelessness should be addressed in a responsible way.

**Seeing no one wishing to provide additional testimony, Mayor Hall closed the public hearing.**

**Deputy Mayor Scully moved to adopt Ordinance No. 906. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Robertson.**

Deputy Mayor Scully acknowledged that there are a lot of emotions and frustration behind this Ordinance. He recalled that over the years he has heard general agreement from the public that something needs to be done to address homelessness, and that Council should be doing more. He shared examples of emergencies associated with homelessness that have been addressed as they arose, but said that until today the Council has not moved toward finding a way to make things better, proactively.

Deputy Mayor Scully said for him, the three questions to address before approving the Ordinance are: Should something be done? Is a low-barrier shelter the right thing to put into Shoreline at this time? And, is this the right location? He observed that the biggest housing need is for a low-barrier shelter. The City has learned some lessons in how not to do things as observed at the facilities in Pioneer Square in Seattle and Basecamp in Bellingham. He said the proposed model of allowing people to stay in the shelter until they can find a better option is the best possible approach. Regarding the location, he said he thinks this is the best place in Shoreline for this shelter and shared his rationale. He is sympathetic to the fears of the community but said the decision should not be driven by fear. He reflected on similar comments received when Ronald Commons was being established. Although Ronald Commons is a different model than the one being proposed, he pointed out there have been no problems with its residents. He asked the Councilmembers who support this project to keep their eyes on the prize without delaying the process and risk losing the DOC funding by trying to pursue the perfect solution, since he is not convinced any of the amendments are needed.

Councilmember Robertson said her goal is to find a way to support the shelter moving forward and to do it in the best possible way to provide reassurance to the surrounding businesses and neighborhood. She said the health and the safety of the community is important to her, and she emphasized that the Council is paying attention to the information and comments submitted. She described her steps in considering this Ordinance and said although the shelter she recently toured is not an apples-to-apples comparison, she saw a peaceful, comforting, safe, healthy, and supportive environment. She added that her tour of the proposed site instilled confidence in her in how the facility can provide personal space for the residents. As winter approaches, shelter beds that adhere to COVID-19 protocols are desperately needed, and those who qualify for them are highly incentivized to stay put. She said she hears the concerns being voiced, but what it comes down to for her is that these fears and concerns represent a possible, but not a predetermined, outcome. She said if the project were to be located in her neighborhood, she would vote the same way because of the confidence she has in the success of the facility.

Councilmember Chang recognized the need of the unsheltered population. She stated she agrees with the benefits the set-up of the facility will offer, but she is strongly opposed to the location. She said in her work for the City of Seattle she has noticed that when permitting shelters, attempts are made to keep them away from residential areas. When researching the list of King County shelters provided by staff, she said she found very few shelters across the street from a single-family neighborhood and they were either women's shelters, had a sobriety requirement, or were small facilities located in churches. These findings increased her concern on the impacts of low-barrier shelters on neighborhoods. She said this process was not what she thought the approach would be when the Council established the goal of helping the homeless in North King County and she asked why the City had not collaborated with other cities in this planning. She said she understands the time constraints but does not think the decision should be driven by the grant timeline. She is concerned about the long-term effects this will have on growth and commercial development in the City, and she shared feedback she has heard from developers. She said she would like to focus on putting some guardrails and guidelines on the project and observed that the legislation as written, does not provide adequate direction. She wants to make sure Lake City Partners knows what they can handle.

Councilmember McGlashan reflected on his involvement with King County's Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness and said it is exciting to now see things start to happen. He said it is disappointing that the population with the most need is not being prioritized. He stated that while this location is not optimum, it is not often that the stars align as has happened with this facility. He said it is important to remember that the residents can stay onsite all day. He said the City needs to take advantage of this partnership with the County and make a go of it. He asserted that it is up to the City to stay involved and make it successful.

**Councilmember Roberts moved to list Enhanced Shelters in Table 20.40.120 Residential Uses as C-I rather than P-I in the R-18 to R-48 Column. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Chang.**

Councilmember Roberts said from the onset Council has listened to the community and wants to do what is best for everyone. He said he wants this shelter to be successful and at the end of the day the Council will need to make sure King County and Lake City Partners remain good partners. He commented that the real factor to be aware of is that permitted uses vest permanent rights to the property owner and he believes a Conditional Use designation provides additional layers of authority and assurances to the City to make sure the partnerships work for the community.

Deputy Mayor Scully asked if taking the time necessary to go this route might interfere with the DOC grant and he asked for a comparison of the process to revoke either designation. Ms. Kelly said the Grant FAQ stipulates that if it is a program that is unable to have people on site by December 31, 2020, the County should reach out to the DOC with a reason for the delay and present a plan. She said the City has asked the County staff to clarify these parameters but there has not yet been a response. Ms. Gierloff said if a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) were to be revoked the City would need to document that conditions were not being met through the Code Enforcement process.



Councilmember Chang said this amendment makes sense for a shelter use. She shared information the Mayor of Renton shared with her on their less than positive experiences in collaboration with King County on their shelter, and she emphasized the importance of maintaining a certain level of control through detailed agreements.

Councilmember McConnell said this decision is not getting easier for her. She expressed that the haste is concerning to her, especially based on the community requests for details. She has consistently supported the City's Human Services efforts, but she is concerned that the trust with the community is being damaged. She recommended the Council do whatever they can to maintain control and establish guardrails so the community feels protected and the residential areas safeguarded. She observed that if the homelessness problem is so dire, there will be additional opportunities for funding. She expressed interest in supporting Councilmember Chang's amendments proposed in the staff report.

Councilmember McGlashan said he fears that the amendment could push Council beyond the time limit for the funding, but he will support it because of the possibility for extension. He said this will give the community some assurance.

Deputy Mayor Scully said he is disappointed with this amendment because guardrails are already in place and this creates delays.

Mayor Hall said he thinks there is a better path to getting to the right place than through this amendment. He said housing is a basic human right, and he believes the community will be better off when everyone has a safe place to sleep at night. The concern he has is that this amendment might slow the process down and the opportunity to address the identified gap in shelters in North King County would be lost. The ideal long-term solution would be for this property to be zoned MB, but because of the concerns about delay, he stated he will not recommend it at this time. He suggested that a MOU would provide the needed safeguards. He concluded that it is important to protect the community and he is proud that our City is welcoming.

Councilmembers discussed the differences between a MOU and a CUP. Ms. Gierloff said either solution could address the Council's concerns about external impacts and that the MOU would be a negotiated agreement. Councilmember McGlashan said in that case, he will support an MOU rather than this amendment because he does not want to create delays. Councilmember Chang said she thinks having a CUP will provide the real teeth to establishing guidelines, and that the State and County will be willing to accept a delay since shelters are difficult to site. Deputy Mayor Scully said he will move for an MOU and the Council should find a way to regulate it without backdoor killing the project.

Councilmember Roberts said when he introduced the idea of the CUP his goal was not to kill the project but to make sure the Council retained a certain amount of control and authority over the Shelter. He agreed that the long-term solution is to rezone the Aurora corridor, since R-48 is not a rationale choice for the location. He said these interim regulations will provide the Planning Commission time to consider and implement alternatives, and when they do rezone, it should be

done based on what is right for the community, and not be pressured by funding opportunities or time constraints.

Councilmember McConnell said when this was discussed at the Strategic Planning Workshop, she had a totally different vision of how it would play out. She thinks it is important to have transparency with the community.

**The motion to list Enhanced Shelters in Table 20.40.120 Residential Uses as C-I rather than P-I in the R-18 to R-48 Column failed, 3-4. with Councilmembers McConnell, Roberts, and Chang voting in favor.**

**Councilmember Chang moved to add another index criterion to SMC 20.40.355 to state “The shelter operator and the City shall enter into an ILA regarding operational issues of concern such as**

- **Staffing plans**
- **Requirement for regular reports to the Council on how the shelter is meeting performance metrics**
- **Documentation of the number of calls for service to the site and an agreement that the shelter operator will be billed for calls over an agreed threshold.**
- **Shelter operator to contribute to the cost of a mental health professional to assist in police response, perhaps through part of the RADAR program.**
- **Require adherence to the Good Neighbor Plan.**
- **Agreement to discontinue the shelter use if documented violations of the operational agreements are not addressed in a timely manner.”**

**The motion was seconded by Deputy Mayor Scully.**

Councilmember Chang said she wants this to work with the least amount of impact on the community and having an interlocal agreements approved by Council will provide them with input on some details that will influence the impact the shelter has on the neighborhood.

Deputy Mayor Scully said he is concerned with some of the items on the list. He said he does not want to obligate the Shelter operator to contribute to the cost of a mental health professional and he questioned the imprecise language on “Agreement to discontinue the shelter use if documented violations of the operational agreements are not addressed in a timely manner.”

**Deputy Mayor Scully moved to amend the amendment by changing the following two bullet points as follows:**

- **If possible, shelter operator to contribute to the cost of a mental health professional to assist in police response, perhaps through part of the RADAR program.**
- **Staff to develop criteria Agreement to discontinue the shelter use if documented violations of the operational agreements are not addressed in a timely manner.”**

**The motion was seconded by Councilmember Roberts.**

Mayor Hall asked for clarification on which parties would enter into the interlocal agreement, and Ms. King confirmed that since the County would be the property owner, the agreement would be with them.

**Councilmember Roberts moved to extend the Council Meeting end time until 10:30 p.m. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnell. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.**

**The motion to amend the amendment passed unanimously, 7-0.**

Councilmember Chang stated that she would prefer that the City retain control over the selection of the shelter operator. Ms. Tarry clarified that there will not be an agreement between the City and the operator, since the contract for operation would be between the County and the operator. Mayor Hall suggested an amendment to the motion to add a bullet point stating “Provisions for city approval of any proposed change in shelter operator.”

