

April 14, 2003

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL

SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, April 14, 2003
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Jepsen, Deputy Mayor Grossman, Councilmembers Chang, Gustafson, Hansen, Montgomery, and Ransom

ABSENT: none

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

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

(a) Proclamation of "High School Musicians Week"

Mayor Jepsen read a proclamation honoring the achievements of Shoreline musicians who were accepted into the All-Northwest Orchestra and Concert Band, and those who attained the status of All State Musicians in the categories of choir, band and orchestra. Those students include: Rachel Moore, Andy Lippert, Shannon Payton, John Salzman, Jeeha Yu, Anna Linvall, John Teske, Hillary Zetlen, John Schindler, Kathleen Hansen, Christine Terreson, Michael Andrade, Caitlin Baker, Jason Byers, Brian Earp, Jared Maddox, Candice Ryu, Irene Yang, Mickey Hansen, Ashley Bell, Lena Buell, Julia King, Michael Korpi, Sarah Montange, Phillip Ng, Andrew and Lauren Van Kempen, and Tabitha Wang.

Shorewood High School Orchestra teacher Dan Wing accepted the proclamation and thanked the City for honoring these students in this way.

Councilmember Gustafson and Councilmember Chang commended Mr. Wing and the musicians for the outstanding job they do in the community.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Steve Burkett introduced Sigrid Batara, Teen Program Supervisor, Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services, to discuss upcoming drug and alcohol awareness programs sponsored by the City.

Ms. Batara and members of the Teen Program described two upcoming events designed to bring awareness to drug and alcohol issues. "Beneath the Surface" is an event developed by Empowering Youth Everywhere (EYE), part of the City's Teen Program, to address the issue of adult denial in teen drug and alcohol use. Information from this event will be shared at the subsequent forum, entitled "Not my Child," sponsored by Partners in Prevention (Center for Human Services), on April 29 from 7-9 p.m. at the Shoreline Center. The intent of these programs is to assist parents, teachers, and other adults in speaking to kids about drugs and alcohol.

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, Ms. Batara explained that flyers are being distributed at local schools, libraries, and the teen center.

Mr. Burkett emphasized the importance of having teens develop these events in order to give them ownership over the program.

Continuing, Mr. Burkett discussed the events leading to the temporary closure of N 183rd Street, noting that neighbors are now being polled about whether they favor permanent closure of the street. 76 percent of petitions received by the City were in favor of permanent closure. He said staff is conducting traffic counts and putting together an analysis of the impact of closure on surrounding streets. He said residents who have provided input will be notified that staff intends to submit a recommendation to Council at the May 12 meeting.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: none

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, asked that the City request the cable company to provide a Public Access Channel, in addition to its Government Access Channel and Education Access Channel, through the City's cable franchise agreement. He explained that no additional tax money would be required since the City already collects franchise fees, which are then distributed back to citizens in the form of public, education and government access channels.

(b) Mark Hammrich, Shoreline, asked that temporary, steel-framed canopies be exempt from the City's permitting process. He said Shoreline Code Enforcement recently instructed him to either remove his canopies or obtain a permit for them. He calculated that the costs for permitting would exceed \$3,000 for a \$150 canopy. He said the code is not evenly enforced, as there are many people who have similar canopies on their properties in Shoreline.

April 14, 2003

Mr. Burkett said he would report back on the terms of Shoreline's cable franchise agreement.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, explained that canopies greater than 120 square feet are classified as temporary structures and therefore require City permits. He acknowledged that enforcement of this code has become a significant issue in the City. He said since the code is reviewed on an annual basis by the Planning Commission and the City Council, there are opportunities to amend the existing law. He outlined the code enforcement process, noting that the City first investigates complaints. He said it is likely there are many violations that have not been reported to the City.

Mayor Jepsen asked for an analysis of Mr. Hammrich's description of fees associated with acquiring a permit. Mr. Stewart said he needs to do a detailed analysis before commenting on the accuracy of Mr. Hammrich's estimate. However, he confirmed that it was possible for Mr. Hammerich's estimate to be correct.

Mr. Burkett confirmed that code enforcement issues will be discussed at the Council retreat on Friday, April 18. Mayor Jepsen told Mr. Hammrich that Council would provide a more complete response after the retreat.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Hansen moved approval of the agenda. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.

Councilmember Gustafson made a motion to move item 8(a) approving Ordinance No. 323 to the Consent Calendar as item 7(h). Councilmember Montgomery seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 7-0, and the agenda was approved as amended.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Montgomery moved approval of the consent calendar. Deputy Mayor Grossman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the following items were approved:

**Minutes of Workshop of March 17, 2003
Minutes of Special Meeting of March 18, 2003
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of March 24, 2003
Minutes of Regular Meeting of March 24, 2003**

**Approval of expenses and payroll as of April 29, 2003
in the amount of \$1,014,564.38**

DRAFT

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute an interlocal agreement between the City of Shoreline and the City of Lake Forest Park relating to Annex Teen Program

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract between the City of Shoreline and the Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council in the amount of \$61,979 to provide cultural service programs

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract between the City of Shoreline and the Shoreline Historical Museum in the amount of \$61,979 to provide cultural service programs

Resolution No. 203 fixing the time for a public hearing and for Council action on vacation of a portion of N. 188th Street between Midvale Avenue N. and Seattle City Light property

Motion to approve the City's entry into an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with King County for the acquisition of open space through the Conservation Futures Tax Levy Collections Grant Program

Ordinance No. 323 amending the Municipal Code to incorporate King County Landmarks Provisions required by Interlocal Agreement, including amending Shoreline Municipal Code Chapter 15.20

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

None

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- (a) Gateway Master Plan-Refined Designs for Priority Sites and Construction Implementation Order

Mr. Stewart said staff is recommending two gateway sites for implementation in 2003: 1) Gateway Site No. 3, I-5 @ NE 175th Street (West Side - @ Ronald Bog Ponies); and 2) Gateway Site No. 4, I-5 @ NE 175th Street (East Side). He said staff is requesting Council input on sites and design features, noting that the proposed sites can be completed with the current appropriations.

Andrea Spencer, Project Manager, presented information on Gateway designs, costs, and the anticipated construction schedule of the following sites:

SITE 1: Westminster

Site No. 1: Westminster/Dayton presents the opportunity for either a small urban plaza design with gateway elements or redevelopment of the site with a building and gateway elements.

SITE 2: I-5 / 145th and 5th NE

This site will have two gateway features: one gateway installation will occur at the existing transit stop at the northwest corner of intersection, and a second, less elaborate sign will be placed at the northeast corner of the intersection. There are two options presented for the transit stop: 1) Construction of an elaborate gateway wall with a bus shelter integrated within it; or 2) Upgrading the existing bus shelter. Coordination with Metro and Washington State Department of Transportation and evaluation of future maintenance costs will be required to determine the option that is most feasible.

SITES 3 & 4: I-5 / 175th

Ronald Bog Site & SE Corner of I-5 & 175th along 175th

Gateway installations are proposed for both the west and east side of the freeway, with the western installation occurring near the Ponies at Ronald Bog Park. A secondary style gateway is proposed at the southeast corner of the intersection of 175th & I-5 so that an eastbound traveler along 175th will enjoy the installation. Staff has proposed that these sites should be constructed in 2003, although the construction at the southeast corner of 175th & I-5 will require coordination with WSDOT and implementation may take additional time.

SITE 5: 205th & Meridian

This gateway installation will occur at the southwest corner of the intersection. There is potential to include features to announce the northern entrance to the Interurban Trail.

SITES 6 & 7: 205th & 15th NE / 145th & 15th NE

One feature of interest will be the inclusion of a city population sign. The addition of this signage type will be easiest on this gateway style because the main structure of the gateway will allow easy attachment/detachment of auxiliary elements.

SITE 8: I-5 Pedestrian Bridge

Improvements are proposed for the I-5 pedestrian bridge in conjunction with the gateway plan. This will include painting the existing fencing "cagework" on the bridge and adding decorative elements such as the "wavy" handrails shown in one sketch or the attachment of sculptural water design from the City's logo.

Ms. Spencer summarized the order in which staff is recommending implementation of the eight Gateway sites. The factors staff considered for this ordering included the assumption that \$100,000 would be available during each year from 2003-2005, allowance for adequate time for interagency coordination and availability of real estate,

and geographic distribution across the City. City Council has the option of reordering this list and/or changing the dollars allocated in the CIP for gateway funding in each year. She introduced Paul Fuesel, Urban Designer for KPG, to answer any questions relating to materials and/or construction.

Councilmember Ransom commented on the high projected cost (\$32,000) for constructing a Gateway at Site 4. He wondered if purchasing the property was part of the overall cost.

Mr. Stewart noted the detailed cost breakdowns on page 113 of the staff report. He said the plan assumes that the City would get permission to build on the property owned by the Washington State Department of Transportation.

Mr. Fuesel said the costs include surveying, construction and staff time in addition to the physical element itself.

Based on the staff report, Councilmember Ransom speculated that the cost of the physical element was around \$10,000. Mr. Fuesel said the figure is closer to \$25,000, adding that there is a contingency to purchase an easement if necessary.

Councilmember Chang commented on the magnitude of building eight sites at a cost of \$500,000. He asked if gateways were considered for Aurora Avenue N at NW 205th Street.

Mr. Stewart explained that the plan anticipates constructing gateways over the next several years. He emphasized that the policy goes well beyond the current Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), therefore, the City will look for opportunities to acquire additional resources to complete construction in future years. He said the plan attempts to identify priority projects and costs, and how they might fit into current and future budgets. He acknowledged that this is a long-term project that will require additional resources beyond those currently programmed.

Mr. Burkett noted that Council included \$300,000 in the adopted CIP over next three years, and the adopted 2003 budget includes \$100,000 for Gateway construction. He acknowledged that some citizens feel gateways are not a high priority expenditure. He added that the CIP is subject to review this year.

Responding to Councilmember Chang regarding future funding, Mr. Burkett clarified that Council has only programmed funds for 2003. Councilmember Hansen concurred.

Councilmember Gustafson asked if the design for Site 3, Ronald Bog, would reduce the existing flowers plantings there. Mr. Fuesel said it will complement the site, not eliminate the plantings.

Councilmember Gustafson commented that it would be nice to improve the unattractive pedestrian bridge over I-5. He asked if it is possible to incorporate the name of the City

into the proposed designs for that site. Mr. Fuesel said the City can discuss with the State what options may be available.

Mr. Stewart said it is possible, although such a proposal would go beyond the current CIP. However, it could be proposed as part of a major I-5 restoration effort by the State.

Councilmember Gustafson envisioned using interagency funds in the future to link the Interurban Trail with the Burke-Gilman Trail.

Deputy Mayor Grossman expressed support for the Gateways program. He emphasized the importance of establishing a sense of place in Shoreline, adding that signage such as Gateways is a long-term goal for the City. He felt assured that costs could be controlled because of the 30% contingency funding included in the project. He was concerned that the design of the I-5 at NE 175th Street - East of I-5 location was of far less magnitude than the design for Ronald Bog. He felt that value engineering could possibly bring the costs down enough to offset an expanded project on the east side.

Mr. Stewart commented that it was difficult for the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission to identify which locations should include primary, secondary, and tertiary treatments.

Deputy Mayor Grossman felt that both sides of the freeway on 175th should receive equal treatment, since traffic is considerable in both directions.

Councilmember Montgomery said the major traffic movements occur on the west side of NE 175th Street between I-5 and Highway 99. She agreed that the east side should be enhanced if possible, but not at the expense of the west side.

Mr. Stewart clarified that many of the details have yet to be finalized, since only 30% design has been achieved so far. He said Council may want to consider alternatives for the east site depending on the construction bids.

Councilmember Ransom inquired about the lot size at the Westminster/Dayton Avenue N location and about additional cost estimates for removal of any hazardous waste material.

Mr. Stewart said the Westminster site is a little over 8,000 square feet, noting that demolition of the existing building will happen shortly. He said the City is currently looking at a Level 1 hazardous materials study to determine subsurface conditions on the site.

Councilmember Ransom expressed his preference to develop the site as a City "pocket park," noting that the only other alternatives for the small lot are either a single-family house or a small business. He was glad to see that population figures are included as an option for secondary Gateway locations, but suggested that primary sites also include population figures because of the high traffic volumes at those locations.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen agreed that the plantings at the Ronald Bog site should not be disturbed. He agreed that a simpler project may result in cost savings. He questioned the 15% figure for construction inspection, noting there are many opportunities to cut costs while still achieving the same goal. He felt that including the City's incorporation date into the signage rather than population statistics may be more meaningful. He felt that more thought should be put into Site No. 4, suggesting that perhaps public art should be added to the matrix for that location. Finally, he asked why conifers were chosen instead of deciduous trees.

Mr. Stewart said conifers were chosen because they are part of the City logo. However, other tree types could be suggested as the design phase proceeds.

Mayor Jepsen expressed support for a more substantial project at Site No. 4 if there is an opportunity. He said the gateway should be incorporated into the site and sized according to the large amount of open space there.

Councilmember Chang expressed appreciation for Walgreens' gateway contribution at NE 145th Street and Aurora Avenue N. He asked whether the City has approached other businesses, such as Albertsons, to see whether they are aware of the City's plans for other gateway locations. He suggested that a joint effort between businesses and the City could result in cost savings.

Mr. Stewart said the Walgreens gateway was negotiated between the developer and the City as part of the mitigation for not locating its building on the corner. He said the City could require similar mitigation if Albertsons submits a major development proposal.

Councilmember Chang suggested that the City be more proactive and approach businesses about the Gateways program.

Mr. Stewart clarified that the Gateway policy manual includes a template that businesses can use to find out what kind of signage and locations are appropriate.

Mayor Jepsen said some business owners have stated that private interests would like to be involved in the building of gateways. He suggested that staff could present the design manual to the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce and find out if businesses are interested in participating.

Mr. Burkett confirmed that staff would return to Council again after reconsidering design features for Site No. 4.

Councilmember Hansen expressed concern about the project costs, but was reassured by the contingencies built into the design. He questioned whether the cost for the 15th NE & NE 205th Street Gateway was realistic, noting that it seemed a bit excessive for such a minimal project. He said excessive signage such as population statistics may detract, rather than complement, gateway sites. He suggested that statistical information could be integrated into a kiosk or signboard at a major Gateway "pocket park" like Westminster.

DRAFT

Mr. Fuesel discussed other cities' gateway investments for comparison purposes. He noted that a gateway in downtown Burien cost \$100,000 for construction alone, and a gateway in Maple Valley cost \$300,000. He added that two gateways in Redmond cost \$150,000 each.

Mayor Jepsen summarized Council comments, noting the desire not to diminish the plantings at Ronald Bog, and to have staff work on the design for Site No. 4.

10. NEW BUSINESS

(a) 2000 Census Summary

George Smith, Human Services Planner, presented a summary of the 2000 Census describing changes in population, income, age, economic security, housing, and diversity in Shoreline. He emphasized that Shoreline's housing needs will change over time as the population ages and household size decreases, as trends suggest will occur. His presentation included the following points:

- The population of the City of Shoreline in 2000 was 53,025, a growth of 2.3 percent since 1990.
- The Puget Sound Regional Council's latest forecast projects a 2.3 percent growth for Shoreline over the next ten years, about the same rate as the last ten years.
- The number of children under 5 remained almost unchanged countywide between 1990 and 2000 but declined by 25% in Shoreline. This drop in young children will continue a three-decade trend of declining enrollment in the Shoreline School District.
- People 65 and older are now 14.5 percent of the Shoreline population, compared to 10.4 percent for the County as a whole. This group will increase sharply beginning in 2011, as the first wave of the baby boomers reaches 65.
- In Shoreline, 65 percent of households are families and 34.9 percent are non-family households. There is a slow trend in the growth of non-family households, and more than a quarter of households, 26.5 percent, have a single occupant.
- Shoreline's average family size is 3.03, the same as for the County as a whole. Among family households, 79.2 percent are married couples, 5.6 percent are male headed, no wife present and 15 percent are female headed, no husband present. Less than half of married couples, 45 percent, have children.
- Major changes in diversity include:
 - (a) The white population declined from 79.5 percent in 1990 to 77 percent in 2000.
 - (b) Asians comprise the largest non-white group at 13.2 percent, with Chinese, Filipino and Korean the three largest subgroups in that order. The proportion of the Shoreline population that is Asian is greater than King County's 10.8 percent.

DRAFT

- (c) Black or African Americans are 2.8 percent of the population, about half their proportion countywide of 5.4%.
- People who are Hispanic or Latino may be of any race and number 3.9 percent of Shoreline's population, a smaller proportion than the County's 5.5 percent.
- Foreign-born residents increased from 12.3 percent of the population in 1990 to 16.9 percent in 2000 and are another indicator of the increasing diversity of Shoreline's population.
- Median household income is \$51,658 in Shoreline vs. \$53,157 for the County.
- Median family income is \$61,450 in Shoreline vs. \$66,035 for the County.
- Reasons why median income is lower in Shoreline than for the County include:
 - (a) One third fewer people employed in manufacturing and information fields, relatively high paying jobs;
 - (b) Largest single group (22.7 percent) employed in education, health and social services, affording more modest incomes;
 - (c) Full-time male workers earn about \$5,000 less than their County counterparts.
- At 6.9%, Shoreline's poverty rate ranks 14th among the 39 cities in King County.
- The poverty rate in Shoreline increased 18.9 percent from 5.8 to 6.9 percent during the past decade. For the county as a whole, the poverty rate increased by .4 percent to 8.4 percent.
- The living wage is defined as twice the poverty rate. For the three-person household example above, this would be twice \$14,924, the poverty threshold, or \$29,848. In Shoreline, 19 percent, or almost one in five, has an income below a living wage. People with an income below a living wage are spread throughout the community.
- The census defines a housing unit as a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied as separate quarters. Of the 21,330 housing units in Shoreline, 74 percent are single family houses, including condominiums.
- More than a quarter of all residents, 26.2 percent, own their homes, and another 73.8 percent have a mortgage with a median monthly payment of \$1,423.
- 68 percent of residents live in owner occupied housing and 32 percent rent housing.
- Rent, as a percent of household income, exceeds 30% (a national standard for reasonableness) for 37 percent of households.
- In 2000 the median priced home, as reported in the Census, was \$205,300 in Shoreline, compared to \$236,900 for King County as a whole. By the first quarter of 2002, the median price of all homes in King County was \$256,000, an 8% increase.
- The median household income in 2000 of \$51,658 was adequate to purchase a home costing approximately \$145,000. This creates an affordability gap of \$60,300 between what the median income household can afford and the median price of \$205,300.

DRAFT

- Major Trends include:
 - (a) Stable population--no significant growth forecast for next ten years.
 - (b) Household size is decreasing, more than one quarter are one person.
 - (c) Future growth will be in small households of 1.54 to 2.2 persons.
 - (d) Population is aging--median age is increasing and proportion over 65 is growing.
 - (e) Families with children are decreasing, as evidenced by a drop in the under-five age group and a three-decade decline in school district enrollment.
 - (f) Shoreline is becoming more ethnically and racially diverse.
 - (g) One in five residents is economically stressed by low income.
- Implications For Shoreline:
 - (a) Fewer children mean future excess school capacity and a change in the image of Shoreline as a place to raise children.
 - (b) An increasingly older population means:
 - shifts in demand for leisure and cultural activities, with increasing demand for quality leisure and cultural activities;
 - increases in demand for life support services provided by Shoreline Fire Department;
 - increases in demand for lifetime learning and for meaningful volunteer roles.
 - (c) Decreasing household size will create demand for different types of housing, including more multi-family, cottage housing and accessory dwelling units.
 - (d) Smaller household size and increasing age will combine to create demand for retirement and assisted living housing options and for smaller homes.
 - (e) Demand for safety net services to help low-income families overcome unexpected emergencies will put pressure on the City to maintain funding for basic human services.
 - (f) User fees for City services, such as recreation, will be a barrier to use for low-income families, without subsidy.
 - (g) The cost of single family housing will remain high and pose a major barrier to attracting younger families to the community. This in turn will increase the income differential between long-term and new residents and contribute to the aging of the population.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern that the Korean population may have been underreported in the Census. He said in the past, the school district reported over 1,500 Korean students, but the Census only counts a total of 1,500 Koreans in Shoreline. He noted that Korean newspapers report over 5,000 subscriptions in the Shoreline area. He speculated that language barriers and apprehension may account for the underreporting.

DRAFT

Mr. Smith explained that the school district reports much higher levels of Koreans because they use a completely different system of data collection.

Councilmember Ransom noted the differences between data collection in the schools versus the Census. He questioned whether the City has a representative number of Korean businesses participating in City issues such as the Comprehensive Plan. He suggested that Koreans could be underrepresented by nearly 2,000 people.

Mayor Jepsen noted that the Census is just one method among many of collecting demographic data. He said while the accuracy of the Census is debatable, it is still the basis for distribution of federal funding. He added that Shoreline benefited in the 2000 Census by receiving an increase in block grant funding at a time when other cities experienced reductions.

Councilmember Chang commended Mr. Smith for his presentation. He suggested that underreporting in the Korean community may be due to the fact that many Korean exchange professors, students, and business people are temporary residents of Shoreline. He said even though Koreans may be underreported, the system is set up to only count those who report.

Councilmember Ransom said statistics seems to indicate there are 12,000 school-age children in Shoreline, yet have only 10,000 are enrolled in district schools. He suggested that a disproportionate number of children are attending private institutions or schools outside the district.

Councilmember Montgomery expressed appreciation for the report, particularly the way it was tied to Shoreline's mission and implications for the future. She was pleased that two major projects in Shoreline, Aegis Assisted Living and the Aurora Corridor Project, both address issues relating to the increasing aged population.

Councilmember Ransom wondered if the increasing population of citizens over 65 accounts for the diminished earning capacity in Shoreline. Mr. Smith said it could be a factor, although Shoreline has a smaller proportion of people in the work force compared with the County.

Deputy Mayor Grossman asked if the Census considered Social Security benefits and other similar payments as income. Mr. Smith believed it did include both earned and passive income, but wished to check the Census to be certain. Deputy Mayor Grossman said income definitions would obviously have a big impact on the data. He speculated whether single adults on fixed incomes could afford to continue living in larger homes.

Deputy Mayor Grossman said data on housing alternatives would be useful to Council when considering the update to the City's Comprehensive Plan, noting that many aging residents are seeking alternative housing. He asked if Census data indicates the number

of people over age 80 living alone in single-family detached dwellings. Mr. Smith said he would further analyze the Census to try and find an answer to that question.

Councilmember Gustafson noted that the Census indicates the City will only grow 2.3 percent in the next ten years (which is only about 1,200 more citizens). He asked if the Census will change Shoreline's Growth Management Act requirements in terms of its housing needs for the future.

Mr. Stewart explained that the Census trends are generally consistent with Shoreline's housing targets over the next 20 years. He said the trend towards much smaller households, higher-density units, smaller units, and accessory dwelling units is in line with the City's Comprehensive Plan, noting that North City is a good example of how the City will accommodate growth targets.

Councilmember Hansen remarked that even though family size is getting smaller, permits indicate that people are building larger dwellings.

- (b) Council's Rules of Procedure at Council regular meetings and workshops

Mr. Burkett explained that this item is in response to Council's request for a comparison between Shoreline's City Council procedures and those of neighboring jurisdictions. He said no action is required for this item since it is presented for information only.

Councilmember Hansen moved to change the Council Rules of Procedure to allow public comment on any topic (except quasi-judicial items) at the beginning of Regular Meetings. Each person would be allowed to speak for three minutes, for up to a total of 30 minutes. Public comment after staff reports and at the end of Regular Meetings would be eliminated. A public comment period for up to 30 minutes would be provided at the beginning of Workshop meetings, allowing up to three minutes per speaker and allowing the public to speak on any topic except quasi-judicial items. Public comment after staff reports during Workshop Meetings would be eliminated. Public comment of up to three minutes per person would be allowed at the end of Workshop Meetings. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion.

Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Hansen discussed and clarified the proposal.

Councilmember Montgomery explained her support for the motion, noting that while she values public input at Council meetings, it could be greatly improved by changing the rules. She said the City's procedures are far different from neighboring jurisdictions, which allow limited, but more effective opportunities for public input. She commented on the relatively few number of people that actually provide public comment. She said many people have approached her in public to ask why the Council allows such uncivil comments at public meetings. She pointed out that a very small percentage of citizens speak at Council meetings, but a much larger percentage communicate via letters and e-

mail. She said the present rules are not facilitating public comment, but are actually discouraging people from participating. She said the rule change will encourage active participation and a more positive tone.

Councilmember Hansen moved to amend his motion to include providing a public comment form to the public attending meetings. Councilmember Montgomery accepted the amendment to the motion.

Councilmember Ransom described his preference for eliminating the television broadcast of public comment at the beginning and end Council Meetings. He said National League of Cities consultants suggested this as a method to curtail uncivil behavior at public meetings. However, he opposed eliminating public comment after staff presentations because citizens would not have the opportunity to comment on action items.

Councilmember Hansen clarified that the public would be able to comment on any item at the beginning of the meeting.

Councilmember Ransom felt people should be able to hear the staff presentation before making public comments. He said it would be insulting to prohibit citizens from speaking on an action item before a Council vote. He clarified his opinion that public comment after action items should be televised.

Councilmember Hansen reiterated that his proposal would allow people to address any topic, including agenda items, at the beginning of meetings. He felt that public comment between staff presentations and Council discussion is more disruptive than helpful.

Councilmember Montgomery clarified that Councilmember Hansen's proposal does not prevent people from speaking on action items, it only changes the speaking order. She said the proposal allows the public to speak after workshop discussions and before regular meetings.

Councilmember Ransom suggested that the 30-minute time limit may prevent large numbers of people from addressing action items. He also believed it is easier to respond to citizen's concerns if they are allowed to speak during the action item.

Mayor Jepsen assumed the motion would include some flexibility to extend public comment periods in order to accommodate large groups. He felt that public comment immediately following staff presentations disrupts the natural flow of the discussion. He believed the proposal would help City staff and Council be more responsive by incorporating the public comments into their own presentations.

Councilmember Ransom reiterated his support for eliminating the broadcast of general public comments in order to maintain Council decorum, although he favored broadcasting public comment after action items as well as general, City-related announcements.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen was concerned that such a system would be too difficult to implement because speakers would need to be polled about their comment topics beforehand.

Mayor Jepsen said Council can resolve the civility issue by helping the presiding officer to identify inappropriate comments.

Councilmember Hansen noted that his proposal does not change general rules of decorum.

Councilmember Montgomery appreciated Councilmember Ransom's suggestion that general public comments not be broadcast because more people would be encouraged to participate. However, she felt such a system would be difficult to manage.

Councilmember Gustafson said he would vote against the motion tonight because he would like more time to review a formal written proposal prepared by staff.

Mr. Burkett noted that a Council decision tonight is really direction for staff to return to Council with a written amendment to the Rules of Procedure.

Councilmember Montgomery clarified that it should come back as a recommendation from Council, not from staff.

Councilmember Chang concurred with Councilmember Gustafson. He agreed that many good insights were presented at the NLC conference. He said while it is good to know what other cities are doing, it is also good to get citizen input and try to achieve consensus.

Mayor Jepsen asked Councilmember Chang to expand on the NLC workshop recommendations. Councilmember Chang explained the suggestions in more detail, noting that eliminating the broadcast of general public comments may serve to discourage hostile speakers.

Deputy Mayor Grossman emphasized the value of public comment, but said it needs to be kept within a framework that works for citizens, Council, and staff. He favored an approach that would combine elements of both Councilmember Hansen's and Councilmember Ransom's proposals. He said public comments should at least be recorded so they are part of the official record, but not necessarily broadcast to the public. He suggested it could decrease citizen's anxiety and encourage more people to participate.

Councilmember Hansen clarified that the main purpose of his motion is to make meetings more effective, not to restrict public comment. He said he is encouraged to see so many people participate in other Council meetings he watches. He disagreed with eliminating the broadcast of public comments at the beginning and end of meetings. He said his motion simply removes the public comment period from the middle of Council-staff discussions in order to make meetings more efficient.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen clarified and summarized the relevant issues relating to the proposal.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Councilmember Hansen moved to extend the meeting for 10 minutes. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mayor Jepsen commented on the Kent City Council meetings, noting that speakers are required to provide their comment topics in advance of the meeting in order to be assigned a specified time slot. He said that kind of restrictive system is a dramatic contrast to Shoreline's procedures.

Councilmember Gustafson restated his desire to continue discussion of the motion as a formal, written proposal. He said NLC suggested informal, roundtable discussions for cities that want to provide more opportunities for dialogue between Councilmembers and citizens.

Councilmember Hansen said the City did have open forums in the past, but they were discontinued due to a lack of public participation.

Mayor Jepsen emphasized the importance of following up with citizens who have contacted Councilmembers through letters, e-mail, and telephone.

Councilmember Hansen called the question and **the motion passed 4-3, with Councilmembers Chang, Ransom, and Gustafson voting in the negative.**

Mr. Burkett clarified that the motion to amend the Rules of Procedure requires that staff bring a resolution to Council to amend Resolution 183 adopting the Council Rules of Procedure.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:10 p.m. Councilmember Hansen moved to extend the meeting for 10 minutes in order to accommodate public comment. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

11. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, expressed objections to limiting public comment at Council meetings. He suggested that Lynnwood and Everett be included in the comparison because they do not limit public comment opportunities. He questioned how the Council can determine what the public wants if it reduces opportunities for public comment. He said things are repeated over and over at Council meetings because the Council will not adopt the public wishes. He said restricting public comment, as well as eliminating television broadcast of public comment, is censorship, and an insult to the

DRAFT

people the Council serves. He urged Council to create new opportunities for dialogue, noting the issue demonstrates a need for a Public Access Channel.

(b) Fred Clingan, Shoreline, clarified that Council is debating two separate issues: decorum; and public comment following staff reports. He said while he has been embarrassed by some citizens' comments at public meetings, it is the presiding officer's responsibility to maintain decorum. He suggested that Council observe the U.S. House of Representatives, which has effective procedures for maintaining decorum. He expressed support for allowing public comment after staff presentations. He said staff presentations have often given him new information that enabled him to make suggestions that Council may not have otherwise considered.

12. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:16 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli
City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.