

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, November 17, 2003
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Mayor Jepsen

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Deputy Mayor Grossman, who presided.

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

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

Upon motion by Councilmember Montgomery, seconded by Councilmember Hansen and unanimously carried, Mayor Jepsen was excused.

3. **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS**

Steve Burkett, City Manager, pointed out that the amended agenda for tonight's meeting adds item 6(a) "Process to schedule and fill Councilmember Linda Montgomery's Vacancy." He noted the number of e-mails received on this item.

4. **COUNCIL REPORTS**

Councilmember Montgomery explained her decision to resign from the City Council and thanked Shoreline citizens for their support over the years.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(a) Larry Owens, Shoreline, expressed disappointment that Councilmember Montgomery's decision to resign was not made in a more timely fashion. If announced earlier, voters could have filled the Council position during the election process. He opposed the proposed process to fill the vacancy and urged the Council to conduct an open, transparent and fair process.

(b) Dale Wright, Shoreline, expressed support for the proposed process to fill the vacancy, asserting that it is an appointment, not an election. He felt the successor's views should closely match the views and positions of the person resigning. He opposed the proposal that sitting Councilmembers whose terms expire on or before December 31 should recuse themselves from the process, since they have a responsibility to participate. He urged Council to follow the recommended process and make the appointment before the end of the year.

(c) Pat Murray, Shoreline, felt the replacement for the Council position should be chosen from candidates that recently ran for office because they have demonstrated an interest in and knowledge of City affairs. He asked that first consideration be given to the non-elected candidate who received the most votes, as this most closely resembles the people's will.

(d) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, said she was angered about Councilmember Montgomery's post-election decision to resign. She asserted that Councilmember Montgomery was aware long before her decision that she would not be able to rightfully participate in crucial decisions affecting the City of Shoreline. She said the questionable resignation shows a contempt for the rights of citizens to be represented by full-time Shoreline resident and the decision precludes candidates from running for the now vacant position. She urged Council to conduct an open, public, and transparent process only after the non-elected Councilmember is replaced by the newly-elected Councilmember.

(e) Rick Stephens, Shoreline, contended that 30 minutes is not a sufficient amount of time for citizens to comment on this important issue. He felt that the public is being left out of the process, and that the resignation should have been made earlier so citizens would have the ability to vote for a publicly-elected official. He felt the Council is rushing to find a replacement, noting that the Council has up to 90 days to fill the vacancy. He also felt the proposed deadline for filing an application was too soon.

(f) Bill Meyer, Shoreline, expressed a preference for the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Ransom and Chang, which provides for an extended process for filling the Council vacancy. He felt the current proposal is deficient and does not address the question of whether non-elected sitting Councilmembers will be involved in the decision-making process. He said Council should consider the fact that the dynamics of Shoreline have changed, and there is a tendency for incumbents to be more vulnerable. He urged the Council take its time in conducting the process and interviewing applicants.

(g) Mary Jo Heller, Shoreline, thanked Councilmember Montgomery for her years of service on the Council. She disagreed with many of the previous comments and stressed the importance of having a full City Council at the beginning of the year. She felt it important that Councilmember Montgomery's position be filled with a person of similar views, and that current Councilmembers should not be excluded from the process.

DRAFT

(h) Lois Cairns, Shoreline, agreed with the previous speakers' comments that the proposed process is deficient. She said the process, not Councilmember Montgomery, is being attacked. She urged any interested party to apply for the position.

(i) Bridgid Newman-Henson, Shoreline, agreed with the previous speaker and urged the Council to conduct an open and fair process.

(j) Clark Elster, Shoreline, urged Council to slow the process down and adopt the proposal by Councilmembers Chang and Ransom.

Councilmember Hansen pointed out that the number of speakers allowed to address the same side of one topic has exceeded Council rules.

Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the public comment period. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion, which failed 2-4, with Councilmembers Ransom and Chang voting in the affirmative.

(k) David Townsend, Shoreline, said his studies indicate that City negligence was responsible for the death of his daughter on 15th Avenue NE. He said traffic engineers support his contention that signage on 15th Avenue NE was not designed to the appropriate standards for traffic speed and volume. He urged the Council to use its grant funding to install a traffic signal. He said he is working on this issue to prevent other children from becoming fatalities.

(l) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, announced that the Shoreline District Court would be renamed the Judge Robert A. Wacker Memorial Building in honor of her deceased husband. She said a ceremony will be held on December 5th at 2:30 p.m. She commented on the fair manner in which her husband presided as a judge. She said it would be fair for Councilmember Montgomery to recuse herself, as she should not be able to vote on her replacement. She suggested a minimum of 30 days to fill the vacancy.

(m) Diana Stephens, Shoreline, pointed out a typographical error with agenda item 6(b). She felt that some Councilmembers rudely cut off speakers without giving them due consideration, noting that the public needs to be treated with respect. She asserted that Council is abrogating its responsibility if it does not listen to public comment.

Upon motion by Councilmember Ransom, seconded by Councilmember Hansen and unanimously carried, the amended agenda was approved.

6. ACTION ITEMS

- (a) Process to Schedule and Fill Councilmember Linda Montgomery's Vacancy

Steve Burkett, City Manager, briefly described the timeline and process proposed by staff to schedule and fill Councilmember Montgomery's vacancy. He noted that state law provides that if the Council is unable to make a decision within 90 days, the responsibility will go to the King County Council. If the County cannot decide within 180 days, then the governor will decide. Mr. Burkett then outlined the proposed timeline, which anticipates that Council makes a decision before the end of the year.

Mr. Burkett clarified that Councilmember Montgomery would not be eligible to vote and participate in the interview process because the position must be vacant.

Councilmember Ransom wondered if the law stipulates that the position must be vacated before the Council can conduct interviews.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, noted that although Councilmember Montgomery would not have to recuse herself, she would not be sitting on the Council when it takes action to fill the vacancy. He clarified that there is no restriction on having an anticipatory process that takes into account a projected vacancy created by a resignation.

Councilmember Montgomery said the process is obviously open and public because nobody is excluded from applying for the position. She commented that all discussion about the replacement will take place in an open public meeting. She felt a strong moral responsibility to make it possible for the Council to select someone who is likely to share her views.

Councilmember Ransom felt the Council should not rush to a decision, noting that it usually takes three to four weeks to recruit for professional positions. He proposed a series of questions to replace the proposed application questions, noting these were used during the election process and were asked of all the candidates by the newspaper. He felt the earliest applications should be due is Monday, December 15.

There was discussion of the application questions and deadline for application submittal. Councilmember Montgomery advised against asking questions that require detailed knowledge of specific City issues because it may unnecessarily limit the field of qualified candidates.

Councilmember Hansen suggested that proposed question #17 be eliminated because candidates will have a chance to provide a summary at the interview.

Councilmember Gustafson was uncomfortable with the proposed timeline and suggested an extended process to be concluded before December 31.

Councilmember Chang questioned whether the resignation was legally valid since it was sent as an e-mail. He thought policy required a signed letter of resignation.

Mr. Sievers clarified that the Council does not have the power to reject the resignation since Councilmembers have an absolute right to resign.

DRAFT

Councilmember Chang emphasized the importance of looking at the process as a whole and doing it right. He questioned the need for selecting a new member in such a short time frame, noting that the proposed process conflicts with existing schedules as well as the holiday season. He noted that the City of Federal Way allows three weeks for people to apply for vacant Council positions. He felt applications should be received until December 15, and that the interview process should extend into January 2004. He felt the newly-elected Councilmember should also be involved in the selection process.

Councilmember Hansen stressed the importance of completing the process before December 31, noting that a stalemate situation would cause the decision to be made by King County or the governor. He felt that such an eventuality would immobilize the Council for a long period of time.

Councilmember Gustafson was willing to extend the application deadline to December 12. Councilmember Hansen favored the proposed deadline of December 1, but was willing to compromise on December 8. He said based on the correspondence he has received thus far, most people know about the vacancy already.

Councilmember Ransom expressed confidence that the Council would be able to agree on a candidate within a reasonable amount of time. He felt the application deadline should be extended to December 15 to give working people sufficient time to apply.

Councilmember Chang emphasized the need to consider the process itself as opposed to individual candidates. He felt the general public should be given a fair opportunity to respond to the vacancy, and that the December 1 deadline is too soon.

Deputy Mayor Grossman described the proposed public process and his views on the desired characteristics of an appropriate replacement. He felt the replacement should be someone who shares similar views.

There was further discussion about appropriate interview questions and the timeline for conducting interviews. Councilmember Hansen noted that Council can always adjust the process, and that he is available anytime Council wishes to meet.

Councilmembers liked the draft questions submitted by Councilmember Ransom, but felt some of them should be reserved for the interview.

Councilmember Montgomery felt that asking too many initial questions might create a burdensome process for both applicants and Councilmembers.

Following additional discussion, there was consensus to close the filing period at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, December 8 and schedule a meeting on Monday, December 15 to review the applications, decide who to interview, when to conduct the interviews, and to develop interview questions.

DRAFT

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Deputy Mayor Grossman said that Councilmember-elect Fimia will have an opportunity to comment on the vacancy process at the conclusion of the meeting during public comment.

- (b) Ordinance No. 340 amending requirements for undergrounding electrical and telecommunication utilities and providing service connections to converted facilities as a public works expense under certain conditions; and amending Chapter 13.20 and Section 20.70.450 - .470 of the Shoreline Municipal Code

and

Motion to designate the North City Project and the Aurora Project 145th to 165th as eligible for projects for reimbursement of adjacent property owners up to \$10,000 for the cost of service connections to converted utilities in the projects

Mr. Burkett introduced this item and explained that staff is recommending that Council increase the amount the City will credit businesses for underground utility connections to \$10,000. He noted that this credit would cover all costs incurred by businesses in Phase 1 of the Aurora project. He said the estimated cost of all connections in the first phase total \$85,000, down from initial projections totaling over \$200,000.

Mr. Sievers explained that the ordinance does not change the current approach for conversion of aerial lines of electrical and telecom utilities to underground conduit and vaults in the right-of-way. The amendments do separate regulation of right-of-way from regulation of private development. This continues the effort begun last week with the removal of right-of-way permits and street vacations from the Development Code. The proposed ordinance is streamlined and updated to reflect current Development Code standards.

Ordinance No. 340 deletes two sections of the Development Code and amends a third. The City is also allowed to designate some street projects primarily of citywide benefit as eligible for project funds to reimburse owners for the costs of service connections to converted utilities. The ordinance dictates that the City perform the work, that property owners allow access on the property to perform the work, and that owners agree to pay for excesses over the credit amount approved by the Council. Property owners can also show proof of a private contract to do the work. By motion, the Council is asked to designate Aurora Avenue from 145th to 165th and the North City Project for a conversion credit for service connections up to \$10,000 per property owner.

Councilmember Chang felt the amendment should not include a limitation on the reimbursement amount if the City's intent is to cover the full costs of undergrounding. Councilmember Gustafson felt the costs should be fully covered since the City is mandating the change on Aurora businesses.

DRAFT

Mr. Burkett stated that he did not think the City should leave the reimbursement open-ended, but a proviso could be added to separately consider individual properties that might exceed the \$10,000 limit.

Councilmember Ransom noted that cost estimates indicated that several Aurora Corridor businesses would exceed the \$10,000 credit. He felt they should also be considered.

Deputy Mayor Grossman asked how staff arrived at the estimated costs.

Mr. Burkett explained that staff conducted an analysis of 57 properties on Aurora between 145th and 165th, and that none of them are expected to exceed the credit limit.

Deputy Mayor Grossman commented on the difficulty of predicting appropriate cost figures. He then asked if Councilmember Chang should remove himself from the discussion since he is an Aurora property owner who will be affected by this decision. Mr. Sievers clarified that this is a legislative matter that does not involve a conflict of interest.

Mr. Burkett pointed out that the recommended policy will apply to both the Aurora and North City projects. He noted that the \$10,000 amount will limit the City's liability, since there are both expensive and inexpensive ways to make utility connections.

Councilmember Gustafson agreed on a maximum limit, but expressed support for a proviso that addresses unique situations.

There was discussion about whether the ordinance would need revision to accommodate a proviso. Mr. Sievers clarified that the ordinance simply establishes the procedure to allow this Council action to designate the credit.

Councilmember Hansen moved to pass Ordinance No. 340. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern that although the ordinance provides for businesses in Phase 1, it acts as a precedent that may affect businesses in the second and third mile. He asked if Rick Stephens, owner of the Highland Ice Arena, could comment on his situation.

With Council consensus, Mr. Stephens explained the situation in his building, where he has multiple utility connections on the front, back, and side of his property. He said an estimate indicates a cost of approximately \$41,000 to underground his utilities. He estimated that eight other businesses along Aurora Avenue are in his same situation.

Kirk McKinley, Aurora Corridor/Interurban Trail Project Manager, explained how the connection estimates were arrived at. He said the highest estimate in this first group was \$8,800 and eight properties exceeded \$5,000, which was the previous limit set by Council in 2001.

DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom commented on the difficulty of considering “rough estimates.” He asked when the Council would be provided with more reliable cost figures, noting that the figures continue to change.

Mr. McKinley stated that the initial limit of \$5,000 was not based on estimates but on a policy statement. He noted that estimates get better and better as the project details are developed. He pointed out that the current estimates are \$140,000 less than originally budgeted. He said the true costs will be known when the construction bids come in.

Councilmember Hansen concurred that the \$5,000 figure was not based on cost estimates. He stated that accurate estimates depend on when the project is actually built. He considered it fiscally irresponsible to leave the limit open-ended. He noted that if costs need to be increased in the future based on new information, then the ordinance can be amended at that time. He felt the ordinance should only consider Phase 1 and not attempt to address future unknowns.

Councilmember Ransom moved an amendment to allow a proviso that Council may consider, on a case-by-case basis, paying a larger amount when the costs exceed the \$10,000 limit. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.

Mr. Sievers clarified that this amount could be part of a motion to designate the two projects for conversion credits.

A vote was taken on the amendment, which failed 1-5, with Councilmember Ransom voting in the affirmative.

Councilmember Hansen and Gustafson accepted as a friendly amendment to the motion to approve Ordinance No. 340 to add a motion to designate Aurora Avenue from 145th to 165th and the North City Project for a conversion credit for service connections up to \$10,000 per property owner. A vote was taken on the motion to approve Ordinance No. 340 and make the designations, which passed unanimously.

- (c) Motion to approve Updates to Aurora Corridor
Real Property Acquisitions and Relocation Policy,
Procedures, and Guidelines

Mr. Burkett explained that this item is an important and necessary step in proceeding with the Aurora Corridor project. Revisions to the existing policy will provide the basis for discussing the City’s right-of-way needs with property owners in the Aurora Corridor. He noted that the City plans to move ahead this week in sending letters to property and business owners.

Kirk McKinley, Project Manager, introduced Tim Bevan of CH2Mhill and Linda Lane of Lane Appraisals and distributed updated attachments describing the proposed changes.

After providing background on the Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisitions and Relocation Policy, he described the three major changes:

- To adjust to the changes in RCW 8.26.035 which increases the maximum benefit for relocation expenses from \$10,000 to \$50,000 (no fiscal impact in the first phase because no relocations are necessary);
- To increase the original appraisal allowance paid by the City from \$750 to a maximum of \$1,500 (fiscal impact in the worst case scenario of paying additional payout costs on all 34 properties would be \$51,000); and
- In response to Ordinance No. 340, pay up to \$10,000 per property for underground connection costs (approximately \$85,000).

He stated that the total amount of land the City intends to acquire in the first phase equates to approximately 0.7 acres, comprised of intermittent strips of land one to two feet wide. He noted that no businesses would be required to relocate as a result of this action.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. McKinley explained why some right-of-way is needed on side-street properties. He said some land is needed to create adequate sidewalks and curb radiuses, and to ensure proper lane alignment.

Mr. McKinley concluded by outlining the acquisition process and schedule, noting that property owners are being contacted and meetings would be scheduled shortly. Staff anticipates conducting an open house in February 2004 to discuss 60% design plans and to get owner input on frontage improvements.

Councilmember Hansen moved to amend the Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisitions and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual as set forth in Attachment B. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

7. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) Bond Advisory Committee Report

After thanking the members of the Bond Advisory Committee for their efforts, Bob Olander, Deputy City Manager, provided a review of the committee's report. He said the committee concluded that the spring of 2004 is not an opportune time to seek a voter approved tax levy for capital improvements. He provided the reasons for this conclusion and said that in order not to lose valuable expertise and energy, staff recommends that the committee proceed with some additional work in 2004.

Councilmembers thanked the committee and accepted their final report.

Councilmember Gustafson provided his perspective on the committee's work, noting the committee could not achieve a consensus to propose a bond issue. The projects that were

DRAFT

considered included sidewalks near schools, property acquisition for parks, storm drainage projects, and linkage of the Interurban Trail. Despite the lack of consensus, he felt the results were positive and will lay the foundation for a future bond issue.

Councilmember Ransom cited a poor economy as the primary reason for the recommendation. He was glad that the committee will continue its efforts in 2004, emphasizing the fact that a bond issue is a protracted process.

Cindy Ryu, a committee member, advised that the committee's work should be incorporated into the Council's 2004 Work Plan. She also questioned the inclusion of the City Hall project in the Capital Improvement Plan.

Deputy Mayor Grossman read the names of the committee members and thanked those present in the audience.

Councilmember Chang commended Councilmembers Gustafson and Ransom for their efforts in bringing the community together via the BAC. Mr. Burkett thanked everyone involved for their contribution to the effort.

RECESS

At 9:05 p.m., Deputy Mayor Grossman declared a five minutes recess. At 9:12 p.m. the meeting reconvened.

(b) Completion of Presentation of the Proposed 2004 budget

Mr. Burkett provided additional information on the following outstanding budget issues that emerged from the previous budget discussions:

- Sister City funding – Should there be matching funds? How much?
- Additional Human Services funding (\$100,000)
- "Showmobile" funding (\$20,000)
- Pavement Management Program (\$700,000)
- Recreation Fee Increases

Before beginning this discussion, Councilmember Ransom suggested that Councilmember salaries should be reviewed by a citizen committee. He was unsure whether this would be a budget commitment. Mr. Burkett said staff could bring back some background information on the options for later discussion. He said such a review would have no budget impacts.

Turning to Sister Cities funding, Councilmember Ransom suggested an amount equal to what he said is allocated in Federal Way, \$15,000. Councilmember Chang supported this proposal. Councilmember Ransom said his recommendation is based on the fact that Shoreline does not have a strong business base such as Bellevue, which has multiple

sister city relationships. He felt the City should take the Federal Way approach and assist the Sister City Association with initial funding.

Councilmember Hansen supported including some amount, possibly \$10,000. He felt the details of how the money would be spent could be worked out later. He also pointed out that Federal Way supports two sister city relationships.

Deputy Mayor Grossman expressed support for a matching funds approach.

Councilmember Chang recommended that the City budget include at least \$15,000 for Sister Cities, noting that Boryeong, Korea spent far more than that when it hosted the Shoreline delegation. Based on his experience, he was not optimistic that the Sister Cities Association would be able to generate adequate funding. He said an initial amount of \$15,000 will give the City a good start and provide a gauge of how much will be needed in the future.

Councilmember Gustafson had mixed feelings about the proposal, noting that he could not justify funding the Sister Cities program when there are proposed recreational fee increases and property tax increases. Councilmember Montgomery also did not support additional Sister Cities funding.

Councilmember Ransom supported adding \$100,000 to Human Services funding. He said of the total \$750,000 budgeted for Human Services, only \$307,000 is earmarked for Human Service contracts. He said agencies are finding it more difficult to find funding, and that the addition would help many needy people. Other Councilmembers did not support this proposal.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Councilmember Ransom suggested that the funding could come from capital projects, which could be slowed down.

Councilmember Hansen opposed the proposal, noting that there will always be human service needs the City cannot satisfy with any amount. Councilmember Gustafson concurred, emphasizing that adding \$100,000 may give King County the impression its support is not needed as much.

Councilmember Chang felt he could not support the proposal without an adequate source of revenue. He suggested exploring other alternatives to help people in Shoreline.

Deputy Mayor Grossman felt he could only support a proposal that had a well-defined allocation plan. He commented on the grid/scoring system the Council has used to prioritize human service allocations in the past.

Councilmembers concurred with an additional \$20,000 allocation for the Showmobile, noting that many organizations are involved in this purchase and have raised significant funds already.

DRAFT

Councilmember Gustafson supported looking at non-resident user fees for recreation programs. Mr. Burkett said staff cannot put together such a program by next week, but an analysis of the issue can be brought forward later.

Councilmember Gustafson also questioned the proposed one-cent property tax increase. It was noted this raises about \$60,000. Finance Director Debbie Tarry and Councilmember Ransom concurred that not taking the increase will have cumulative impacts down the road.

Councilmember Gustafson suggested asking voters to increase the levy lid. Deputy Mayor Grossman opposed the idea since the amount per taxpayer is negligible, yet the long-term compounding effects on the City budget is significant. Mr. Burkett added that the judicial decision on Initiative 776 has left a permanent loss of \$500,000 in revenue.

MEETING EXTENSION

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

8. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Dan Mann, Shoreline, opposed the proposed process to fill the Council vacancy. He said the ill-timed resignation is perceived as a manipulation of the process and a way to deprive people's right's to vote on a new representative. He said trying to replace Councilmember Montgomery with someone of similar views is an affront to the elective process. He urged the Council to rethink the process in favor of a more open-minded discussion.

(b) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, said the legislative intent of Ordinance No. 340 is to cover the full cost of utility connections for Aurora properties, so the ordinance should reflect that intent. She noted that the owner of Highland Ice Arena has multiple utility connections. She suggested a change in the ordinance to include "existing businesses," since they are the ones the City intends to help. She commented that the Councilmember selection process is too short and ill-timed, and noted that many people believe the selection process has already taken place.

(c) Janet Way, Shoreline, felt the Council should change its rules to allow for more public comment on action items. She thought the three speaker rule is an unnecessary and arbitrary limit imposed by the Council. She thanked Councilmember Montgomery for her service to the City, but said that tonight's meeting is an example of how things are not working. She felt the proposed process to fill the vacancy does not fit the citizen's needs.

(d) Richard Johnsen, Shoreline, expressed support for Sister Cities funding, noting that the visit by Boryeong officials next year will be a major international event

DRAFT

for the City. He commented on the significance and success of the sister city relationship between Houston, Texas and Stevenger, Norway.

(e) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, commented on the results of her recent campaign and stated she will be applying for the City Council vacancy. She said she hopes the Council will use the process as an opportunity to build goodwill and consensus. Regarding the budget, she said the Council should reduce unnecessary expenditures such as travel and lodging for employees and focus on providing essential public services. She asserted that an increase in recreation fees amounts to a tax increase on Shoreline citizens.

(f) Maggie Fimia, Shoreline, expressed opposition to the proposed Council vacancy process. She said the proposed process is ill-timed due to the holidays and budget negotiations. She felt it limits the City's ability to appoint someone from a broad pool of qualified applicants. She also felt the public does not have an adequate opportunity to provide input in the process. She characterized the Council as "referees" who should consider public input. She urged the Council to reconsider its decision and allow more time for deliberation.

Deputy Mayor Grossman briefly responded to the public comments. Councilmember Ransom suggested that Council think about allowing the public to give feedback before deliberations on the Council appointment.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:20 p.m., Deputy Mayor Grossman declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.