**Councilmember Chang moved to amend the amendment by adding another bullet point stating: “Provisions for city approval of any proposed change in shelter operator.” The motion was seconded by Deputy Mayor Scully.**

Ms. King added that this type of language can also be added in during the ILA negotiations.

**The motion to amend the amendment passed unanimously, 7-0.**

**Councilmember Chang moved to amend the amendment by adding another bullet point stating: “Include a detailed referral plan.” The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnell.**

Councilmember Chang said this requirement is key to the success of the shelter. She said she envisions the plan indicating the agencies that will be referring people to the Shelter and how the decisions are made. She shared examples of other referral processes and said there needs to be an understanding of the population in order to properly serve them.

Councilmember Roberts said the Council does not need to be in a position of evaluating referral programs. Councilmember McGlashan said he will oppose the amendment because the referral process should be worked out in the ILA. Mayor Hall said he wants to leave the decision of who gets services to the professionals.

Councilmember Chang replied that she is not suggesting that the Council decide who gets services, just that the ILA should designate referring agencies. Mayor Hall explained that since this direction is being proposed as part of an ILA, it would mean that Council would be the deciding authority, and that is where his discomfort lies with it, but he agreed that a referral plan should be a standard part of shelter management.

**The motion to amend the amendment failed, 1-6, with Councilmember Chang voting in favor.**

**Councilmember Roberts moved to amend the amendment by changing the verbiage “Require adherence to the Good Neighbor Plan” to read “Require adherence to a Good Neighbor Plan that addresses litter, noise, security procedures, and other issues of concern.” The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGlashan, and passed unanimously, 7-0.**

Councilmember Chang asked if there would be a management plan that would help Lake City Partners control who is admitted to the shelter based on the needs of the existing population, and if so, where it would be noted. Ms. Kelly replied that she asked for feedback from County staff about this but has not had a response. She said she suspects it may be a requirement of the County, based on her conversations with Catholic Community Services. Ms. Kelly said she is gathering information to help Lake City Partners develop a management plan for this program.

**The motion to add another index criterion to SMC 20.40.355 as further amended by Council to read as follows passed unanimously, 7-0.**

**“The shelter operator and the City shall enter into an ILA regarding operational issues of concern such as:**

- **Staffing plans;**
- **Requirement for regular reports to the Council on how the shelter is meeting performance metrics;**
- **Documentation of the number of calls for service to the site and an agreement that the shelter operator will be billed for calls over an agreed threshold;**
- **If possible, shelter operator to contribute to the cost of a mental health professional to assist in police response, perhaps through part of the RADAR program;**
- **Require adherence to a Good Neighbor Plan that addresses litter, noise, security procedures, and other issues of concern.**
- **Staff to develop criteria to discontinue the shelter use if documented violations of the operational agreements are not addressed in a timely manner;**
- **Provisions for city approval of any proposed change in shelter operator”**

Councilmember McConnell asked if the three to five year timeline of the transition of the enhanced shelter to permanent supportive housing was a condition of the County, or of the grant. Ms. Kelly said it is not a condition, but that King County has expressed interest in this possibility for the property. Councilmember McConnell asked if the period the property could be used as an Enhanced Shelter could be shortened. Ms. Kelly said she thinks the expectation of the County and the Department of Commerce would be that it runs the term of the grant. Councilmember Chang said it is her belief that the community would be more accepting of permanent supportive housing than an Enhanced Shelter.

**Councilmember McConnell moved to extend the Council Meeting end time until 10:40 p.m. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Chang and passed 6-1, with Councilmember McGlashan voting against.**

Councilmember Chang confirmed that just because permanent supportive housing may be added, it is not a given that the Enhanced Shelter would be eliminated.

**Deputy Mayor Scully moved to strike the word “adults” from the definition of Enhanced Shelter and replace it with “persons”. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Robertson.**

Councilmember Scully said although it is highly unlikely that King County will transition this shelter to a family or juvenile shelter, this amendment would permit persons other than adults to live in the shelter.

**The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.**

Mayor Hall said looking at rezoning the parcels on Aurora that are not currently zoned MB would be an alternative approach to making these regulations permanent. He said if these interim regulations are adopted, the next step would be for staff to work with the Planning Commission and King County on permanent regulations. Councilmembers Roberts and Robertson agreed that it would be good to take a holistic look at the entire Aurora corridor.

Mayor Hall said he would work with the City Manager to create a future study item to review permanent regulations.

**The main motion to adopt Ordinance No. 906 as amended passed 5-2, with Councilmembers Chang and McConnell voting against.**

Mayor Hall confirmed that the remaining agenda items would be rescheduled.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:37 p.m., Mayor Hall declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk