

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, June 6, 2005
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Hansen, Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, Grace, Gustafson, and Ransom

ABSENT: none

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

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

- (a) Proclamation of Shorewood High School
Jazz Band Week

Mayor Hansen read the proclamation recognizing the Shorewood High School Jazz Band's outstanding performance at the Tenth Annual *Essentially Ellington* High School Jazz Band Competition and Festival at Lincoln Center in mid-May. The band received Honorable Mention, placing fourth in the ranking of the finest high school jazz bands in the country. The brass section was named the Outstanding Brass Section, and Sam Reid and Karl Fagerstrom were named Outstanding Soloists for the alto saxophone and drums, respectively.

Shorewood band director Paul Harshman accepted the proclamation and thanked the Council for this recognition. Members of the band then played a selection for the audience.

- (b) Report by Senator Darlene Fairley

Senator Fairley was not able to attend due to illness. Deputy Mayor Jepsen expressed his appreciation for her support of City of Shoreline issues. Councilmember Grace also wished her well in her medical treatment.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Steve Burkett, City Manager, reported that the bids for the King County 1st NE Transfer Station project were 42% above the engineer's estimate. Therefore, the project will not go forward as expected this year and the transfer station will not be closed this summer.

Councilmember Grace commented on the success of the Renewable Energy Fair hosted by Meridian Park Elementary.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Dom Amor, Shoreline, expressed support for the Aurora Corridor project, noting that corridor improvements in other jurisdictions have resulted in business improvements and improved community safety. He said the "toxic anger" that sometimes comes out of City Council meetings does not represent his views or those of his neighbors. He objected to some people speaking as though they represent the general public. He said while the Council is not perfect, it is moving the City in the right direction. He supported working past the differences and doing what's right for the community. He expressed agreement with the Council direction on several City projects, including North City, South Woods, soccer fields A and B, and the Aurora Corridor.

(b) Bronston Kenney, Shoreline, described the ways in which the recent meetings on cottage housing have been biased toward cottage housing advocates, developers and representatives from Planning and Development Services. He asserted that citizens have been ignored and their questions have not been adequately addressed. He said planning staff has relegated citizens to second class status while granting first class status to developers and builders by controlling the process. He said homeowners still do not have an explanation as to why cottage housing is being built in spite of overwhelming citizen opposition. He said the Growth Management Act is being used as an all-encompassing justification for cottage housing. He urged the Council to work diligently to protect community desires.

(c) Todd Linton, Shoreline, thanked the Council for making soccer field turf improvements a higher priority in the Capital Facilities Plan. He said his soccer affiliates will continue to pursue other community funds and sponsor fundraisers to ensure that any City funding is supplemented by the community. He thanked the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Board and Director Dick Deal for their help in explaining the legal and financial ramifications involved and in supplemental fund-raising.

(d) Pamela Burt, Shoreline, explained that her rental property in Richmond Beach has been taxed and billed by utilities as a four-plex, but the City is considering code enforcement action that would require it to be converted to a three-unit structure. She said she has written confirmation that the City previously said it would allow it as a four-unit structure, but it has since retracted that promise. She explained that she and her husband purchased the property as a retirement investment, emphasizing that the property has been acknowledged as a four-plex for 20 years. She asked the Council to read the

DRAFT

information she provided and to either “grandfather” this four-unit residential use or at least waive the \$10,000 fee required for a rezone.

(e) Barbara Lacy, Shoreline, described the recent spate of vandalism to public property and burglaries to several Echo Lake homes in the vicinity of N 195th Street and Stone Avenue N. She said the police suggested that parks and residences in close proximity to transit centers, such as Aurora Village, often suffer higher rates of criminal activity because of the perceived lack of surveillance in these areas. She encouraged the Council to make increased law enforcement and surveillance in this area a higher priority in public safety budgets. She said the police remarked that they would like to be doing a better job but are hampered by insufficient funding. She also felt that continued use of the narrow, unauthorized path between the trailer park and Stone Avenue N. would exacerbate the crime problem.

Mr. Burkett responded to public comments, noting that the City Attorney is reviewing the code enforcement issue. He said the situation on Stone Avenue sounds like a good problem-solving opportunity for the police department.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Ian Sievers, City Attorney, said he is still reviewing the situation and would provide a full memo to the Council.

