

June 11, 2001

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

Monday, June 11, 2001  
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Highlander Room

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

ABSENT: Councilmember Gustafson

STAFF: Steve Burkett, City Manager; Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager; Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager; Bill Conner, Public Works Director, Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director; Kirk McKinley, Transportation Manager, and Sarah Bohlen, Transportation Planner

The meeting convened at 6:08 p.m.

The meeting began with a general discussion regarding recent heavy rainfall.

Steve Burkett, City Manager, proposed certain changes to the evening's regular meeting agenda.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, discussed issues raised by opponents of the Paramount Park Plat, scheduled for approval on tonight's agenda. He explained why postponing the item may be advisable. The date of June 25 was discussed as a possible alternative date to consider this item.

Mr. Burkett introduced discussion of Sound Transit alternatives.

Sarah Bohlen, Transportation Planner, distributed an options memo and discussed these options with Council. She recommended that staff set up a meeting with Joni Earl, Sound Transit Executive Director, before the June 28 Sound Transit decision on options to recommend regarding the reinstatement of commuter bus service on Aurora Avenue. Council concurred with setting up a meeting, to include the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, and City Manager.

Ms. Bohlen also gave a quick update regarding recent Metro changes.

There was continued discussion regarding tonight's agenda.

# DRAFT

Mr. Burkett discussed a number of issues raised by citizens regarding the Aurora Corridor. Recent changes in the position of the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) were also discussed.

Councilmember Grossman raised the issue of having some kind of survey to demonstrate public support for the project.

Councilmember Ransom arrived at 6:35 p.m.

Mr. Burkett discussed the potential impacts of additional process time that would result from the FHA's new position that further environmental process will be required. He distributed a modified recommendation for the motion regarding the approval of the final design contract for the Aurora Corridor Project. He also related his experience in meeting with the Concerned Citizens of Shoreline.

Councilmember Grossman raised concerns regarding the proposed amendment language. Mr. Burkett clarified staff's intent and Council discussed altering specific language in the recommendation.

In response to a question, Mr. Burkett stressed staff efforts to engage the public and property owners regarding the project.

Councilmember Lee discussed the desirability of providing data from other cities to rebut the position that medians will damage businesses. She also suggested new graphics.

Mayor Jepsen asked for observational data regarding actual left-turn lane uses.

Mr. Stewart suggested utilizing the public hearing requested by the FHA to identify the issues to which staff would provide a response.

Bill Conner, Public Works Director, raised doubt that any amount of information will resolve the stated concerns.

Mayor Jepsen raised the issue of actual sales tax revenues. Staff raised concerns regarding disclosability of that information, but agreed to investigate alternatives.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

---

Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager

# DRAFT

June 11, 2001

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, June 11, 2001  
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Councilmember Gustafson

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

Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Councilmember Gustafson.

**Councilmember Montgomery moved to excuse Councilmember Gustafson. Councilmember Lee seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and Councilmember Gustafson was excused.**

Mayor Jepsen recognized that Councilmember Lee received a Master's Degree in Business Administration from the University of Washington. He commended her for this accomplishment while serving on the City Council.

(a) Proclamation of High School Fastpitch Softball Week

Mayor Jepsen proclaimed the week of June 10, 2001 as High School Fastpitch Softball Week to recognize that the Shorecrest Women's Fastpitch Softball Team won the State Championship May 26. He presented the proclamation to Coach Kristie Oglesby and members of the team. A video reprising the championship game was played.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

City Manager Steve Burkett recommended the following changes to the agenda: 1) change Item 7(f) from a consent calendar item to an action item; 2) postpone item 8(a) for two weeks; and 3) if Council wishes, change item 8(b) from an action item to a consent calendar item.

Mr. Burkett discussed the June 14 Aurora Corridor Project Open House.

# DRAFT

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Bill Bear, 2541 NE 165<sup>th</sup> Street, provided copies of the Briarcrest Neighborhood Association newsletter. He encouraged Council to continue to listen to the community.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Lee moved to approve the agenda with the following changes: 1) postponement of Item 8(a) for two weeks until June 25; 2) removal of Item 7(f) to become a new Item 8(a); and 3) placement of Item 8(b), Ordinance No. 275, on the consent calendar. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the agenda, as amended, was approved.**

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

**Minutes of the Dinner Meeting of May 29, 2001  
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 29, 2001**

**Approval of expenses and payroll as of May 25, 2001 in the amount of  
\$ 629,764.03**

**Resolution No. 174 approving a \$401 Money Purchase Plan under  
ICMA Account Number 7576 for the City Manager**

**Resolution No. 175 approving an amendment to the \$401 Money  
Purchase Plan established for all employees under Nationwide Life  
Insurance Company Contract No. 013-05329 to provide loans**

**Ordinance No. 274 granting Shoreline Water District a franchise to  
operate a water system within the City of Shoreline**

**Ordinance No. 275 revising regulation of security devices (alarms);  
and repealing Shoreline Municipal Code 9.10.360**

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

# DRAFT

June 11, 2001

- (a) Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a supplement to the existing Design Services Contract with CH2MHill for final design of the first phase of the Aurora Avenue Corridor Project in an amount not to exceed \$2,100,000 and to authorize the City Manager to execute contract change orders up to 10% of this amount

Mr. Burkett reviewed the history of the Aurora Corridor Project, which has included ten meetings of the Citizens Advisory Task Force (CATF), seven open houses, four block meetings and discussions during 13 City Council meetings. Staff anticipates that final design will run through October 2002. He explained staff's intent to coordinate the final design with the additional environmental review and not to proceed past the 60 percent design portion of the project if environmental issues arise that are not resolved as part of the design.

Public Works Director Bill Conner reviewed the staff report. He said the Aurora Corridor Project will be about a \$75 million project, with the first phase being about one-third of the cost. He noted that staff submitted the documented Categorical Exclusion (CE) to the Local Programs Agency at the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) on May 11. He went on to discuss the schedule for the environmental process of the Aurora Corridor Project. He said the biological assessment under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is running concurrently with the start of the final design process—as are the right-of-way coordination and the beginning of utility design. He explained the plan to begin right-of-way acquisition in July with completion in January 2003. Right-of-way acquisition is contingent upon sufficient environmental analysis and final design work.

Mr. Burkett discussed comments about the Aurora Corridor Project that he has heard during his first month as City Manager. He noted support for the project among Council of Neighborhoods representatives.

Continuing, Mr. Burkett discussed input he received from representatives of the Aurora Improvement Council (AIC) and Concerned Citizens for Shoreline during a meeting June 5. The groups assert that the City is not listening to their concerns. Their key issues include: opposition to the proposed 12-foot width of the sidewalks and landscaping; a preference for a continuous two-way left-turn lane to the proposed continuous landscaped median; and impacts to businesses and the City. Mr. Burkett said Walt Hagen advises that 72 businesses along Aurora Avenue between 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 165<sup>th</sup> Street oppose the Aurora Corridor Project.

Mr. Burkett asserted a lack of significant environmental impacts of the Aurora Corridor Project. He said staff intends to meet with each business and property owner who may be affected by the project. He encouraged business and property owners to contact Project Manager Anne Tonella-Howe.

Finally, Mr. Burkett referenced additional language that staff has proposed as part of the motion to authorize the supplement to the existing design service contract.

# DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen invited public comment.

(1) Myron Phillips, Richmond Highlands Veterinary Hospital, 18019 Aurora Avenue N, identified himself as AIC Co-Chair. He read a letter that AIC received that was written by Elizabeth Healy, Transportation and Environmental Engineer, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), to Douglas B. MacDonald, WSDOT, noting that the FHWA is requiring a public hearing on the project and considering "whether it is appropriate to change [the project] from a Class II project to a Class III project as a result of public controversy."

(2) John Chang, Quest Inn, 14817 Aurora Avenue N, opposed the Aurora Corridor Project as designed. He said he has visited 36 merchants, all clearly against the project. None of them have been visited by the City, including himself. He said business, government and citizens must work together, and he hoped Council would take this approach.

(3) Daniel Mann, 17920 Stone Avenue N, discussed a map showing Aurora Avenue business owners opposed to the Aurora Corridor Project as currently designed. He stated that lack of opposition is a prerequisite for a CE. He asserted that the CE is inappropriate given the significant opposition.

(4) Cindy Ryu, Allstate Insurance, 15215 Aurora Avenue N, opposed funding of the final design of the Aurora Corridor Project at this time. She said she dislikes the proposed design, especially the 15-foot median.

(5) Dennis Lee, 14547 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, identified himself as President of Concerned Citizens for Shoreline. He advocated that Council table the vote for funding the final design. He said the City has not contacted businesses on Aurora Avenue. He questioned preparation of the final design while the City is still accepting comments from the public. He urged Council to consider statistics concerning traffic flow, traffic accidents, pedestrian safety and bus ridership.

(6) Randy Ferrell, Ferrell-Penning General Contractors, 17510 Aurora Avenue N, recommended an independent study of the economic impacts of the proposed design. He advocated that Council postpone further funding for the proposed design until after Council and citizens have considered such a study.

(7) Kevin Reeve, General Manager, Carter Subaru, 17225 Aurora Avenue N, said his business could lose all of its new car display space and as much as 20 percent of its used car display space, depending upon the final design of the Aurora Corridor Project. He said the resulting decrease in car sales will result in job losses. He expressed concern about the cost of maintaining the proposed landscaping.

(8) Kristina Stimson, 2155 NW 201<sup>st</sup> Street, asserted safety as the most important priority for improving Aurora Avenue. She commented that the proposed

# DRAFT

design does not improve the poor safety ratings of the intersections on Aurora Avenue. She advocated grade separation of north-south and east-west traffic at least at one or two intersections.

(9) Bill Bear, 2541 NE 165<sup>th</sup> Street, discussed the environmental impact of accommodating more traffic on Aurora Avenue. He questioned the representativeness of the Council of Neighborhoods. He said many of the representatives on the Council of Neighborhoods have not interacted with their neighbors for a long time.

(10) Rick Stephens, 18005 Aurora Avenue N, said the City has ignored the concerns he has raised about the Aurora Corridor Project. He commented that he and other business owners support the improvement of Aurora Avenue but oppose the proposed design.

(11) Jerilee Noffsinger, 14731 Aurora Avenue N, represented businesses in her complex in opposition to the proposed design of the Aurora Corridor Project.

(12) Claudia Newman, Bricklin and Gendler, LLP, 1424 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, identified herself as the attorney for the AIC. She stated the AIC request that Council table the decision on the final design contract. She said approving the final design contract before obtaining input contradicts the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

(13) Patty Crawford, 2326 N 155<sup>th</sup> Street, represented Twin Ponds Fish Friends. Referring to the SEPA Threshold Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance for the Walgreens at 14510 Aurora Avenue N, she said the Aurora Corridor Project will affect Thornton Creek. She stated that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) considers Thornton Creek a Chinook salmon stream. She asserted that the Aurora Corridor Project must take Thornton Creek into account.

(14) Clark Elster, 1720 NE 177<sup>th</sup> Street, stated that CH2MHill has based studies on incomplete traffic data from WSDOT. He said the proposed Aurora Corridor Project will result in worse levels of service at key intersections on Aurora Avenue. He advocated the separation of east-west and north-south traffic.

(15) Tim Crawford, 2326 N 155<sup>th</sup> Street, opposed funding the final design of the Aurora Corridor Project before considering the environmental impacts of the project.

(16) Edsel Hammond, 18541 Burke Avenue N, opposed the proposed design of the Aurora Corridor Project and expressed concerns about traffic flow.

(17) Walt Hagen, 711 N 193<sup>rd</sup> Street, asked who at WSDOT received the CE from the City. He disputed the assertion that the Aurora Corridor Project lacks significant environmental issues and said there is no mention in the CE of traffic impacts

# DRAFT

on any street other than Aurora Avenue. He stated that the addition of four traffic lights on Aurora Avenue will slow traffic and that drivers will seek faster routes using neighborhood side streets. He said Council is failing the primary directive of the Comprehensive Plan to maintain the quality of Shoreline's neighborhoods. He questioned whether public input will matter at the Aurora Corridor Open House.

(18) Russ McCurdy, 17532 Aurora Avenue N, said the AIC has repeatedly stated its willingness to support a more modest version of the Aurora Corridor Project. He reiterated the AIC recommendation of an independent study of the economic impacts of the project, including the costs to acquire and relocate businesses and lost jobs and tax revenues. He felt such a study will disclose costs in "millions of dollars" that have been "hidden from the taxpayers." He requested that Council vote to table the motion to fund the final design.

(19) David Carver, 18526 Burke Avenue N, asked how the proposed design will affect the ability of the fire and police departments to respond to emergencies. He opposed the proposed project design.

(20) Janet Way, 940 NE 147<sup>th</sup> Street, represented Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund and supported the suggestion that Council table the motion to fund the final design. She disputed the assertion that the Aurora Corridor Project lacks significant environmental impacts.

(21) Julia Elster, 14721 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE, stated that Council should listen to Shoreline residents and business owners about what needs to be done in Shoreline.

**Councilmember Montgomery moved to authorize the City Manager to execute a supplement to the existing Design Services Contract with CH2MHill for final design of the first phase of the Aurora Avenue Corridor Project in an amount not to exceed \$2,100,000 and to authorize the City Manager to execute contract change orders up to 10% of this amount. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Lee disputed the assertion that the City does not care about existing businesses on Aurora Avenue. She requested information about the CE submission. Mr. Conner discussed the three levels of environmental review under NEPA. The most stringent review, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is required in cases of clear, direct impact on the environment. The second level of review, an Environmental Assessment (EA), occurs when the environmental impacts do not clearly merit an EIS but do merit significant environmental analysis. A CE, the least stringent review, is allowed in cases of minimal environmental impact. Mr. Conner acknowledged the validity of concerns about stream basins. He said the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project will primarily affect the Boeing Creek basin, which already has erosion and water quality issues. He explained the basic analysis that the project will enhance the environment by increasing the amount of pervious surface by approximately 12,000 square feet, by replacing the center continuous left-turn lane with landscaped median strips, and by



# DRAFT

June 11, 2001

replacing concrete and asphalt on the shoulders of the roadway with landscaped sidewalk areas.

Councilmember Ransom asked what the City will do to address storm water runoff from Aurora Avenue. Mr. Conner said some storm water runoff will permeate the ground in the new landscaped surfaces, but most of it will continue to run off. He explained that the City could address storm water runoff from Aurora Avenue in projects in conjunction with the Aurora Corridor Project. He said the City has not planned any such projects at this point.

Councilmember Ransom noted the continuing concern of a large number of Aurora Avenue businesses (he has talked to as many as 80 businesses on Aurora Avenue) about the current design. He mentioned that business concerns about street improvements in Lynnwood continued until the City of Lynnwood negotiated an agreement about medians and sidewalks. He suggested that Council postpone final design of the Aurora Corridor Project until the City can negotiate an agreement with the majority of Aurora Avenue businesses.

**Councilmember Ransom moved to table the motion. There was no second.**

Councilmember Lee noted that traffic concerns were a major impetus for the project and that WSDOT provided data on the number of accidents and the dangerous condition of Aurora Avenue. Mr. Conner responded that the WSDOT data is from 1996 and that the City has since been using a manual tracking system maintained by the Police Department. He acknowledged that the figures may include some inaccuracies, but he questioned whether anyone believes the Corridor to be safe currently and therefore requires no action to make it safer.

Deputy Mayor Hansen asked to whom the CE had been submitted and under what circumstances. Mr. Conner responded that he signed the CE on May 11 and turned it in to WSDOT. He did not know who specifically received the document, but when he met with WSDOT last week Maureen Sullivan, Dave Scott, and Terry Paananen all were aware of the submittal.

Noting that the project has been controversial from the beginning, Deputy Mayor Hansen questioned the statement that "there is no opposition." Mr. Conner did not understand the genesis of those comments. He said it is clear the project has been opposed from the beginning by certain individuals. The confusion may be that staff has asked that the project be treated as two projects for environmental purposes (Phase 1—145<sup>th</sup> to 165<sup>th</sup>; Phase 2—165<sup>th</sup> to the county line). The rationale for this was that Phase 1 has an insignificant amount of environmental impact; whereas, for the second phase, staff did not feel as sure this was the case. Perhaps the statement that Phase 1 has no significant environmental impact was construed as meaning there was no opposition to the project.

# DRAFT

Deputy Mayor Hansen emphasized his view of the positive environmental impacts of the project. Doing nothing will continue the runoff that occurs now. He noted his previous suggestions to build vaults or to use runoff in other ways.

Councilmember Montgomery responded to the issues raised by the speakers, noting that Council decision making has not occurred in a vacuum. On the contrary, there has been a great amount of public input. Those speaking tonight represent one viewpoint, but there are many others who have expressed support to individual Councilmembers for moving forward with improvements to the Corridor. Councilmember Montgomery assured the audience that when necessary Council will continue to solicit more information but, she pointed out, Council has already listened to many experts. She noted that a representative from WSDOT encouraged Council at a meeting to do something about safety issues along Aurora Avenue.

Continuing, Councilmember Montgomery said she has looked at medians in other communities, and they do not seem to impact business access. She felt that the continuous left-turn lane on Aurora Avenue does not guarantee easy access to businesses. Besides, safety is as important as economic impacts—although she would not support something that would have a negative impact on the City. She mentioned that she felt the criticism of the Council of Neighborhoods was unfair. She concluded that Council must represent the whole City, not just those speaking tonight.

Councilmember Grossman thanked speakers for continuing to make their voices heard. He pointed out the difference between "not listening" and "not agreeing." He concurred with Councilmember Montgomery that many individuals have expressed a desire to move forward on the project. He said part of the problem is the ambiguity of the design. The only way to get clarity is to move to the 60 percent design point.

Mayor Jepsen noted a petition signed by a number of business owners and employees along the Corridor who oppose several components of the design, including the width of the sidewalks and landscaping and the continuous center median. Petitioners felt the loss of left-turn access will affect visibility of and accessibility to Corridor businesses.

Mayor Jepsen pointed out that Council has listened to business concerns and some compromises are represented in the "32 Points" Council adopted on August 23, 1999. He highlighted points 7, 8, 9, 21 and 22 from that document.

Mayor Jepsen said a final design is necessary in order to move forward with these items. He concluded that #3 ("Twelve foot sidewalks will be provided on both sides of Aurora the entire length . . .") has since been moderated by a policy that an interim standard of less than twelve feet is acceptable if needed to minimize impacts on existing businesses.

To formalize this policy and other Council direction regarding the design contract, **Mayor Jepsen moved an amendment to the motion to have staff do the following as part of the design contract:**

- set the total width of sidewalk and landscaping strips at 11½ feet;

# DRAFT

- **case-by-case, consider the reduction of the sidewalk widths on an interim basis to mitigate land impacts and acquisition; and**
- **incorporate issues from the environmental review into the final design work and return to Council at the 60 percent design state with proposed additional design changes.**

**Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the amendment.**

Mayor Jepsen clarified that the contract under consideration will run for 15 months, so the final design will not be completed until October 2002. He felt action tonight will help in discussion of the project.

Councilmember Lee clarified that if a business is sold, the new owner will not have to meet the sidewalk width requirements unless there is a major renovation of the property.

Deputy Mayor Hansen said he might support an over/underpass at 185<sup>th</sup> or possibly at another intersection. However, at this point only Phase 1 is under consideration, which should be the easiest part of the project. Once the first section is completed, the City will have a lot of information about how to go about completing the remaining Corridor. If the design doesn't work, something else will have to be considered. However, he felt that once Phase 1 is completed, those along the rest of the Corridor will like what they see and be more enthusiastic about the process. He concluded by disputing the assertion of "hidden costs" in the project.

Mr. Conner said the original assessment of the design was that three or four properties would have to be bought. With the reduction of the sidewalk widths and the other adjustments Council has agreed to over the past year, no properties must be purchased. He assured Council that as far as he knew, no costs have been left out of the estimate of \$25 million for Phase 1.

Mr. Burkett added that pinning down costs is one of the outcomes of the design contract. Once the design is done, the project can be bid and all the costs defined.

Deputy Mayor Hansen said it should be recognized that something could be discovered through the design process that would force the City to rethink the process. The contract does not commit the City to the complete \$25 million, but it indicates a belief that that is where the City is going.

**A vote was taken on the amendment to include in the design contract the following: 1) setting the total width of sidewalk and landscaping strips at 11½ feet; 2) case-by-case, considering the reduction of the sidewalk widths on an interim basis to mitigate land impacts and acquisition; and 3) incorporating issues from the environmental review into the final design work and returning to Council at the 60 percent design state with proposed additional design changes. The amendment carried 6 – 0.**

# DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom commented on personal experience with how dangerous Aurora Avenue is and people are concerned about safety on Aurora Avenue. He noted the split CATF vote on recommending the 32 points, with one more vote for 12-foot sidewalks than for eight-foot sidewalks. He said the question is ultimately whether Aurora Avenue can be made into a boulevard, Main Street, Shoreline. He said Council must remember that most of Shoreline's businesses are along the Corridor and business revenue pays about 70 percent of Shoreline's income in one way or another. Many of these businesses have been in the community for 30 or 40 years and are part of the Shoreline family. He emphasized that the City needs to work even harder to create "a united house" by coming to an acceptable compromise with the business community.

Councilmember Lee concurred with Councilmember Ransom's comments. She said as a small business owner herself, she knows exactly what the small business owner goes through.

Mayor Jepsen did not think 70 percent of Shoreline's revenue comes from businesses. He felt Council is doing its best to moderate differences of opinion.

**A vote was taken on the motion, as amended to include the three points, which carried 6 – 0, and the City Manager was authorized to execute a supplement to the existing Design Services Contract with CH2MHill for final design of the first phase of the Aurora Avenue Corridor Project in an amount not to exceed \$2,100,000 and to execute contract change orders up to 10 percent of this amount.**

## 9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(1) Bill Meyer, 358 N 189<sup>th</sup> Street, said he did not think the Council was "putting Aurora together right." He referred to the original Aurora Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC), which made recommendations for the Comprehensive Plan, noting 14 of the 19 members did not want wider sidewalks or bus lanes on Aurora Avenue. He referred to Ordinance Nos. 31 and 128, which contained design guidelines for Aurora Avenue. He said the Aurora Avenue businesses are fragile and will fail if they lose parking, access, etc.

(2) Walt Hagen, 711 N 193<sup>rd</sup> Street, referred to his request to Mr. Conner for certain documents, including the CE document. He protested that the CE was submitted on May 11 but was not available to citizens until May 18. He said "something is wrong. I don't know who is paying who—I don't even like to imply that—but I asked Terry Paananen if he'd seen the document. No!" (He acknowledged that Mr. Paananen might have meant he hadn't looked at it yet.) Then Mr. Hagen made the following points: 1) he was unaware that the Council of Neighborhoods supports the Aurora plan; 2) the original CPAC did not give the City the "answers it wanted," so the City established the CATF to do so; 3) most Asian business owners do not know what is going on because of the language barrier; and 4) the City's Economic Development Plan is about getting new development into Shoreline and not helping current businesses.

# DRAFT

(3) Kenny Coulter, 16720 Linden Avenue N, said the house across the street is dealing heroine on a regular basis. He described an incident that occurred the previous Friday. He complained that he was unable to reach the appropriate person. He said he needs to know who to call about such drug-related incidents.

(4) Rick Stephens, 18005 Aurora Avenue N, commented on storm water runoff into his building. He said the City's storm drains do not work. The project and landscaping plans will impact his business because the water will pool in the hardpan and create pressure to push his building out of alignment. He emphasized the effort that has gone into developing his land. Now the City is not considering his interests. He said people won't walk along Aurora Avenue even with 12-foot sidewalks.

(5) Edsel Hammond, 18541 Burke Avenue N, suggested meeting with business owners. Noting that the continuous median will cause traffic backups, he urged a study to determine what the impacts will be.

## MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m., Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to extend the meeting to 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

(6) Mr. Limm, employee of Aurora Cold Storage, did not think wider sidewalks would result in people walking along Aurora Avenue.

(7) Joe Farris, 16739 Linden Avenue N, commented on illegal activities at the property mentioned by Mr. Coulter. He said nothing happens when neighbors complain, and he asked Council to do something.

(8) Roberta Farris, 16739 Linden Avenue N, also commented on the drug house problem, which she said has been going on for 20 years.

(9) Amy Stapleton, 17820 Palatine Avenue N, said she is a former neighbor of the residence mentioned by previous speakers. She asked the police to take care of the problems there.

(10) Cindy Ryu, 15215 Aurora Avenue N, said the City needs to do a better job communicating with people. She mentioned concerns about the costs of watering the landscaping and doing tree maintenance.

(11) John Chang, 16229 Sixth Avenue NW, felt that the Aurora process has not been a dialogue and that the City government is being arrogant. He asked Council to name one thing it has done to help the merchants. He expressed his anger that Council will not recognize that all of the businesses between 145<sup>th</sup> and 155<sup>th</sup> oppose the project and asked Council to produce one person who supports the project. He said he would try to convince that person of his perspective, which is what dialogue is about and what must be done to bring the community together.

# DRAFT

(12) Daniel Mann, 19926 Aurora Avenue N, said this issue has brought people along the Corridor together who did not know each other before. He respected Council's desire to find a middle ground, but said this has not yet been achieved. He said the people he talks with are not aware of the extent of the width of the project. Everyone wants something done along the Corridor, but not the current design of 12-foot sidewalks and the continuous median. He hoped the City would not squander the opportunity to work together with businesses for the benefit of the whole community.

(13) Jerilee Noffsinger, 17431 Aurora Avenue N, said businesses want to see progress on Aurora Avenue, but they also want to feel like they have been heard.

(14) Claudia Newman, 1424 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Seattle, emphasized that the City is not following the proper process. She said the City must do a threshold determination in this situation regarding environmental impacts. She disputed that the project qualifies for a CE and said it is not exempt from SEPA. She urged the City to look carefully at the governing laws.

Responding to public comment, Mayor Jepsen noted that the Police Chief left the meeting to talk with the neighbors about the drug house. He also wanted to clarify that a public hearing will be held as required on the Aurora Project. He said the City is not ignoring the environmental process.

Mr. Burkett assured everyone the City will follow all the laws, including environmental laws.

Mayor Jepsen concluded that there is a lot of emotion around the issue of redeveloping the Aurora Corridor. He said the City also wants to partner and dialogue, but at that same time it is important that everyone is dealing with the facts.

Councilmember Lee added that as an Asian-American business owner she is aware of the communication issues. She said the City is trying to reach out, and she expressed her hope to act as a liaison with the Asian-American community.

## 10. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:21 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk

June 18, 2001

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, June 18, 2001  
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Hansen, Councilmembers Gustafson, Lee, Montgomery and Ransom

ABSENT: Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Grossman

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:42 p.m. by Deputy Mayor Hansen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Deputy Mayor Hansen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exception of Councilmember Gustafson, who arrived later in the meeting, Councilmember Grossman, who was expected later in the meeting, and Mayor Jepsen.

**Councilmember Lee moved to excuse Mayor Jepsen. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and Mayor Jepsen was excused.**

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Steve Burkett reported that the Shoreline Police Department has followed up on concerns that residents of the 16700 block of Linden Avenue N raised during the June 11 Council meeting about drug activity at a house in their neighborhood. He said the City will keep residents of the neighborhood informed of any new developments.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Montgomery noted that Mayor Jepsen and Deputy Mayor Hansen are scheduled to meet next week with Sound Transit Board Chair Dave Earling. She asked about exploring the potential for a commuter rail station in Richmond Beach in an effort to identify "some specific benefit to Shoreline" for taxes paid to Sound Transit.

Deputy Mayor Hansen welcomed Boy Scout Troop 167, in attendance at the meeting.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

# DRAFT

(a) John Chang, Quest Inn, 14817 Aurora Avenue N, encouraged Shoreline citizens to learn the facts about the Aurora Corridor Project. He said businesses are not opposed to the project, but the Aurora Improvement Council (AIC) and the Concerned Citizens of Shoreline have serious concerns about it. He asked citizens to phone the AIC to advise whether they support or oppose the project.

(b) Russ McCurdy, 17532 Aurora Avenue N, commented that 52 businesses and citizens represented AIC and Concerned Citizens for Shoreline during the June 11 Council meeting. He said the groups support narrower sidewalks and a "more manageable" median. He stated that the proposed budget for the Aurora Corridor Project has increased dramatically from \$38 million to \$78 million. He noted the groups' concern about "increased taxes falling on citizens and businesses." He requested the extension to July 2 of the public comment period initiated at the June 14 Aurora Corridor Open House.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Mr. Burkett agreed to extend the public comment period to July 2. He stressed that Council acted June 11 to begin the 15-month final design process, not to approve a final design. He said staff will: meet with individuals who own properties along Aurora Avenue; address the location of driveways; determine if the 11½-foot sidewalk and landscaping strips will not fit in certain areas in the Aurora Corridor; and work with the State to try to include additional left-turn lanes.

Councilmember Lee commented that State requirements dictate many of the specifics of the Aurora Corridor Project design. She said the City hopes to meet with the AIC and the State together to continue the dialogue about the project.

Councilmember Montgomery questioned Mr. McCurdy's comment about an increase in the costs of the Aurora Corridor Project. Public Works Director Bill Conner said staff estimated the cost of the project (adjusted for inflation to reflect the ten-year length of project construction) at \$75 million in August 1999 at the end of the pre-design study. He explained that a previous, lower cost estimate had not been adjusted for inflation over the length of the project. He said staff has used the \$75 million cost estimate during the past two years.

Councilmember Ransom explained that Council chose to reduce the width of the sidewalk and amenity strips from 12 to 11½ feet. He said this insures a minimum sidewalk width of six feet to accommodate passage of two wheelchairs. He stated his support for this proposal. He acknowledged the small number of left-turn and U-turn lanes in a preliminary design. He reiterated the City objective to work with the State to try to include more left-turn and U-turn lanes.

## 6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

- (a) Shoreline Park and Ride Transit Oriented Development Stakeholder Meeting to Forward Bookend Concepts to State



# DRAFT

Planning Manager Kirk McKinley introduced the other stakeholders at the table: King County Councilmember Maggi Fimia; Maureen Sullivan, Northwest Region Administrator, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT); and Ron Posthuma, Assistant Director, King County Department of Transportation.

Mr. McKinley reviewed the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) process to date and the future schedule for the process. He discussed considerations that have emerged from community outreach efforts (e.g., page 12 of the Council packet).

Councilmember Gustafson arrived at 7:06 p.m.

Continuing, Mr. McKinley reviewed the Shoreline Park and Ride TOD Principles (page four of the Council packet).

Ms. Sullivan suggested the revision of the second principle to read: "The park and ride function must be maintained at the existing 400 parking stalls and potentially be enhanced. . . ."

Mr. McKinley mentioned another possible revision to the second principle to address the reduction of residential parking ratios in light of the transit orientation of the site. Mr. Posthuma said TOD developments in Redmond and Renton have parking ratios of one parking stall per residential unit; whereas, the study for the Shoreline Park and Ride TOD assumes a residential parking ratio of 1.5 stalls per unit. He mentioned ways to reduce the need for structured parking at the site, including the provision of good transit services to the site and bus passes for each residential unit. He said the overall project will be more affordable if more parking is available for shared use and less is devoted exclusively for residential use.

Mr. McKinley said the Hillwood Neighborhood favored the revision of the second sentence of the third principle to state that "Enhancements must include sidewalks, screening, water quality. . . ." County Councilmember Fimia noted the use of "shall" instead of "must" in most legislative documents.

Ms. Sullivan questioned the meaning of "usable public space" in the fourth principle.

Mr. McKinley said Hillwood Neighborhood advocated the inclusion of a reference to Richmond Beach in the seventh principle. He mentioned the perception that many Richmond Beach residents use the park and ride.

Mr. McKinley said Hillwood Neighborhood suggested the revision of the eighth principle to read "The project should be a hallmark for community development."

Mr. McKinley went on to review the two bookend concepts. He said the key difference between the two concepts is whether WSDOT retains ownership (Concept 1) or relinquishes ownership (Concept 2).

# DRAFT

County Councilmember Fimia said the availability of free parking is the greatest single determinant of whether people drive or take transit. She pointed out that the designation of 298 parking stalls for the 197 residential housing units included in Concept 1 is based on the parking ratio of 1.5 parking stalls per unit. She asserted that the more parking provided, the less incentive people will have to use transit. She suggested that future drawings include a range in the number of parking stalls and reflect the policy decisions involved.

Deputy Mayor Hansen invited public comment.

(1) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Avenue N, said the proposed TOD does not take the future needs of Shoreline citizens into account. He asserted that future increases in housing density will necessitate greater park and ride capacity.

County Councilmember Fimia questioned the designation of 700 parking stalls for the park and ride and two development parcels in Concept 2. Mr. Posthuma said the work team anticipated the parking demand associated with the two development parcels at approximately 300 stalls with good potential for shared use with the park and ride. He explained that park and ride capacity at the site could thus expand.

In response to County Councilmember Fimia, Ms. Sullivan said the State has determined the need for more park and ride capacity in the north Interstate 5 corridor. She explained the State expectation that a viable TOD will include at least 400 parking stalls for park and ride use and the potential for more. She mentioned shared use as one method of creating more park and ride capacity.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. McKinley said staff is cognizant of the 15,000-square-foot WSDOT property adjacent to the Shoreline Park and Ride. This property provides a valuable buffer for the neighborhood. Ms. Sullivan said the property can be improved, but restrictions associated with the funds with which the State purchased the property preclude its designation as a park.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Terry Pollard, Shoreline YMCA, said the YMCA sees the TOD as a great opportunity. He explained that YMCA has been looking for property in north King County and south Snohomish County for two years. He noted YMCA concerns about the timing of the TOD—the YMCA prefers to build soon. Mr. Pollard estimated the size of a YMCA facility at 45,000-50,000 square feet. He described the process the YMCA follows to design a facility.

In response to County Councilmember Fimia, Mr. Pollard discussed the complications of building a swimming pool at the TOD site. He estimated that a YMCA facility would need a building footprint of 30,000-33,000 square feet.

County Councilmember Fimia expressed concern about losing "the potential of an anchor tenant like [the YMCA] because our process requires a six- to nine-month timeframe."

June 18, 2001

She suggested a Request for Proposals (RFP) for potential tenants concurrent with the ongoing process as one means of providing more predictability "for both sides."

Councilmember Gustafson agreed with the value of the Shoreline YMCA as an anchor tenant and advocated efforts to secure its involvement.

Referring to the illustration of Concept 1 (page nine of the Council packet), Councilmember Ransom questioned the feasibility of constructing a swimming pool over the proposed lower-level parking. He agreed that the Shoreline YMCA would be an attractive tenant, and he expressed his hope that "something can be worked out."

Noting the designation of 15,000 square feet for the Puget Sound Learning Center (PSLC) in Concept 1, Councilmember Ransom asserted that 100,000 square feet seems more realistic for a vocational center. He suggested covering the transit lanes to allow additional construction above them.

Councilmember Lee asked about the opportunity for office space—in addition to residential housing, the YMCA and the PSLC—"between the bookend concepts."

In response to Councilmember Montgomery, Mr. McKinley explained that the City will review the TOD master plan as a master development permit application from the County.

Noting the revision that Hillwood Neighborhood suggested to the eighth TOD principle, Councilmember Montgomery asked if the neighborhood is concerned that economic development at the Shoreline Park and Ride will be damaging to the community. Mr. McKinley explained that Hillwood Neighborhood views the park and ride as a community asset and that it wants development to reflect community values as well as economic benefits.

In response to Councilmember Montgomery, Mr. McKinley explained that "Eliminate cut-through traffic at N 192<sup>nd</sup> Street" (page 12 of the Council packet) means maintaining traffic operation and safety as appropriate for the neighborhoods east and west of Aurora Avenue. Councilmember Montgomery and Deputy Mayor Hansen commented that N 192<sup>nd</sup> Street provides convenient, safe access to the park and ride and to Aurora Avenue. Mr. McKinley said the origin-destination study will help determine who is using the park and ride.

Councilmember Ransom questioned: the definition of "public space" in the fourth principle and the Hillwood Neighborhood proposals to reference Richmond Beach in the seventh principle and to substitute "community" for "economic" in the eighth principle.

After discussion, Deputy Mayor Hansen confirmed consensus to revise the eighth principle to read "The project should be a hallmark for community and economic development and set an example for future redevelopment efforts in Shoreline."

# DRAFT

County Councilmember Fimia reiterated the suggestion to revise the second sentence of the third principle to read "Enhancements shall include sidewalks, screening, water quality. . . ." After discussion, Deputy Mayor Hansen confirmed consensus in support of this revision.

County Councilmember Fimia suggested the revision of the fourth principle to read "The development of this site should include reasonable public space for formal and informal gathering." Noting the restrictions associated with the funds with which the State purchased the property, Ms. Sullivan recommended "may" in place of "should" as more flexible.

In response to County Councilmember Fimia, Ms. Sullivan explained that the State must ensure the provision of 400 or more park and ride parking stalls in Shoreline but that the State does not necessarily have to provide the park and ride. County Councilmember Fimia suggested the revision of the fourth principle to read "The development of this site should include reasonable public space for formal and informal gathering by the public, unless precluded by federal or State requirements." After discussion, Deputy Mayor Hansen confirmed consensus in support of this revision.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Ms. Sullivan explained the need to revise the second principle to indicate the expectation that the TOD will enhance park and ride capacity from the base level of the existing capacity. Mr. McKinley suggested revision of the first sentence of the second principle to read "The park and ride function should maintain the existing 400 spaces and potentially be enhanced." Deputy Mayor Hansen confirmed consensus in support of this revision.

Deputy Mayor Hansen questioned the inclusion of a reference to Richmond Beach alone in the seventh principle. Mr. McKinley explained that Hillwood Neighborhood advocates a park and ride in Richmond Beach to absorb some of the users of the Shoreline Park and Ride. He reiterated that an origin-destination study will help determine who is using the park and ride. Deputy Mayor Hansen confirmed consensus in support of not revising the seventh principle.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Mr. McKinley said staff will consider the reduction of the parking ratio for residential units as part of the workshops.

In response to County Councilmember Fimia, Mr. McKinley said PSLC provided the estimate of 15,000 square feet included in Concept 1.

Mr. Posthuma asserted the importance of major tenants, such as the YMCA and the PSLC, to the viability of the TOD. He said the project team is "very serious about including them, even if the pool has to be on the ground floor."

County Councilmember Fimia identified the number of residential housing units as one of the biggest concerns of the adjacent neighborhoods, in addition to the traffic impacts.

Mr. McKinley said neighborhood residents discussed the compatibility, height and design of the residential housing units when staff presented Concepts 1 and 2 to them.

County Councilmember Fimia discussed a proposed "Letter of Agreement between Stakeholder elected officials." Councilmember Gustafson suggested further Council discussion of the letter for future consideration among the stakeholders. County Councilmember Fimia said she would "like it to be signed by the next meeting."

Deputy Mayor Hansen invited Ros Bird, Executive Director, Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Arts Council, to speak about the Shoreline Arts Festival, scheduled June 23 and 24.

(b) Proposed Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Map and Development Code Amendments

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, introduced Rachael Markle, Senior Planner, Andrea Spencer, Planner I and Brian Krueger, Planner I, who together reviewed the staff report and explained the binder of materials titled "2000-2001 Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Map Reconciliation Resources" and the folio of area maps.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Ms. Spencer explained that staff grouped the 881 parcels requiring reconciliation into ten areas. The Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Zoning Map designations of parcels outside the ten areas are consistent and are not included in the amendment process.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Ms. Spencer noted significant testimony concerning Area 8, Bundle F (properties on the west side of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE between NE 165<sup>th</sup> and NE 155<sup>th</sup> Streets). She said residents favored the retention of the Comprehensive Plan designation of high-density residential. Mr. Stewart explained that "a number of property owners wanted to keep a high-density designation for future development." He said the Planning Commission and staff recommend changing the Comprehensive Plan land use designation to make it consistent with the existing R-6 zoning.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Stewart said the Shoreline 20-year growth target, including the annexation areas, is 2,300-2,800 new housing units. He noted a "starting date" of 1992 or 1994, depending upon interpretation. He estimated the annual Shoreline growth target at approximately 100 new housing units. He said Shoreline "has generally been producing about that amount" since 1996. He explained that the City will receive a new growth target for the next ten year increment sometime during the next year and a half. He said the City will need to review its development regulations and Comprehensive Plan as necessary to address the new growth target. He asserted the need to participate in the regional debate about the target allocations.

Deputy Mayor Hansen invited public comment.

# DRAFT

(1) Kathy Halliburton, 18315 Wallingford Avenue N, addressed the proposal to change the zoning of parcels in Area 4, Bundle F from R-6 to R-12. She expressed concern that the zoning change could increase an existing problem with cut-through traffic in the area. She noted that residents in the area have proposed the vacation of N 167<sup>th</sup> Street to provide parking for the Interurban Trail. She expressed concern that a zoning change could preclude this proposal.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Stewart explained the concern addressed in a letter that Councilmembers received. He illustrated how the rounding provision of the base density calculation in the Development Code (20.50.020 [B] [1]) can allow construction of more than one detached single-family residential unit on single lots of 10,891 or more square feet. He noted that the Planning Commission deliberated and decided on this provision during preparation of the Development Code. He mentioned that the Planning Commission will consider this and approximately 124 other potential modifications to the Development Code beginning in August.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Mr. Stewart explained that a revision of 20.50.020 (B) could decrease the unit yield for low-density areas, necessitating a "compensating target increase somewhere else." He went on to say that 20.50.020 (B) (1) "generally encourages" construction of smaller dwelling units because other Development Code requirements (e.g., setbacks, drainage) still apply. He said the provision may thereby be working to protect neighborhood character.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Stewart said the City has permitted one application involving 20.50.020 (B). He agreed to provide the address of the project.

Councilmember Lee asked why the City should seek to achieve growth in new housing units above the minimum of the growth target range. Mr. Stewart said the range is meant to provide flexibility. He explained that the County used a calculation based on anticipated household size to meet its Growth Management Act (GMA) responsibility to allocate population growth to jurisdictions. Noting the likely contentiousness of the next round of allocations, he said jurisdictions may question the continued calculation of population growth by the size and number of households. He stated that staff is comfortable that City development regulations permit the development of the number of housing units required within the existing range.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Stewart said the City estimated the potential number of new housing units as part of the environmental review of the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Spencer said the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) showed a capacity for 1,616 new housing units.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Stewart distributed information showing that the City permitted 397 new dwelling units from 1996 through 1999 and that the City permitted 185 new dwelling units between April 2, 2000 and April 1, 2001.

June 18, 2001

Councilmember Montgomery noted that housing in north King County is very expensive. She asserted that the number of dwelling units is insufficient for the number of jobs. She acknowledged that many people favor less new building, but she attributed traffic congestion to people's need to commute from areas outside King County where affordable housing is more available. She advocated that Shoreline attempt to contribute to the provision of more affordable housing in order "to solve a lot of other problems, too."

Councilmember Lee requested confirmation that the City has communicated with each of the owners of the 881 parcels affected by the proposed Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Map and Development Code amendments. Mr. Krueger said staff notified the owners and occupants of the affected parcels with letters that included information specific to each parcel. He said the number of returned, undeliverable letters was very low.

Councilmember Ransom advocated a second Council workshop to consider contentious amendments (e.g., those parcels in Area 8, Bundle F). Mr. Stewart pointed out that pages 19-21 of the Council packet identify potentially contentious issues. He commented that the Planning Commission was very thorough when listening to comments and concerns and discussing and working through issues.

Councilmember Ransom said the City "went to a lot of work to come up with multiple use for 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE." Referring to page 11 in the folio of area maps, Mr. Stewart commented that the parcels in Area 8, Bundle F are in an existing single-family neighborhood. Redevelopment of the parcels would be very difficult and would result in an intensification of the use of the multiple curb cuts along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The City has chosen an approach that focuses housing density in the North City Sub-area Plan. He pointed out the detailed analysis of Area 8, Bundle F on page 21 of the Council packet.

Deputy Mayor Hansen suggested that Council schedule the public hearing of the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Map and Development Code Amendments without another workshop. Councilmembers Montgomery and Gustafson agreed.

Mr. Burkett commented that Council could schedule the public hearing July 9 and, if input during the hearing warrants, schedule a subsequent Council workshop.

Deputy Mayor Hansen confirmed Council consensus in support of scheduling the public hearing July 9.

Councilmember Lee noted the difference of opinion between staff and the Planning Commission concerning Comprehensive Plan Amendment Log #003B. Mr. Stewart said staff believes that the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code provide sufficient protection and that the additional policy is not necessary. Councilmember Lee supported the Planning Commission recommendation. Ms. Markle mentioned that the proponent of #003B has proposed a modification to the Development Code addressing the same issue. She reiterated that the Planning Commission will consider Development Code modifications beginning in August. She asserted that the issue of the height compatibility

of industrial development with residential zones is really a Development Code issue. Mr. Stewart noted the staff and Planning Commission findings on #003B on page eight of the resources binder. He committed to provide additional staff analysis on #003B, if necessary, after the July 9 hearing.

(c) Annual Police Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report

Shoreline Police Chief Denise Pentony reviewed the 2000 Service Efforts and Accomplishments (SEA) report. She noted that the second sentence in the second paragraph on the second page of the report (page 29 of the Council packet) should read "The 'Crime Rate' has dropped to an all time low of 32.6 per 1,000 residents."

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m., Councilmember Gustafson moved to extend the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Councilmember Gustafson requested a copy of the citizen survey. He expressed support for the Victim Callback program and the problem-solving projects. He complimented the police department on its youth initiatives and community partnerships.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Chief Pentony asserted the need for engineering changes on Aurora Avenue to reduce the number of accidents there. She noted that the speeds at which vehicles travel cause major damage and injuries. She mentioned that one of the Shoreline officers is trained in the concept of crime prevention through environmental design and that he will participate with staff to insure that the project design maximizes vehicle and pedestrian safety.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Chief Pentony discussed police department actions in response to concerns raised during the June 11 Council meeting about drug activity in the Richmond Highlands neighborhood.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Chief Pentony said First Northwest Associates, which conducted the 1998 citizen survey, contacted 100 qualified participants by phone. She mentioned that the next citizen survey will include 300 residents.

Councilmember Ransom mentioned the high incidence of drug-related crimes in Shoreline at the time of incorporation. He requested statistics about the number of drug houses closed and about the apprehension of people selling drugs to teenagers. Police Chief Pentony confirmed that drug-related activity has decreased substantially since incorporation. She agreed to research and report back on statistics about drug sales to teenagers. She noted the no-tolerance policy under which Shoreline police jail people they find using or possessing drugs.

Councilmember Ransom said Shoreline police estimated, at the time of incorporation, that 70-80 percent of crime was drug related. He noted the significant drop between 1996



# DRAFT

and 2000 in Part I crimes. Chief Pentony agreed with Councilmember Ransom that the drop in Part I crimes is related to Shoreline police efforts against drugs. She identified larceny—shoplifting and car prowls—as the primary crime concern in Shoreline now.

Councilmember Ransom commented on the doubling of the number of traffic citations issued. Chief Pentony said most of these are written for speeding in school zones. She clarified that her department is responsible for traffic enforcement on Aurora Avenue.

Councilmember Ransom concluded by noting the excellent community relations program under the first Chief of Police. He asked if there is as much emphasis on community policing as there used to be. Chief Pentony responded by describing the efforts made toward community policing. She felt there is an increased emphasis on community partnerships and customer service.

Councilmember Ransom commented on speeds on Aurora Avenue and the fact that he has been stopped by state patrol officers for going too slow. He felt Aurora Avenue should be marked 35 miles per hour. Chief Pentony reiterated that Shoreline Police are responsible for traffic on Aurora Avenue. She agreed to bring back information on this and on cost statistics for Seattle, which Councilmember Ransom requested.

## 7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(1) Patty Brauns, 16733 Linden Avenue N, commented on remarks made by her neighbors at the last Council meeting regarding drug activity on her property. She said she has evicted the tenant in question and is cooperating with the police.

(2) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Ave. N, commented on his satisfaction with the Shoreline Police. He suggested that the City consider opening a neighborhood police center in the Ballinger area. He also commented on the TOD project discussed earlier, noting the need for many more parking stalls than has been discussed and better east-west transportation.

## 8. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:29 p.m. Deputy Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL

#### SUMMARY MINUTES OF JOINT DINNER MEETING

Monday, June 25, 2001  
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Highlander Room

#### Shoreline City Council

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

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF:** Steve Burkett, City Manager; Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager, and Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager

#### Ronald Wastewater District

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Arnie Lind, Gary Shirley and Art Wadekamper

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF:** Phil Montgomery, Manager

The meeting convened at 6:10 p.m.

Mayor Jepsen welcomed the visitors from the Ronald Wastewater District and explained that the dinner meeting is an opportunity to share concerns and ideas about mutual issues. He announced plans to hold a workshop discussion on July 16 regarding the King County Brightwater treatment plant project. He invited the Commissioners and staff to attend.

Commissioner Shirley stated that he and Commissioner Wadekamper have been involved on the King County Siting Advisory Committee, which may make it awkward to take a position about the proposed site at Richmond Beach.

Mayor Jepsen pointed out that the City is also participating in the Siting Advisory Committee established by Ron Sims, King County Executive. He said that he is looking forward to an analysis of the site and to discussion of a possible Council position.

Commissioner Shirley discussed some of the pros and cons of the five sites still under active consideration by King County.

# DRAFT

Commissioner Wadekamper added that the number of sites being actively reviewed may be down to four.

Deputy Mayor Hansen pointed out that the Siting Advisory Committee's recommended siting criteria have been partially ignored, which is one of his complaints about the process.

Councilmember Gustafson stated his interest in having the Commissioners participate with the Council in its discussion on July 16.

Steve Burkett, City Manager, asked Phil Montgomery, Ronald Wastewater District Manager, to make a presentation about the District's agreement with Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) for transfer of the sanitary sewer infrastructure north of 145<sup>th</sup> Street.

Commissioner Shirley reviewed the history of the District's work to acquire SPU's infrastructure in Shoreline. In March, a conceptual agreement was reached and consent given for attorneys to finalize the language. The Seattle City Council approved the agreement on June 19.

Mr. Montgomery displayed a color-coded map outlining the existing District service area and the section being purchased from SPU. He explained issues surrounding infrastructure improvements and various service issues. He said the goal is to have the system transfer complete by October 1.

Continuing, Mr. Montgomery also explained potential areas to annex. He explained that ratesetting for the old SPU area is one problem that needs to be addressed. He promised to keep the City informed about the process as the October 1 changeover date approaches.

Mayor Jpsen offered the District use of the City's cable television channel for public information.

Mr. Burkett concluded the meeting with a discussion of some future issues, including a franchise agreement to be developed between the District and the City.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

---

Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, June 25, 2001  
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

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

(a) Proclamation of King's High School Girls Track Week

Mayor Jepsen proclaimed the week of July 1, 2001 as King's High School Girls Track Week to recognize that the team won the Class A Track and Field State Championship and broke the State record for most points scored. Coach John Hubbell and his assistant coaches were present to accept the proclamation.

(b) Proclamation of King's High School Boys Golf Week

Mayor Jepsen also proclaimed the week of June 24, 2001 as King's High School Boys Golf Week. Coach Myrle Carner and golfer Kevin Sawtell were present to accept this proclamation.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

City Manager Steve Burkett recommended the agenda be amended by discussing consent calendar Item 7(d) concurrently with Item 8(a) and removing Item 8(b) regarding the Paramount Ridge final plat.

Tim Stewart, Director of Planning and Development Services, explained that it came to staff's attention late this afternoon that two of the lots in the proposed plat will have infiltration as part of the detention scheme. This requires new engineering drawings and a careful analysis of the proposal before it comes to Council.

# DRAFT

Mr. Burkett commented on the third year of enforcement of Shoreline's prohibition of fireworks, noting that in addition to education and confiscation, there will be stepped up enforcement, including tripling the staffing on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July and the issuance of citations.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, reported on the schedule for the Growth Management Hearing Board's action on Shoreline's appeal of the City of Woodway's Comprehensive Plan designation of the Pt. Wells property. The hearing is scheduled for October 22, 2001.

Mr. Stewart then reported on the closing of Parkers Casino for what the Shoreline Fire Department called "a serious threat to life safety in the building." He described the violations, including installation of flammable thatched ceiling panels, posting of a required fire exit as "Not an Exit" inside the building, and having an unconnected fire sprinkler system. He then reviewed the corrective actions ordered by the City of Shoreline.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Stewart said the City and the Fire Department are willing to review any reasonable proposals to address the issue of an operational sprinkler system.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) John Pruett, 7115 55<sup>th</sup> Pl. NE, Marysville, speaking as the General Manager of Parkers Casino, made the following points: 1) the thatch has been removed from the ceiling; 2) the building is monitored by a 24-hour fast response fire alarm system; 3) they will get water to the sprinkler system as soon as it is available; and 4) Parkers has more exits and entrances than any casino in the area. Mr. Pruett reported 115 employees are currently out of work. He felt the City is not acting in good faith on this matter.

(b) Rick Stephens, 18005 Aurora Avenue N, protested that Council did not table the Aurora Corridor design contract even when 52 people attended the meeting and asked Council to take that action. He was concerned about the costs of the project, which he said have escalated from \$33 - \$38 million to \$50 - \$75 million. He feared the final cost could be \$100 million, which might result in increased taxes. He suggested a less expensive plan.

(c) Diane Stephens, 18005 Aurora Avenue N, said the City is considering the "pros" of the Aurora Corridor Project but not the "cons," which she listed as: 1) higher taxes; 2) higher cost of business services; 3) bleed-over traffic into neighborhoods; and 4) loss of businesses and residents due to the cost of living in Shoreline. She said these unintended consequences can be reduced by listening to the businesses impacted by the project.

# DRAFT

(d) Randy Ferrell, 17510 Aurora Avenue N, asked that the Categorical Exclusion (CE) document on the Aurora Corridor Project consider socio-economic impacts such as loss of businesses, jobs, and resulting tax implications. He noted that a CE is allowed only when there is no significant opposition to the project design. Consequently, the application for CE status indicates that the City believes there is no opposition to the project design. Businesses consider this a "slap in the face" because they have repeatedly voiced their opposition. He concluded that businesses favor the project, but with design modifications.

(e) Dean Barnett, 9515 Interlake Avenue N, a Parkers employee and student, explained why he needs to work there and urged the Council to help work things out.

(f) Tim Crawford, 2326 N 155<sup>th</sup> Street, said he would be suspicious of the timing of this "harassment over a fire issue" when the City is in the middle of the Aurora project. He also reported the success of the Twin Ponds Fish Friends appeal of the Aegis project. He commented that work on site has been stopped and that the judge found the hearing examiner in error on many counts. Mr. Crawford said his group is going to involve itself in the Aurora project and force the City through litigation to appreciate that Thornton Creek is part of a Chinook watershed.

(g) Patty Crawford, 2326 N 155<sup>th</sup> Street, Twin Ponds Fish Friends, commented on Cheryl Klinker and Kelly Swenson's support of the Aegis project. She alleged that Mr. Stewart is the cause of the problem. She questioned whether the City Codes were enforced at the Aegis project. She also alleged that Mr. Stewart did not listen to the agency with technical expertise on this issue (the State Department of Fish and Wildlife). She said Mr. Stewart should have listened to the individual who testified at the Aegis hearing from that agency. Instead, Mr. Stewart tried to have him fired. She blamed Council, asserting that Council did not interact with the appellants and that Council is in denial. She said the project to date has caused destruction to Thornton Creek.

(h) Sam Jacobs, 600 University Street, Ste. 2701, Seattle, attorney for the Paramount Ridge applicant, opposed the staff recommendation that the matter be pulled from tonight's agenda. He said his client has worked with staff extensively and it was only at 6 p.m. tonight that he heard that the final engineering plans were inadequate. He contested that there is infiltration from any lots and said the proposal for handling stormwater has been the same for many months. He said the current design allows for detention of 100 percent of the stormwater generated from the site. He asked Council to reschedule this within the next two weeks.

(i) Tiffany Nicole, 817 Broadway, Bremerton, applauded Parkers management, which has worked hard to bring the building into compliance and would never endanger the employees. She protested that employees had only 20 minutes notice of the closure. She said she and other employees have no safety net for times like these. Council must facilitate employees being able to return to work as soon as possible.

# DRAFT

Mr. Burkett supported the job Mr. Stewart is doing in enforcing City codes.

Mr. Stewart assured Council that the City will coordinate with the Fire Department to do another inspection of Parkers. He mentioned the Coconut Grove fire in 1942 that resulted in 492 deaths, explaining similarities to this situation. He said life safety is the critical issue.

Mayor Jepsen committed the City to working with Parkers management to address the items of concern.

Councilmember Ransom explained that the Fire Department is a separate entity from the City and that the City contracts with it for fire marshall/inspection services.

Turning to comments on the Aurora Corridor Project, Bill Conner, Public Works Director, explained the cost estimates on the project. He said the Capital Improvement Program adopted in December 2000 shows an estimate for the complete project of \$75,761,795. The City's contribution is estimated to be \$13 million, the State's \$27 million, and the federal government's \$35 million.

Mr. Conner noted two environmental processes involved in the project. The federal process is under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the state process is under the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA). Staff has undertaken to receive approval under the NEPA process that involves review by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). He said staff originally determined that the first phase of the project (145<sup>th</sup> Street to 165<sup>th</sup> Street) would have minimal environmental impact. Therefore, the City asked for the lowest level of environmental review, a CE. He said FHWA has indicated there may be enough controversy to warrant going to the second level of review, an Environmental Assessment (EA). A determination will be made on this after a public hearing. With regard to the socio-economic impacts, Mr. Conner said that an assessment of the socio-economic impacts will be made during the design process no matter what process is used.

Mr. Burkett assured everyone that the cost of the project will not cause an increase in taxes. Most of the funding will come from State and federal sources.

Councilmember Grossman said most of the time redevelopment projects like this one result in higher sales and a higher tax base. Commenting on the allegation that the City has said there is no significant opposition to the project, he said the City recognizes the opposition by certain individuals.

Mr. Conner responded that the CE document does not discuss the degree of opposition to the project.

Councilmember Ransom reminded the audience that he made a motion to table the design contract on June 11, but it died for lack of a second. He said the issues of the Aurora Improvement Council have been brought to the Council on numerous occasions. He

himself has restated their points at Council meetings. The issue is not that Council has not heard the opposing viewpoint but that the majority of the Councilmembers have not been persuaded by these arguments.

Councilmember Montgomery pointed out that the business community was asked what should be done. Members of the business community have been involved in the discussion from the beginning.

Councilmember Ransom clarified that individual business owners feel that property owners have been approached more than tenant businesses. These are the individuals feeling left out.

Staff confirmed that no date can be set for the review of the additional work required for the Paramount Ridge final plat.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Montgomery moved to approve the agenda with the following changes: 1) discussion of Item 7(d) on the consent calendar concurrently with Item 8(a); and 2) removal of Item 8(b) regarding the Paramount Ridge final plat. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the agenda, as amended, was approved.**

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Councilmember Lee moved approval of the consent calendar as amended to remove Item 7(d). Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the following items were approved:**

**Minutes of Workshop Meeting of June 4, 2001**

**Approval of expenses and payroll as of June 8, 2001 in the amount of \$ 761,235.89**

**Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute an amendment to increase the Design Services contract for MacLeod Reckord for the Paramount School Park Project in an amount not to exceed \$14,601 and to execute amendments up to an additional 5% of the original contract amount**

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) **Motion to authorize staff to design the Ronald Bog Drainage Improvements with daylighting of the stream channel south of Ronald Bog along Corliss Avenue (to south of 171<sup>st</sup> Street)**



# DRAFT

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a preliminary Design (60%) and Environmental Services Contract with OTAK, Inc. for the Ronald Bog Drainage Improvement Project in an amount not to exceed \$441,930

Chuck Purnell, City Engineer, provided the staff report regarding how to address the flooding problems in the Ronald Bog drainage area. He reviewed the direction given to staff at the February 26 Council meeting and described comments made at the meeting with the neighbors. He reported that the "no action" option would result in continued flooding south of the bog. Replacement of the closed channel would still require one or two openings and might generate a requirement for other mitigation. This option would cost \$500,000 more than daylighting the stream and would be more difficult to maintain.

Mr. Purnell said staff continues to recommend daylighting the stream. It would probably become a Type II stream, which would require 75-foot buffers. This requirement actually has limited impact on the properties along Corliss Avenue because most of the buffer will be in the City right-of-way. Property owners would still be able to do some additions, even with the larger buffer.

Mr. Purnell demonstrated a potential design concept that shows the stream meandering along Corliss Avenue. He concluded that there are still some neighborhood concerns, but there were also positive comments made by neighbors.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(1) Rick Furman, 2320 N 171<sup>st</sup> Street, expressed his continued concern about bog water coming into his neighborhood and how much standing water will be allowed. He said a stream might bring waterfowl and cause problems with bird droppings, mosquitoes and vermin. He was also concerned about maintenance of the open stream and problems with overgrown areas. He said some access issues were addressed for current property owners, but access for future remodels is restricted.

(2) Ann and Marcus Nelson, 2304 N 171<sup>st</sup> Street, also spoke in opposition to the plan. Mr. Nelson said he and many of his neighbors are concerned about impacts to the neighborhood, including access by emergency and over-sized vehicles and more people coming into the neighborhood. Mrs. Nelson distributed photographs demonstrating their concerns. Mr. Nelson noted that there is an open field at the end of Corliss Avenue that has always been maintained by the neighbors, not by the City. He concluded that there is an open streambed north of Corliss Avenue that the City has done a poor job of maintaining.

(3) Norma Myers, 2321 N 172<sup>nd</sup> Street, was concerned that the open stream would not be maintained. She supported replacing the pipe with a larger pipe.

(4) Janet Way, 940 NE 147<sup>th</sup> Street, supported daylighting the stream. She wished Seattle Public Utilities would do the same at Northgate Mall. She stressed

the importance of maintenance to make the stream an amenity for the neighborhood, not a nuisance. She urged the City to review the hydrology carefully and to call the resultant waterway a "creek and not a ditch."

(5) Tim Crawford, 2326 N 155<sup>th</sup> Street, also supported daylighting of Thornton Creek. Noting he was not contacted about the project, he said the City should have contacted all "downstream riparian creek-side owners." He hoped neighbors would realize that their property values will go up because they are adjacent to a waterway. He said daylighting will improve their quality of life.

(6) Cheryl Klinker, 12036 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Seattle, a member of the Ronald Bog Drainage Study Advisory Committee, supported the project as a wonderful opportunity to work together and test new theories about integrating a natural area with a dense urban environment. She said she has personally called 20 people she knows in Shoreline and they all support daylighting of the creek. She said flood control is a key issue for Shoreline residents and those living downstream in Seattle.

(7) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Avenue N, explained how he is impacted by the current project and asked for an update on plans to upgrade the storm system and perform maintenance on the open channel south of 171<sup>st</sup> Street to 167<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to authorize staff to design the Ronald Bog Drainage Improvements with daylighting of the stream channel south of Ronald Bog along Corliss Avenue (to south of 171<sup>st</sup> Street). Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion.**

Mayor Jepsen thanked staff for responding to Council's concerns as expressed in February and for bringing forward a design that responds to neighborhood concerns. He urged staff to continue to work with neighbors on the issues raised tonight. He particularly wanted to hear plans about the level of maintenance and operating costs associated with the project. Mr. Purnell responded that he will return during the design process with this information.

Mr. Burkett noted that a natural creek is envisioned with that level of maintenance.

Responding to Councilmember Montgomery Mr. Purnell confirmed that this proposal would prevent such flooding in the area as occurred in 1996/97.

Councilmember Gustafson asked about the water going from the daylighted portion into a channel or pipe downstream. He favored daylighting but wished to be certain that all flooding issues will be resolved.

Mr. Purnell said the total project addresses flooding in three areas in the basin and extensive hydrologic and hydraulic modeling has been done. This will be further refined if Council gives direction to proceed with the open channel.

Responding to Councilmember Grossman, Mr. Purnell explained the Development Code provision that allows for an additional 750 square feet in building space within the buffer. The other controlling provision of the code allows only 35 percent of a lot to be covered by a structure. This can still be attained with the addition of the 75-foot buffers.

Councilmember Grossman questioned whether there are additional permitting processes required when building within 75 feet of a Type II stream.

Gabe Snedeker, Environmental Coordinator, clarified that a State or federal permit would not be required under normal circumstances, but a critical area review would be. Such a review is integrated with the review of the underlying permit. As long as the proposed structure is not in the buffer, this review would have a fairly minimal financial impact. However, it could result in requiring a biologist's report, costing between \$500 and \$2,000.

Councilmember Grossman said all the homes along Corliss Avenue will have a significant increase of area within the buffer. He was concerned that what began as a stormwater management issue will place financial and process burdens on a dozen homeowners. He wished to insure that they will not be forced to bear this additional burden.

Mr. Stewart said this is a conceptual proposal that will evolve as the project goes through the environmental review process. Before the City makes a formal decision, it will have to outline the regulatory impacts of the project.

Councilmember Ransom commented that this issue was discussed by a panel at the last Association of Washington Cities conference. He said a Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) engineer and two Bellevue staff made it clear there are ways to design such projects to meet all regulatory requirements without opening the waterway. He said Bellevue never opens a stream because it sets a precedent that can have huge implications. Councilmember Ransom was concerned about setting a precedent in the City of Shoreline.

Mr. Purnell said staff met with the Departments of Ecology, and Fish and Wildlife, and the U.S. Corps of Engineers to discuss this project. The channel could be closed but there would have to be some openings to provide light. These would probably require a buffer within the existing code. Staff was advised that it did not make sense to let issues such as those Councilmember Ransom raised prevent something good from being done. Mr. Purnell said this site is one of the better daylighting opportunities because a 60-foot right-of-way and required setbacks are already in place.

Councilmember Ransom continued to be concerned about the precedent and asked if staff discussed other options with engineers who take the other approach.

Mr. Conner confirmed that staff can go either way. However, the staff supports daylighting because it moves the water better and makes more sense from an

environmental perspective. Piping will be more expensive to build and maintain. It will break down again in 20 years because of the substrata it is built on. It will also be difficult to permit and may result in the City being required to daylight somewhere else.

Mr. Burkett said various experts counsel various approaches to this type of situation. However, there is no certainty that there is a "right" answer.

Deputy Mayor Hansen suggested that the design contain a gateway at Ronald Bog to change the level of the outflow to allow retention of water in the bog when necessary. Mr. Purnell assured him there will be an adjustable structure to control the flow.

**A vote was taken on the motion to authorize staff to design the Ronald Bog drainage improvements with daylighting of the stream channel south of Ronald Bog along Corliss Avenue (to south of 171<sup>st</sup> Street), which carried 6 – 1, with Councilmember Ransom dissenting.**

**Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to authorize the City Manager to execute a preliminary Design (60%) and Environmental Services Contract with OTAK, Inc. for the Ronald Bog Drainage Improvement Project in an amount not to exceed \$441,930. Councilmember Lee seconded the motion.**

Mayor Jepsen urged that staff continue to work with neighbors about their concerns and to keep them informed as key milestones are reached. Mr. Purnell said this is part of the Scope of Work in the contract.

Councilmember Gustafson also wished to ensure there is adequate access for emergency vehicles and other large trucks.

Councilmember Lee was concerned about the fiscal impacts on homeowners considering modifications to their homes in the future. She said if there are changes to the design that better accommodate buffering issues, staff should bring them back to Council.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 7 – 0, and the City Manager was authorized to execute a preliminary Design (60%) and Environmental Service Contract with OTAK, Inc. for the Ronald Bog Drainage Improvement Project in an amount not to exceed \$441,930.**

- (c) Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute an interlocal agreement with King and Snohomish County regarding solid waste issues

Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager, provided a brief staff report. He said after initial concerns about notification and the process, there have been positive discussions about the impacts to Shoreline of the closure of Snohomish County's Southwest Recycling and Transfer Station in Mountlake Terrace for yearlong renovations.

**Councilmember Lee moved to authorize the City Manager to execute an interlocal agreement with King and Snohomish County regarding solid waste issues. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 7 – 0.**

Mr. Burkett asked Mr. Stewart to report on progress made during the Council meeting to address the Parkers situation. Mr. Stewart said the City and Fire Department will walk through Parkers on Tuesday. There may be some short-term solutions to the sprinklering problem.

9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Janet Way, 940 NE 147<sup>th</sup> Street, representing the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group, protested the process for the Paramount Ridge Plat. She said the City was notified last Monday of the issues that her group has raised. She asked for better notice when an issue is going to be pulled from the agenda.

(b) Ian Adams, 5005 217<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Mountlake Terrace, a manager at Parkers, recapped Wednesday night's events and subsequent actions by Parkers. He commented on the fire safety of the Mt. Rainier Room. He felt Parkers had to deal with "a lot of red tape." He said they were more than happy to comply with any reasonable proposal.

(c) Rick Stephens, 18005 Aurora Avenue N, read from the CE regarding the original alternatives for the Aurora Corridor Project. Alternative 1 was estimated at \$48 million and Alternative 2 was \$52 million. He said the CE is for 145<sup>th</sup> Street to 165<sup>th</sup> Street. He asked whether the estimate was for 20 blocks or the whole project.

(d) Walt Hagen, 711 N 193<sup>rd</sup> Street, said he had discovered that the CE had been returned to the City by WSDOT two weeks ago. He described interactions with staff on this issue. Mr. Hagen offered to provide an analysis of the CE that would identify where the document says the project is unopposed. Mr. Hagen warned Council that it is not getting correct information. He said he has asked that the Aurora Improvement Council and the Concerned Citizens for Shoreline be kept informed of the status of the CE document and be apprised of any action on environmental issues on the Aurora Corridor.

(e) Karyn Klein, 7431 181<sup>st</sup> Place SW, Lynnwood, supported Parkers management and said employees do not have funds to tide them over during this period.

At 9:46 p.m., Mayor Jepsen turned the gavel over to Deputy Mayor Hansen and left the meeting.

(f) Richard Tinsley, 14855 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, spoke in favor of daylighting the creek and said the City should not allow disturbance of the buffer zones.

(g) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Avenue N, discussed flooding in the area between 171<sup>st</sup> Street and 167<sup>th</sup> Street in 1996/97. He suggested that Council take this area into consideration concurrently with the proposed project and solve the whole problem at once.

(h) Alicia Thompson, 1010 100<sup>th</sup> Street SE, said Parkers employees came to the meeting to put a face on the closure problem. She asked Council to allow them to "get on with their lives."

MEETING EXTENSION

At 9:58 p.m., Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting to 10:20 p.m. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

(i) Andrew Williams, 14338 Midvale Avenue, a Parkers employee, asked Council how it could allow the casino to be closed after it was permitted only a month ago.

(j) Shelley St. Louis, 12714 N Macsloop Road, Granite Falls, concurred with other speakers that Parkers is a great place to work. She explained how the closure has affected her family.

(k) Christopher Atkinson, 30218 407<sup>th</sup> Street NE, Arlington, confirmed that the thatched roof was coated with fire retardant material. He said the roof has since been removed. He emphasized that the remodel was inspected by the City and that Parkers did everything the way it thought the City wanted it done. He said the closure will impact Shoreline businesses because Parkers employees spend money here.

(l) Kathy Halliburton, 18315 Wallingford Avenue N, bid Council farewell, noting that she will be moving to Texas. She appreciated the opportunity to comment over the years to the Council. As a final observation, she suggested that the Richmond Beach bluff trail be straightened so that it always faces the water or the trees.

(m) Patty Crawford, 2326 N 155<sup>th</sup> Street, said Mr. Stewart did not enforce the Development Code at the Aegis site. She said Thornton Creek was treated as a drainage ditch for purposes of the Aegis permit. She supported her contention that the waterway has been identified as a Class II stream because of the discovery of salmonids there. She said that Aegis argued that the project would not be financially viable if it had to accommodate the buffer requirements. She said staff is providing Council a "spun version" on what happened in court. She said the judge ruled that the City and developer "did not get it right" when work continued in the buffer.

(n) Kelly Swenson, 2308 NE 149<sup>th</sup> Street, responded to comments about her letter in support of the Aegis project as President of the Parkwood Neighborhood Association.

(o) David Lyons, 511 Myrtle Street, La Conner, a Parkers employee, said he wanted to get back to work.

(p) Tim Crawford, 2326 N 155<sup>th</sup> Street, said staff "is heartless" and has "their own agenda." He said staff is treating the businesses on Aurora Avenue like "this isn't America" and being "tyrannical and selfish." He said the individual who headed the Citizens Advisory Task Force for the Aurora project will personally profit from the project. He concluded that "these guys are a bunch of crooks."

Deputy Mayor Hansen assured the Parkers employees that Council regrets that they are temporarily unemployed. He said Council would be a lot sorrier if there were deaths or injuries in a fire there.

Mr. Burkett expressed concern about the comments that staff is dishonest. He said he has never heard such baseless allegations in his 30 years of being a City Manager.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk