

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

Monday, October 11, 2021  
7:00 p.m.

Held Remotely via Zoom

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

ABSENT: Mayor Hall

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present except for Mayor Hall.

**Councilmember McConnell moved to excuse Mayor Hall for personal reasons. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Robertson and approved by unanimous consent.**

Deputy Mayor Scully announced that October 15, 2021 has been proclaimed as Paper Tigers Day in Shoreline in recognition of the release of the locally produced film.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

4. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

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

5. COUNCIL REPORTS

There were no Council Reports.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Jackie Kurlle, Shoreline resident, spoke regarding the Enhanced Shelter and encouraged full transparency about its operations.

Kathleen Russell, Shoreline resident and member of the Tree Preservation Code Team, commented regarding Consent Item 7(f). She expressed hope that DOWL, LLC will design sidewalks that help preserve the mature trees in the project area.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Upon motion by Councilmember McGlashan and seconded by Councilmember McConnell and unanimously carried, 6-0, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:**

**(a) Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting of September 20, 2021**

**(b) Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of September 24, 2021 in the Amount of \$3,693,754.13**

\*Payroll and Benefits:

| Payroll Period | Payment Date | EFT Numbers (EF) | Payroll Checks (PR) | Benefit Checks (AP) | Amount Paid  |
|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 8/22/21-9/4/21 | 9/10/2021    | 98742-98942      | 17602-17611         | 83448-83451         | \$581,652.28 |
| 8/22/21-9/4/21 | 9/10/2021    |                  |                     | WT1208-WT1209       | \$104,402.35 |
|                |              |                  |                     |                     | \$686,054.63 |

\*Wire Transfers:

| Expense Register Dated | Wire Transfer Number | Amount Paid |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| 9/24/2021              | 1210                 | \$20,314.17 |
|                        |                      | \$20,314.17 |

\*Accounts Payable Claims:

| Expense Register Dated | Check Number (Begin) | Check Number (End) | Amount Paid    |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 9/15/2021              | 83395                | 83413              | \$68,615.06    |
| 9/15/2021              | 83414                | 83430              | \$1,196,025.96 |
| 9/15/2021              | 83431                | 83447              | \$245,067.32   |
| 9/22/2021              | 83452                | 83452              | \$1,047.85     |
| 9/22/2021              | 83453                | 83453              | \$47,676.83    |
| 9/22/2021              | 83454                | 83460              | \$14,951.69    |
| 9/22/2021              | 83461                | 83464              | \$743,228.94   |
| 9/22/2021              | 83465                | 83482              | \$124,694.53   |
| 9/22/2021              | 83483                | 83502              | \$346,109.56   |
| 9/22/2021              | 83503                | 83521              | \$199,967.59   |
|                        |                      |                    | \$2,987,385.33 |

- (c) Adoption of Community Development Block Grant Funding and Contingency Plan for 2022**
- (d) Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Amendment to the Contract with Herrera Environmental Consultants for the Final Design of the Hidden Lake Dam Removal Project in the Amount of \$336,126**
- (e) Authorize the City Manager to Amend the Lynnwood Link Urban Tree Canopy and Landscape Enhancement Partnership Cooperative Agreement with Sound Transit and King Conservation District**
- (f) Authorize the City Manager to Execute Professional Services Agreement with DOWL, LLC in the Amount of \$336,126 for Design of the 5th Avenue NE (NE 165th Street - NE 175th Street) Sidewalk Rehabilitation Project**
- (g) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Interlocal Agreement Between the City of Shoreline and Seattle City Light to Attach Utilities onto Seattle City Light Utility Poles**

8. STUDY ITEMS

- (a) Discussion of Ballot Measure for Park Improvements and Park Land Acquisition

Christina Arcidy, Management Analyst, delivered the staff presentation. Ms. Arcidy reviewed the background of work towards the initiative and said the purpose of this discussion is to obtain Council direction on whether the City should move forward with a ballot measure to fund park improvements and land acquisition, and if so, when; and what the overall bond measure cost should be.

Ms. Arcidy stated that there are several points to consider. She listed the potential upcoming ballot measures in front of Shoreline voters, indicating that the most significant are two levy renewals from the Shoreline School District and the City's property tax levy lid lift. She reviewed the approval and validation requirements for bond measures and said the validation threshold will be established after the November general election, and she provided an estimated range of costs for the special election. Mr. Arcidy said that given the continued general community support for such actions, staff recommends Council move forward with a funding measure for the February 2022 Special Election.

In consideration of the bond measure amount, Ms. Arcidy addressed the potential issues of inflation, possible alternative funding sources, and the impacts to property taxes. She displayed a chart reflecting the inflation estimate of \$3.4 Million to the previously proposed package. She stated that staff recommends a mix of funding by bond measure and contributions from the City's unreserved, unrestricted fund balance. She reviewed the net increase in financial impacts of the bond measure to property owners, taking into account the expiring bond.

Ms. Arcidy continued that staff has identified three alternatives for Council consideration. Alternative 1, the staff recommendation, is a 20-year, \$38.5M bond with contributions of \$3.4M

fund balance and includes priority parks, park amenities, park acquisition, and improvements to acquired park land similarly to the previously approved package. Alternative 2 is a 20-year, \$38.5M bond only, and removes key features from several parks and eliminates funding for public art. Alternative 3 is a 20-year, \$41.9M bond with no reduction in package scope. Ms. Arcidy concluded by reviewing the next steps should Council direct staff to prepare legislation for the February 2022 election and reiterated the staff recommendation of Alternative 1.

Councilmembers Robertson, McConnell, McGlashan, and Chang expressed support for Alternative 1. Councilmember Robertson said she is interested in getting a parks bond back on the ballot. Her preference is for Alternative 1, but she would support a \$41.9M bond measure as well. She spoke to the value of green spaces in the City, observed that people talk about moving to Shoreline for parks and schools, and recognized a potential for competing interests with the School District Bond. Councilmember Robertson asked if the previously completed pro and con committee work could be included in this cycle and Ms. Arcidy said she was not sure, but should Council approve it, next steps would include reaching out to people who had previously expressed interest in participation. Councilmember McGlashan said he supports outreach for this committee work.

Councilmember McConnell said she is optimistic since the community has always supported parks improvements and emphasized the importance of green spaces as density increases in the City.

Councilmember McGlashan said he would like to keep the funding impact to residents as previously presented. Councilmember Chang agreed, observing that this approach will make it easier to explain to the public what is being voted on. Councilmember Roberts said he feels the size of the bond needs to reflect what the public say they want. He recognized the public interest in park acquisition. He said development at Edwin Pratt Memorial Park needs to be considered, and this is an opportunity to revisit what is wanted from the bond funding. He said the increase in cost to the median family homeowner for inflation costs is minimal and then the use of reserve funding for additional improvements and acquisitions could be considered in a budget discussion. He recommends starting with the \$41.9 as a bond amount. Councilmember Chang said she thinks staying with \$38.5 Million is important because the Council needs to think about future funding asks. Deputy Mayor Scully agreed that there is more that could be funded and there is a public desire for more parks, but he hesitates to rework it at this eleventh hour. He would like to get this done but agrees that he would like to see the funding package be on the ballot measure rather than taken from reserves.

Deputy Mayor Scully summarized that the Council unanimously agrees with moving forward with placing the bond measure on the ballot in February. Ms. Tarry asked if the Council is comfortable bringing an Ordinance for potential action on November 1 or if the Ordinance should come for discussion, with action to follow. Councilmember Roberts said the choice the Council is facing is relatively clear, and his preference would be to discuss and act at the same meeting. Councilmember McConnell agreed and wondered if additional property acquisition possibilities could be a separate discussion as opportunities arise. It was agreed that the Council would consider action on November 1, 2021.

## (b) Discussion on Resolution No. 485 - Updating the Council Rules of Procedure

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk, delivered the staff presentation. Ms. Simulcik Smith reviewed the background of the City Council Rules of Procedure, which are designed to assist in orderly conduct of Council business and are periodically reviewed and amended. She stated that the amendments proposed by staff focus on remote attendance/participation in Council Meetings and placement of items on the agenda by Councilmembers. Regarding remote attendance for Council meetings, Ms. Simulcik Smith explained that the goal is to have procedures in place when in-person meetings become possible. She shared the process by which information was gathered on the circumstances, frequency, and logistics for remote participation in a meeting and said the feedback was used to draft the proposed baseline amendments. She said tonight's discussion is intended to determine if Council supports the proposed amendments and added that staff is seeking direction on additional policy questions.

Ms. Simulcik Smith listed the policy questions and indicated the staff recommendations for each, which included frequency of remote attendance; whether circumstances/criteria for remote attendance need to be met; a requirement to be on camera; remote participation in public testimony; clarifications for the use of visual aids by remote public speakers; and interpretation of Rule 3.2B, which outlines procedures for how individual Councilmembers place items on the agenda. She displayed proposed language to either add clarity or change intent of this section of the Rules. Ms. Simulcik Smith shared an amendment to Council Rule 7.19 submitted by Councilmember Roberts, which corrects an error in the language of the Rule and with which staff concurs. Ms. Simulcik Smith listed the next steps and stated proposed Resolution No. 485 is scheduled for potential action on November 1, 2021.

Councilmember Roberts said staff has identified many good questions that should be considered. He recognized that the Rules exist for the benefit of the Council itself, and suggested that any Rules established tonight regarding hybrid meetings would not affect the current Council, and therefore should be tabled until the new Councilmembers can weigh in. Councilmember Robertson said the current Council has the benefit of experience that the new Councilmembers will not have, and Councilmember McConnell agreed with her.

In consideration of the ways in which public testimony is handled in hybrid meetings, Councilmember Robertson said she does not have a preference to the order in which the public is called to testify, and Councilmember Roberts asked how the current rule would come into play with either of the proposed adjustments. Ms. Simulcik Smith stated that members of the public who indicate they would be speaking on agenda items would go first, from both the remote and in-person contingencies. Councilmember Roberts said his preference is for call-in members of the public preceding in-person attendees for the comment period, but it should come down to what works best in practice. Councilmember McConnell said she defers to what is best supported technically. Councilmember McGlashan said the best option from a fairness perspective would be alternating back and forth between in-person and remote attendees, Councilmember Chang agreed, if the technology is manageable, but if not, in-person first and then remote attendees.

The Council unanimously agreed against allowing remote attendees to display visual aids since this could create an opportunity in which inappropriate or offensive materials could be shared.

In consideration of a requirement for camera use for Councilmembers, the Council concluded that they support establishing a preference, rather than a requirement, and discussed situations in which turning one's camera off is necessary and recognized the importance of generally being on camera, when possible.

In addressing the questions of remote attendance by Councilmembers, Councilmember Robertson said she feels there should be a limit, preferably in the single digits, to the number of meetings any one member can attend remotely, and said any circumstances or criteria established for remote attendance should take into consideration that Councilmembers serve the community, and should live in, and experience, the community. Councilmember McConnell said in good faith, she does not want to put a number out. Councilmember McGlashan said neither the number of attendees allowed to be remote at one time, or number of times allowed per year are important to him, so he did not think criteria needed to be established. Deputy Mayor Scully said remote attendance should be allowed, and there should not be an arbitrary number on it, if the expectation of in-person attendance when able is conveyed. Councilmember Roberts commented that the fewer expectations put into the Rules, the better, and he would prefer to create a Council culture in which expectations were communicated through less formal conversations. Councilmember Chang commented that one of the reasons remote meetings have been successful for this Council is that they had had the opportunity to work together in person prior to the pandemic, establishing relationships and making connections. She thinks the Rules need to be written to indicate that when hybrid meetings commence there is an expectation that Councilmembers will attend in person as the default, so criteria for attending remotely may be helpful.

In discussing adding clarity to Council Rule 3.2B, the ways in which Councilmembers place items on the agenda, Councilmember McGlashan supported two Councilmembers putting an item on the agenda planner with discussion on best timing with the City Manager, and Councilmember Chang agreed. Deputy Mayor Scully said this Rule is a matter of where the power lies and described ways in which the timing of items on the agenda could be manipulated in either option. He said the Council has not historically had issues with either scenario, but if making a choice, he would rather put more power in the hands of the Councilmembers. Councilmember Roberts agrees that the expectation has been that Councilmembers will put something on the agenda planner, rather than the agenda, but recognized that there may be times that two members of the Council may want to expedite a conversation, and he is concerned that Option B will not allow that to happen. Details around use of suspension of the Council Rules were discussed.

Most Councilmembers verbalized support for Councilmember Roberts' amendment to correct an error in language in Rule 7.19, and there was no opposition voiced.

Ms. Simulcik Smith summarized that Council had indicated a preference to not tie a number to the number of meetings someone can attend remotely, nor the number of Councilmembers who could be remote at any one time but that there should be an expectation for in-person attendance. The Rules should indicate that use of a camera is nice, but language can be softened to not prevent a Councilmember from participating if their camera was off. She said she heard unanimous agreement that remote public commenters should not be allowed to use visual aids

and that practicality should drive the order in which in-person and remote commenters are called on. Finally, she stated that a majority of Councilmembers showed preference for the option of Councilmembers' having the authority to place items on the agenda planner rather than on the agenda for a specific meeting date.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:16 p.m., Deputy Mayor Scully declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk

DRAFT