Councilmember Fimia requested information from City departments about the issue to determine if there is any potential discretion the City Council might have in the matter.

5. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Deputy Mayor Jepsen and unanimously carried, the agenda was approved.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, seconded by Councilmember Grace and unanimously carried, the following consent calendar items were approved:

Minutes of Dinner Meeting of May 9, 2005

Minutes of Cottage Housing Forum of May 11, 2005

Minutes of Workshop Meeting of May 16, 2005

Minutes of Dinner Meeting of May 23, 2005

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute Local Agency Agreements, Supplements and Prospectus to obligate grant funds totaling \$496,000 for the Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Project

DRAFT

There was Council consensus to take item 8(a) next because the public hearing was advertised to begin at 8:00 p.m.

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) Motion to 1) authorize the City Manager to execute a Construction contract with Gary Merlino Construction Co., Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$23,111,987.75 (base bid plus Additive Alternative 1); 2) authorize a 5.9% contingency authority to complete the Aurora Avenue North Multimodal Corridor Project N. 145th St. to 165th St. and Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Projects for a total amount of \$24,473,805.68; and 3) authorize the City Manager to accept the anticipated TIB and federal funds for the purposes of funding this project and to make necessary changes to the Capital Improvement Plan to reflect these additional revenues

Paul Haines, Public Works Director, introduced staff and provided background on the Aurora project, noting that this bid encompasses five different components: Aurora Corridor; two Interurban Trail Bridges; a Seattle City Light undergrounding project; Seattle Public utilities water main project; and a Ronald Wastewater District project. He described the elements in each project and the two additives to the bridges which Council will decide upon tonight. He described the roles that City staff, project manager, construction manager, engineer, and contractor would play in the project and the relationship of each to the others.

Continuing, Mr. Haines reviewed the two bids received and outlined the results of the contractor evaluation, noting the highly favorable reference checks for Gary Merlino Construction Co., Inc. and Merlino's recent experience with similar projects. He explained that the bid was within 9% of the engineer's estimate and the award is supported by all the City's funding partners, including the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB), the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Seattle City Light (SCL), Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) and Metro/King County. He noted that the bids reflect the current bidding climate and the substantial scope of the Aurora project. He pointed out that a new TIB contribution of \$500,000 and new state gas tax funding of \$1.3 million can fund the additional bridge needs beyond the current Capital Improvement Plan allocation. He concluded by discussing funding for the bridge additives and conveyed the staff recommendation to approve the construction contract with Bridge Additive A1.

Mayor Hansen called for public comment.

- (a) Dale Wright, Shoreline, said the improvement of the Aurora Corridor was one of the primary reasons the City incorporated, noting that the public process began in

DRAFT

1996 for developing the City's concept for Aurora in its 20-year Comprehensive Plan. He said the preferred concept was adopted by Council in August 1999 in a legitimate public process involving citizens from all geographic areas, staff, consultants, businesses, WSDOT, Federal Highway Administration, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, developers, Aurora businesses, Community Transit, Sound Transit, King County Metro, City of Seattle, City of Lynnwood Public Works, City of Edmonds, Department of Ecology, Seattle City Light, and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. He said despite all the work, some have never acknowledged this legitimate public process and the resulting plan for Aurora. He urged the Council to approve the project tonight, noting the City has already invested nine years and \$5 million in the project.

(b) Keith McGlashan, Shoreline, urged the Council to award the bid with Alternatives 1 and 2, noting that this is an opportunity to make Aurora safe, business-friendly, and attractive. He said the project has "dragged on long enough" and the resulting delays have cost the City millions of dollars. He urged citizens to patronize Aurora Corridor businesses during construction, noting it is citizens' responsibility to ensure that these businesses remain successful.

(c) Kevin Grossman, Shoreline, encouraged the Council to move forward with the contract and include both alternatives, noting that the project has been in the planning stage for the past 10 years. He said after an extensive planning process, including the activities of the Aurora Comprehensive Planning Action Committee groups, the City has arrived at a solution that addresses safety, aesthetic, and infrastructure issues. He said the project addresses surface water issues and will help encourage more substantial development along Aurora Avenue. He concluded that if the Council does not do it now, it will probably never happen.

(d) Caralee Cook, Shoreline, supported the bid award with both alternatives, noting that the 8-foot missile barriers on the N 155th Street bridge would be safer for the motorists beneath. She commented that the project would be a great benefit to the developmentally disabled community because the project will facilitate safer pedestrian crossings. She commented on the amenity of the bicycle trail, pointing out that the Interurban Trail will soon be a continuous trail all the way into Seattle. She said she looks forward to using her bicycle to commute across Aurora Avenue.

(e) Harley O'Neill, Shoreline, urged the City to move forward with the project because many businesses hope that the improvements will attract additional customers from outside of Shoreline. He emphasized the need to attract outside dollars and keep Shoreline money in Shoreline. He said the project is a significant start to business success in the City.

(f) Barbara Guthrie, Shoreline, expressed support for the bid award with both alternatives, noting that as year-round bicycle commuter, she has anxiously awaited the completion of each segment of the Interurban Trail in Shoreline. She felt the Council would be remiss in not including both alternatives, since the arguments for them are

reasonable and financially sound. She said it is amazing to think there may be an actual groundbreaking ceremony, noting that Shoreline will soon be unrecognizable.

(g) Connie King, Shoreline, noted that the Aurora Corridor project will fulfill the vision of clearly identifying Shoreline to commuters and motorists. She said while few motorists see the City's beautiful parks, they will see the beauty and foresight of this Council's decision. She commended the Council for being fiscally responsible and encouraged the Council to approve the contract.

(h) Dan Thwing, Shoreline, expressed concern about the cost of the project, pointing out that the bid is 9% above the engineer's estimate and over 10% above the estimate with Alternative 2. He wondered if sidewalks and other City priorities would suffer as a result of approving these additional expenses. He also commented on the long-term maintenance costs associated with landscaping and trail sweeping that may not be included in the Capital Improvement Plan. He hoped the City's plan carefully considered whether the project would actually improve safety and not adversely affect business activities. He said even though the project is partially funded by federal revenues, he pays federal taxes so he is being "hit from all sides" as a Shoreline citizen.

(i) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, expressed appreciation that City staff met with business owners in the first mile of Aurora Avenue, but felt that some questions were not satisfactorily answered. She said contrary to statements in the staff report, not all properties have granted right-of-way use. She said the staff response regarding u-turns for large vehicles was inadequate, and that accommodations for large vehicles should be part of what is billed as a "first-class design." She also felt the staff response regarding maintenance of the planting beds was inadequate, noting that property owners should not be responsible for pruning and watering the plants/trees. She also expressed concern about the prolonged disruption to the business community and potential lack of business access. She concluded by asking which projects would lose funding as a result of awarding this bid, which is \$2.1 million over budget.

(j) Ellen Barrington, King County Metro, urged the City to award the contract, noting that Aurora Avenue is an important transit corridor for Metro. She expressed appreciation for the city's to-date investment in transit improvements and noted Metro's financial partnership on Phase 1 and its intent to partner in Phase 2. She concluded by outlining Metro's transit improvements in the corridor that have increased service levels by over 54%.

(l) Rick Stephens, Shoreline property owner, said many questions remain unanswered in the project because the Council was not wise enough to process a National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statement. He said the Council is unaware of the damage that will be done to the business district and the traffic impacts to adjacent neighborhoods as a result of the project. He said it is extremely disappointing that the Council considers it more important to build entranceways and signs that say "Welcome to Shoreline" than it is to provide safe walkways for children to get to school. He said the City has not been forthright about the actual costs for

DRAFT

underground utilities, noting that Shoreline ratepayers will actually bear this expense. He asserted that the storm water design for the project does not meet current standards, and that many corrections could have been made if the Council would have listened to its citizens. He said the project is still the most expensive one-mile project in the region and the Council has not fulfilled its responsibility to use taxpayer money to benefit the whole City.

(k) Mary Jo Heller, Shoreline, noted that in 1995 she and others stood before the City Council and expressed their hopes for a future Shoreline, which included “a downtown that’s actually a downtown and not a pass-through” and “something more than cleaner streets.” She said despite the many priorities and continued needs, the Aurora Corridor project meets the vision that citizens have had for Shoreline since 1995. She urged the Council to fund the project with the overpass that was discussed in 1995.

(l) Paulette Gust, Shoreline, urged the Council to award the contract with both additives. She commented on the difference between a needs assessment and strength assessment, noting that there will always be more needs than the City can satisfy. She explained that the Aurora Corridor project has tremendous strength in terms of public support and financial assistance from many funding partners. She noted that 87% of the funding for the project is provided from outside sources, and the project has the support of past and current local and state legislators, including Connie King, Linda Montgomery, Cheryl Lee, Kevin Grossman, Jay Inslee, Patty Murray, and Darlene Fairley.

(m) Dan Zoretic, Shoreline business owner, urged the Council to approve the contract with Additives 1 and 2, noting that the project will update the corridor and “change the face of Shoreline.” He said many people only know Shoreline as having casinos and don’t know it for its schools, parks, and diverse community, but the new bridges will make a statement for the City. He commented on the frequent accidents he witnesses caused by the two-way left-turn “suicide” lanes in front of his business. He also commented on the danger that the current configuration poses to transit riders and pedestrians due to the absence of an adequate buffer. He said the project will encourage more redevelopment, such as the one currently underway at N 185th Street, and ultimately increase Shoreline’s tax base. He felt the additional revenue from jobs, property taxes and sales taxes would more than offset the project costs and long-term maintenance costs.

(n) Ros Bird, on behalf of the Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council, said the Art Jury deliberated the bridge design for many hours and concluded that the benefits of additives 1 and 2 would be worth the investment. She said an enhanced, aesthetically pleasing bridge design will increase safety, act as a deterrent to vandalism and graffiti, and increase jobs and sales tax revenue. She said receiving federal funding for this project is a good thing because the funding would probably go to another jurisdiction for another project if not Shoreline. She said she has been very impressed with staff and Council’s ability to find outside funding to make the project possible. This brings tax dollars back to the community to make it a better place to live.

- (o) Stan Terry, Shoreline, said “It’s about time!”

There was Council concurrence to move to the public hearing and continue action on this item after the hearing.

7. **ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARING**

- (a) Public hearing to consider citizens comments on four site-specific land use change requests to the Comprehensive Plan:

File Number & Project Name: 201277-Harper

Address: 19671 15th AVE NE

Existing Land Use Designation: Ballinger Special Study Area (BaSSA)

Requested Land Use Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

File Number & Project Name: 201371-Crosby

Address: NW Corner of N 160th ST & Fremont PL N

Existing Land Use Designation: Low Density Residential (LDR)

Requested Land Use Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

File Number & Project Name: 201372-Echo Lake

Address: 19250 Aurora Ave N

Existing Land Use Designations: Mixed Use (MU), Public Open Space (PubOS), and

High Density Residential (HDR)

Requested Land Use Designation: Mixed Use (MU)

File Number & Project Name: 301275-James Alan Salon

Address: 18511 Linden Ave N

Existing Land Use Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

Requested Land Use Designation: **Mixed Use (MU)**

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, outlined the four site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals and the Planning Commission’s recommendation for each:

- Proposal to change one parcel located at 19671 15th Avenue NE (Ballinger Special Study Area) from Low Density Residential (LDR) to High Density Residential (HDR): recommended for approval by the Planning Commission.
- Proposal to change one parcel located at 18511 Linden Avenue N from HDR to Mixed Use (MU): recommended for approval by the Planning Commission. The current R-48 zone would be consistent with the change to MU, although applicant has suggested at some future point the intent to expand a business use on this site.

- Proposal to change one parcel located at N 160th Street and Fremont Place N from LDR to HDR: recommended for denial by the Planning Commission. This application was highly contentious and opponents argued that the change in density would not be consistent with the character of the existing neighborhood.
- Proposal to change the property located at 19250 Aurora Avenue N (Echo Lake) from the current designation of HDR and Public Open Space (PubOS) to MU for the entire site. The Planning Commission recommended changing only that portion of the site that is currently designated HDR to MU. Further, the Commission recommended that the current designation of PubOS remain without modification. The major reason for retaining the PubOS designation was the desire to ensure access to Echo Lake and maintain a connection between the lake, Aurora Avenue, and the Interurban Trail.

Mr. Stewart explained that rezone actions will come forward next week for the Ballinger and Echo Lake properties.

Mayor Hansen declared the public hearing open.

(a) Peter Henry, Shoreline, said as one of the appellants of the Echo Lake proposal that the City made the correct decision in not moving forward with a City Hall Project at that site. He said a majority of his appellant group were satisfied with the agreement made with the developer to ensure the highest standards for surface water quality and drainage at the site. He went on to address conditions of the agreement and the Planning Commission recommendation for changes.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, noted that Mr. Henry is addressing aspects of the quasi-judicial contract rezone proposal.

(b) David John Potter, Shoreline, expressed concern about the potential harm to Boeing Creek and related habitat as a result of developing the property located at N. 160th and Fremont Place. He felt that Boeing Creek should be protected, regardless of whether portions of it are considered piped watercourses.

(c) Janet Way, Shoreline, noted that Boeing Creek runs directly adjacent to the Fremont Place site under the road. She agreed with the Planning Commission recommendation to deny this amendment because of potential environmental impacts related to streams and trees. She said her appellant group came to a good solution on the Echo Lake site, noting that her group supports the original agreement that was made. She hoped the City would continue to honor the agreement as a legal contract between the parties.

(d) Lee Michaelis, Shoreline, representing the application recommended for denial, noted that the piped watercourse is not on the subject property, and even if it was, piped watercourses do not fall under the City's definition of streams, which are defined as surface water courses with a defined channel or bed. He did not feel a discussion of Boeing Creek was warranted in this case. He said the applicant is happy to comply with

DRAFT

the City's requirement that 20% of the existing trees remain on the property, noting the applicant's willingness to allow three (33%) trees to remain. He pointed out that the current code allows property owners to remove up to six significant trees. He disagreed with the Planning Commission's findings that the proposal would have an adverse impact. He felt the subject property should be considered for increased density because it serves as a transitional zone between the High Density Commercial zone to the south and the lower density zones to the north and west. He noted that issues such as traffic and aesthetics can be addressed through the Development Code as part of a development proposal.

(e) David Maul, Rutledge Moll Architects, urged the City to approve the Comprehensive Plan change for the Ballinger property and said he is available for questions.

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, seconded by Councilmember Gustafson and unanimously carried, the public hearing was closed.

Councilmember Ransom wondered why the developer did not propose a change from LDR to Medium Density Residential for the Fremont Place property if the intent was to build townhomes.

Mr. Stewart said the application simply proposed a change from LDR to HDR. The Planning Commission did not feel HDR was an appropriate land use designation for this parcel, mainly because Commissioners felt that Fremont serves as a distinct boundary between low and high density that should not be breached. He noted the parcel has an area of 7,700 square feet.

Councilmember Fimia asked about the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan land use designation and the zoning designation relative to the Echo Lake site. She felt the Comprehensive Plan designation would take precedence over the zoning designation, and that structures could not be built on an underlying land use that is designated as open space.

Mr. Stewart explained that the MU designation allows a great number of land use zones within it, so the zone must be consistent with those outlined in the plan.

Councilmember Fimia felt the public might be confused by the fact that the land use designation of PubOS has an underlying zoning designation.

Mr. Stewart assured her that the definition of PubOS clearly states that the underlying zoning for this designation will remain the same. It does not deny the private property rights of the developer to have a PubOS designation in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Burkett mentioned that many City parks are designated as PubOS, but have an underlying zone of R-6.

DRAFT

RECESS

At 8:58 p.m. Mayor Hansen declared a five minute recess. The meeting reconvened at 9:03 p.m.

9. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) Aurora Corridor and Interurban Trail Bridges Project Bid award
(continued)

Councilmember Gustafson moved to authorize the City Manager to execute a construction contract with Gary Merlino Construction Co., Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$23,606,287.75 (base bid plus A1 and A2) and authorize a 5.9% contingency authority to complete the Aurora Avenue North Multimodal Corridor Project N. 145th St. to N. 165th St. and Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Projects for a total amount of \$24,992,820.68. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion.

Councilmember Ransom moved to delete A2 from the motion. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion. Councilmember Ransom felt the artwork for the Aurora bridge should be funded but felt Additive 2 was an excessive cost. A vote was taken on the motion, which failed 2 – 5, with Councilmembers Fimia and Ransom voting in the affirmative.

Councilmember Gustafson spoke in favor of retaining Additive 2 in the bid, noting that it would provide an important safety improvement for the community.

Councilmember Fimia questioned the design of the Aurora Bridge and its lack of direct access from the east side of Aurora Avenue. She questioned why a stairway was not designed on the east side so people could access the trail.

Mr. McKinley explained that the budget did not allow for a ramping system, which would be required for this type of amenity, in addition to the fact there is not much privately owned commercial land north of this location.

Councilmember Fimia questioned whether the City could negotiate with the contractor to find savings in the project rather than borrow against Aurora Phase 2 for the bridge additives.

Mr. Haines said the City has the right to negotiate change orders once a contract is awarded, but he was skeptical about whether savings could be achieved. He said he would not want to make any guarantees until the project is well underway.

Councilmember Fimia also asked for information on current levels of service at the affected intersections both now and when the construction is complete. She also

DRAFT

requested that staff reconsider the use of ivy in the planting beds since it is considered an invasive species.

Councilmember Chang pointed out that improvements made by the utility districts will be charged back to Shoreline citizens through the rate structure. He felt that there could be less expensive solutions to some of the safety issues. He cited the installation of a stop sign at 152nd Street that has reduced accidents there. He was concerned about the traffic flow and access to Aurora Avenue from Whitman Avenue in the area between 145th and 149th Streets, noting that the design might actually increase traffic accidents. He said some customers may refuse to patronize the businesses in that area due to the lack of a northbound left turn onto Aurora from Whitman Avenue. He did not feel the design adequately addressed the concerns of businesses and property owners on the corridor.

Mr. Haines agreed that a traffic signal at N 149th Street would be advantageous for the City in terms of access and pedestrian safety, but WSDOT must be convinced of this need. He said this could be pursued separately from the project.

Councilmember Chang noted that WSDOT would likely respond more favorably if the City applied more pressure.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concerns related to irregularities in a number of individual elements of the bid pricing. He pointed out that in many cases, the bid price is twelve times higher than the engineer's estimate. He said the Public Works department indicated that some bidders "front load" their bids to get paid off early in the process and bid low on items they do toward the end. He said contractors also bid high on items they feel will be included as change orders to make the project more profitable. He compared the two bids received and questioned whether the City received a fair bid. He said it is disconcerting that contractors manipulate bids in an attempt to overcharge the City.

Continuing, he questioned whether the City made reasonable accommodation to the businesses, noting that businesses were promised left-turn access, signal lights and u-turns but they were not included in the project. He pointed out that WSDOT acquiesced to other jurisdictions' demands for certain traffic features. He also noted that business owners are concerned that maple trees might adversely affect visibility for businesses. He said businesses are not satisfied with the number of left-turns and u-turns and still have concerns about signage.

Mayor Hansen emphasized the importance of the overall bid as opposed to individual bid items. He commented on the good reputations of both firms, noting that the bids were relatively close to the engineer's estimate.

Councilmember Chang noted that other jurisdictions spent between \$9 million and \$13 million per mile for their corridor projects, but Shoreline's project is costing over \$30 million. He questioned whether Shoreline's project was a good value. He said a majority of businesses and property owners he has spoken to have serious concerns about the project.

DRAFT

Councilmember Fimia spoke against the motion, noting that while she has always been in favor of improved transit and safety on the Aurora Corridor, the proposed plan is not balanced in terms of cost-benefit and overall transportation needs. She felt the plan should have been for the entire three-mile stretch of Aurora, not just for one mile. She commented on the high costs of the plan and the fact that Shoreline has many other transportation priorities such as sidewalks that are not even funded in the 20-year Capital Improvement Plan. She noted that 80% of the funding over the next 30 years will be used for only four City projects. She explained that Metro was only able to increase service levels because it decided to do clean diesel instead of natural gas buses, which saved about \$100 million. She said any level of service (LOS) improvements on Aurora Avenue would not be equivalent to the investment, and that the plan has symbolically and physically divided the community. She questioned the City's ability to deliver the project on-time and on-budget, noting that recent capital projects have not met her expectations.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen spoke in favor of the motion, noting that the project would bring the community together and make a "real statement" for Shoreline. He pointed out that Shoreline has been spending a lot of money over the past 10 years on dilapidated infrastructure inherited from King County but has made many improvements in the areas of parks, surface water management, and roads. He said the project would create economic development opportunities for both current and future businesses, and it is important to continue to send this message to the community. He commented on the safety and aesthetic benefits the project would provide and emphasized Shoreline's many funding partners, noting his belief that the project is a "great investment for this community." He commented that people should also acknowledge the reasons for the delays and cost increases rather than just attacking the project.

Councilmember Grace strongly supported the motion, noting that while he had to carefully consider the additives, they make a significant contribution to the overall project. He said he looks forward to the safety and mobility improvements and the economic development opportunities the project will provide. He said finishing this project and moving on to the next priority, such as sidewalks, will show people that the Council cares about the future of the community. He commented favorably on the contractor, noting that Merlino Construction has been very responsive to the businesses community in previous corridor projects.

Councilmember Gustafson said he has always been an advocate for the project because it provides so many improvements in the areas of safety, aesthetics, infrastructure, economic development, and ADA facilities. He said completion of the Aurora Corridor has been the City's #1 goal ever since he has served on the Council, and past Councilmembers have been supportive of this vision. He said while he is concerned about the costs, the costs have risen due to factors beyond the City's control.

Councilmember Ransom restated his objections to the project due to what he perceived as bid irregularities and the lack of accommodation to businesses.

DRAFT

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 4-3, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia and Ransom dissenting. The City Manager was authorized to execute a construction contract with Gary Merlino Construction Co., Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$23,606,287.75 (base bid plus A1 and A2) and authorized a 5.9% contingency authority to complete the Aurora Avenue North Multimodal Corridor Project N. 145th St. to N. 165th St. and Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Projects for a total amount of \$24,992,820.68.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to authorize the City Manager to accept the anticipated additional TIB and federal funds for the purposes of funding this project and to make necessary changes to the CIP to reflect these additional revenues. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Councilmember Fimia moved to negotiate with WSDOT to add an additional stop light at Aurora Avenue and N 149th Street. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen said he would probably not support the motion because staff has already asked for this and was turned down by WSDOT.

Councilmember Ransom noted that passing this motion means the City intends to pursue this very significant issue with WSDOT. He emphasized the importance of persuading WSDOT to allow a traffic signal and crosswalk at the subject intersection.

Councilmember Chang reiterated the problems caused by the fact that vehicles cannot make a left turn from Whitman Avenue onto Aurora Avenue. He felt a traffic count in this area would provide the evidence needed to warrant a traffic signal.

Mr. McKinley said the City has already conducted traffic counts and submitted a traffic signal warrant analysis, both for a pedestrian signal and for a full signal. He reassured the Council that staff would continue to "push very hard with the DOT to get a signal in there eventually."

Mayor Hansen said while he supports the concept, he does not consider the motion necessary because of staff's commitment to working with WSDOT on this issue.

Given that a warrant analysis has already been conducted, Councilmember Grace wondered what alternate course of action the City could take with WSDOT.

Mr. Haines said that traffic pattern changes resulting from the Aurora project and other economic development projects in the area might be enough to warrant further consideration by WSDOT. He said every change that occurs is another opportunity for the City to request reconsideration. He felt the best chance for success is to identify it as a separate project and pursue it more rigorously after Aurora Phase 1 is underway.

DRAFT

Mr. McKinley said the development and redevelopment going on in the area will help the City build a strong case for a traffic signal.

Councilmember Fimia felt that staff would have more influence on WSDOT if it had “the formal strength of the Council” behind it. She also felt it would spur economic development if people knew the City is “working on this very strongly.”

MEETING EXTENSION

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

After further brief discussion, **a vote was taken on the motion, which failed 3-4, with Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, and Ransom voting in the affirmative.**

Mr. Burkett confirmed that staff would return with strategies to continue working with WSDOT on this issue.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.